

DISSERTATION

PERCEIVED DETERRENTS
TO CLASSIFIED STAFF'S
VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Submitted by

Nancy L. Reed

School of Occupational and Educational Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Summer 1994

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

June 28, 1994

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE DISSERTATION PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION BY NANCY L. REED ENTITLED PERCEIVED DETERRENTS TO CLASSIFIED STAFF'S VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING IN PART REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Committee on Graduate Work

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

Advisor

[Redacted signature]

Director

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

PERCEIVED DETERRENENTS TO CLASSIFIED STAFF'S VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

The purpose of this study was to identify the deterrents to public higher education classified staff's voluntary participation in staff development activities. The population was classified staff at the three Colorado State University System institutions: Colorado State University, Fort Lewis College, University of Southern Colorado.

The sample population was asked to respond to the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD), a modified form of the Deterrents to Participation Scale--General Form (DPS-G). The survey asked thirty-five questions, comprising six participation deterrent factors, and nine demographic questions. A correlational design was utilized to study the relationships between the participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and their demographics and the relationships between classified staff's perceived participation deterrents and those perceived by the personnel/human resource services directors of the three campuses.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for all statistical treatment. Frequencies, percentages, and relationships are discussed.

All campuses identified Time Constraints as the most important deterrent factor, and Lack of Confidence as the least important. There were significant differences between the staffs regarding the Lack of Confidence and Low Personal Priority factors. The three staffs agreed on seven of the ten participation deterrent questions identified from the survey with the highest means. There were one significant difference between the staffs' and directors' perceptions of deterrents.

There were no significant differences between gender or racial/ethnic identification of respondents and the participation deterrent factors. There were significant differences between the age, educational credential, family income, and total years of employment in the Colorado State System and the Lack of Confidence factor. Additional correlations were found between staff demographics and deterrent factors.

Useful data may be obtained with the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD), although further study and modification are recommended. Derived data may be used by institution personnel to plan and conduct viable, appropriate staff development efforts.

Nancy L. Reed
School of Occupational and
Educational Studies
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523
Summer 1994

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my committee members for their encouragement and understanding. In particular, I want to thank my advisor, Dr. Barbara J. Nelson, for her humor, patience and endurance - you made it enriching and fun. Thanks to Dr. Charles F. Porter for his positive attitude - your suggestions were always helpful and inspiring. Thanks to Dr. Robert W. Richburg for taking the field so late in the game and never fumbling - your encouragement was ever-present. Thanks, also, to Patricia A. Smith for sharing a new adventure - you were a tireless advocate.

A special thanks to Dr. Gordon G. Darkenwald for giving me permission to build on his research and his encouragement of my efforts.

To the three Personnel/Human Resource Services individuals who took the time from their busy schedules for phone calls, letters, fax messages and interviews, I offer my heartfelt appreciation. It wasn't possible without you.

And to all the classified staff who returned surveys, and those who might have, you have supported the premise of professional and personal development efforts for all of us.

Last, but not least, a multi-thanks to my family, friends, and co-workers who lived through all the years of my learning anxieties and wild enthusiasms. You deserve a rest and great praise.

DEDICATION

This manuscript is lovingly dedicated
to all my dragons past and future
and to *La Belle Bête*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....		iii
Acknowledgements.....		v
Dedication.....		vi
List of Tables.....		ix
 <u>Chapter</u>		
I	Introduction.....	1
	Need for the Study.....	4
	Problem Statement.....	5
	Research Questions.....	6
	Definition of Terms.....	7
	Significance of the Study.....	8
	Delimitations.....	9
	Limitations and Assumptions.....	9
	Summary.....	10
II	Review of the Literature.....	11
	Staff Development in the Workplace.....	11
	Participation Deterrents.....	13
	Deterrents to Participation Scale.....	18
	Demographic Variables.....	22
	Summary.....	24
III	Methodology.....	26
	Introduction.....	26
	Population and Sampling Design.....	26
	Research Design.....	27
	Variables.....	27
	Instrumentation.....	28
	Pilot Study.....	28
	Data Collection Procedures and Analysis....	29
	Statistical Treatment.....	29
IV	Data Analysis.....	31
	Introduction.....	31
	Collected Data.....	33
	Demographics.....	33
	Research Questions.....	41
	Research Question 1.....	42

	Research Question 2.....	48
	Research Question 3.....	50
	Research Question 4.....	52
	Research Question 5.....	61
	Research Question 6.....	63
	Summary.....	69
V	Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	70
	Procedure.....	70
	Findings.....	71
	Conclusions.....	75
	Recommendations.....	76
	References.....	82
Appendix A	Cover Letter and Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development....	87
Appendix B	Follow-up Post Card.....	93
Appendix C	Personnel/Human Resource Services Director Survey....	95
Appendix D	Personnel/Human Resource Services Director Informed Consent Form.....	103

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Gender of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD.....	34
2. Age of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD.....	35
3. Highest Educational Credentials of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD.....	36
4. Total Family Income Before Taxes of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD.....	37
5. Racial/Ethnic Group Identification by Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD.....	38
6. Staff Development Activities Participated in by Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD.....	39
7. Total Years Employed as Classified Staff in Colorado State System as Reported on the DPS-SD.....	40
8. Means of Classified Staff's Perceived Participation Deterrents on the DPS-SD.....	42
9. One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Perceived Participation Deterrents among Staffs at the Three Institutions.....	49
10. Ten Participation Means on Participation Deterrent Questions by Classified Staff at the three Institutions.....	51
11. T-test Comparison of Female and Male Staff Members on Participation Deterrent Factors.....	53
12. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff Age and Participation Deterrent Factors...	54

13.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff's Highest Educational Credential and Participation Deterrent Factors.....	55
14.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff Total Family Income Before Taxes and Participation Deterrent Factors.....	56
15.	One-way ANOVA Comparison of Racial/Ethnic Group Identification and Participation Deterrent Factors by Classified Staff.....	58
16.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Development Activities Participated in by Classified Staff and Participation Deterrent Factors.....	59
17.	Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff Total Years of Employment in Colorado State System and Participation Deterrent Factors.....	60
18.	T-test Comparison of Perceived Deterrent Factors by Staff and Personnel Directors at the Three Institutions.....	62
19.	Means of Perceived Participation Deterrent Factors by Personnel/Human Resource Services Directors on the Three Colorado State University System Campuses.....	64

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION
Background

Institutions of higher education rely on non-teaching, support staff to conduct much of their daily business. In higher education, a labor-intensive industry, using human resources effectively is critical (Smith & Ferris, 1990). Colorado Governor Roy Romer recognized the importance of state employees as "the backbone of Colorado's system of state government" (Romer, 1993, April, p. 2) in a guest column addressed to state employees. In a second column, he urged state leaders, including college presidents, to "find ways for all state employees, from all levels, to become active participants in improving the way we do business" (Romer, 1993, October, p. 2). Romer's comments convey the idea that state classified employees are involved in the business of state institutions.

In a report concerning the study of classified staff in selected Arizona higher education institutions, Sherberg and Cetone (1988) stated: "The universities rely heavily upon the support of classified personnel to help maintain the excellence, efficiency and competitiveness of the institutions...As partners in the management of 'the company,' the staff should expect to share in its profits and risks" (p. 780).

In order to participate in the state system which employs them and to share in the profits and risks of 'the company', state employees must be provided appropriate staff development opportunities to become qualified and informed. One of the profits for both employees and the institution is the opportunity to participate in staff development activities and improve the work ecology. One of the risks for both the employees and the institution is the lack of growth which can result from deterrents to participation in staff development activities. Human resource managers must plan carefully and use all data at their disposal to insure quality programs.

While discussing the linkage between employee development activities and human resources programs, Mirabile (1991) points out that resources, time and energy must be committed by management, regardless of difficulties due to resistance to change or political squabbles. With the tightening of budgets for public higher education institutions, there is an increasing need to justify funds spent for staff development activities for classified staff. Some individual higher education institutions, such as Metropolitan State College of Denver (S. I. Fasano, personal communication, May 4, 1994), have established policies and procedures for classified staff professional development. The University of Idaho conducts a full schedule of staff training and development workshops both semesters with special certification series in leadership and management (K. Flack, personal communication, April 28, 1994).

Also, an eight year comprehensive review by the Employee Development Committee has been prepared at the University of Colorado at Boulder (K. Mitchell, personal communication, April 27, 1994). Colorado State University has initiated a professional development plan "to provide non-teaching personnel with expanded and more comprehensive professional-development opportunities" (Staff, 1993, October 7, p. 1). This plan is a result of one of the University's strategic goals. It promotes the development of staff as lifelong learners and more creative, inquisitive and better workers (Staff, 1993, October 7, p. 1). These efforts serve as examples of organized approaches to staff development efforts for classified staff.

In order to conduct a successful staff development effort, planners must have data at their disposal which explains the various elements of participation in such activities. One such element is nonparticipation. Even though staff development is not an exact science, researchers need to come to grips with such variables as barriers to participation. Kreitlow (1990) is among educators who urge observers, users, or researchers to conduct studies in order to compile reliable and valid data.

Phillips (1991) also recognizes human resource professionals' basic responsibilities in evaluation and measurement of programs. Many times there is a lack of centralized administration of staff development which targets classified staff. In these cases, there are no comprehensive reports or statistics concerning the

deterrents to voluntary participation of this employee group in staff development activities from which to plan. In discussing research on participation barriers, Cross (1981) states that "the construction and testing of plausible theories for explaining barriers and explaining participation is a powerful tool that has not yet been adequately utilized in adult education" (p. 108).

Staff development is concerned with learning, not only the idea of education, and when participation in learning is deterred, individuals and organizations do not grow. As Houle (1981) states, "...primary emphasis is upon the actions of individuals and groups who seek to fulfill their own potentialities. Learning is the process by which people gain knowledge, sensitiveness, or mastery of skills through experience or study" (p. xi).

Shirley O. Harris, Director of the Colorado Department of Personnel, supports employee growth and development for the largest work force in Colorado. (Harris, 1992, October, p. 2) Ms. Harris urges state employees to "strive for excellence through every opportunity presented to us, whether it be networking, training, self-development or self-improvement" (Harris, 1993, February, p. 2).

Need for the Study

There is a general need to identify deterrents to participation in adult learning settings. Specifically, there is a need to identify deterrents to participation in the development of

classified staff in the public higher education setting. Knowledge concerning nonparticipation can aid institutions of higher education in up-grading their staff development efforts by identifying participation deterrents and their relationships to individual classified staff's demographics and to the individual institution's efforts. Personnel/human resource services directors at the three Colorado State University System campuses have expressed concern regarding participation deterrents to staff development efforts (personal communications, April 1994). They agreed there was a need for information such as would result from participation deterrent research. Neutralizing participation deterrents, with the possible result of increased participation, may support a more economically viable staff development effort and an invigorated, participatory staff. Although nonparticipation factors for faculty in public and post-secondary education have been studied and reported, there is little in the literature concerning staff development and deterrents to participation in staff development activities for classified staff in higher education.

Problem Statement

The problem of this study was to identify deterrents to Colorado State University System classified staffs' voluntary participation in staff development activities; to investigate the relationships between the participation deterrents and respondents'

demographics; and, to compare the participation deterrents perceived by the classified staff and those perceived by the personnel/human resource services directors of the three Colorado State University System campuses.

Research Questions

1. What are the perceived participation deterrents identified on the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) by public higher education classified staff?
2. What are the differences, between institutions, of the participation deterrents perceived by the public higher education classified staff?
3. Which of these participation deterrents are identified by classified staff at the three institutions as most important?
4. What are the relationships between perceived participation deterrent factors and demographic variables?
5. What are the differences between participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and those perceived by personnel/human resource services directors?
6. What are the differences between the participation deterrents perceived by the three personnel/human resource services directors?

Definition of Terms

Terms are defined here for the purpose of clarification, and these definitions may be assumed throughout this study.

Classified Staff: Classified staff, as defined by the State of Colorado job classification system, are employees in positions identified by the 921 job classes established and maintained by the State.

Staff Development Activities: These activities are formal or informal, group or individual, organized or independent learning experiences promoted by the employer which encourage personal and professional growth of employees as individuals and as members of the institution. They include courses, workshops, seminars, and independent projects, but exclude initial task training on a new job.

Voluntary Participation: This is the action of taking part based on the individual's decision and not as mandated by the supervisory chain-of-command.

Participation Deterrents: These are barriers to taking part in some activity, barriers such as those identified in the Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G) and the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD): Lack of Confidence, Lack of Relevance, Time Constraints, Low Personal Priority, Cost, Personal/Work Problems.

Colorado State University System: This higher education system consists of Colorado State University (Ft. Collins), Ft. Lewis College (Durango), and the University of Southern Colorado (Pueblo).

Demographics: Demographics are the characteristics of survey respondents, such as gender, age, educational credentials, family income, employment status, racial/ethnic identification, staff development activities' participation, years as classified staff, and location of employment.

Significance of the Study

Deterrents to adults' participation in learning has been a subject of interest for educators for some years (Cross, 1981; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985; Rubenson, 1977). Deterrents to adults' participation in specific learning situations has also been of interest to educators and researchers (Drake, 1988; Eatman, 1992; Marsick, 1987). This study provides information on deterrents to voluntary participation of classified staff in staff development activities and how the deterrents relate to the respondents' demographics. In addition, the study compares the participation deterrent perceptions of the personnel/human resource services directors to those of the classified staff. With a wider range of information, educators, trainers, and learners in varied environments may address the problem of neutralizing the deterrents

and enhancing the benefits of staff development experiences for this specific group.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were imposed for this study:

1. Initial task training on a new job was considered outside the scope of this study.
2. Participation in this study was limited to full-time Colorado State University System classified staff.
3. Classified staff possessed the appropriate literacy level to respond to the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development.

Limitations and Assumptions

The following limitations and assumptions were made for the conduct of this study:

1. The higher education classified staff were motivated to respond to the DPS-SD survey.
2. Respondents to the survey instrument provided accurate and honest information.
3. The phrase "staff development activities" was perceived in a similar way by all respondents based on the definition provided in the directions to the survey.
4. The modified Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G), known as the Deterrents to Participation Scale--

Staff Development (DPS-SD), accurately measured deterrents to classified staff's voluntary participation in staff development activities.

5. Classified staff at each institution varied in their patterns of participation in staff development activities.
6. The appropriate person at each institution participated in the personnel/human resource services director's interview.

Summary

This chapter presented an overview of the study including: an introduction to the topic; the problem statement; enumeration of the needs, the definitions, the delimitations, the limitations, and the assumptions of the study. Chapter Two contains a review of literature relevant to this study. Chapter Three describes the instrumentation used in the study and the methods of analysis of the data. Results of the analysis are reported in Chapter Four. Chapter Five presents a summarization of the study and discusses findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

As Rudestam and Newton (1992) point out, the literature review is not to convince the reader that the writer is familiar with a wide range of works and, consequently, to present a laundry list of previous studies. Instead, the purpose of the literature review is to provide a context for the proposed study, demonstrating its importance and timeliness. This chapter includes a review of books, articles, dissertations, government documents, databases (i.e. ERIC, PsychLit, Dissertation Abstracts, Social Work Abstracts), and other pertinent sources which accomplishes this purpose.

Staff Development in the Workplace

Lifelong learning for workers is an accepted philosophy in today's ever-changing global work community. Whether in the private or public sector, employers are recognizing the essential need to provide an environment in which employees may learn in order to upgrade skills, learn new skills, meet the many needs of their varied life roles, and remain content and competent workers (Morse, 1984; Cheren, 1990).

Cheren (1990) stressed that organizations need to foster learning-to-learn for employees so that they may experience

improvement in both self-initiated and organizationally-sanctioned learning efforts. In a 1992 study, it was found that workers were interested in participating in an employee involvement program as a way to increase responsibility, self-expression, and fulfillment of personal needs (Miller & Prichard, 1992). Public higher education institutions, as employers of non-faculty staff, also recognize the importance of this philosophy by providing staff with professional development activities and study privileges as job benefits. Institutions have been concerned with the processes and procedures of providing learning experiences and also concerned with the employee as a human resource (Wheless & Howard, 1983).

From the human resources perspective, higher education personnel and human resources departments must consider what Wheless and Howard (1983) term the "knowledge contract" between the employee and employer which recognizes the employer's need for skills and knowledge in its employees and the need of employees to obtain and improve those skills and knowledge. A report concerning attraction and retention of classified staff at Arizona's three public universities stated that education waivers and developmental training programs were incentives for staff retention (Sherberg and Cetone, 1988). One of the conclusions made by the report is that expanding programs for training staff will help to maximize the use of the institution's resources. When higher education institutions prepare to provide staff development activities

for classified staff, one concern should be the participation or lack of participation of the staff in the activities provided.

Participation Deterrents

This study will not debate the question of whether participation attractors are the opposite side of the coin to participation deterrents. It is assumed that when participation deterrents are neutralized, participation becomes possible. The focus of this study is on identifying participation deterrents.

Barriers to adult participation in educational experiences has been discussed for many years. A review of literature on women's barriers to participation in postsecondary education was published in 1975 by the National Center for Education Statistics. The literature review preceded a survey program which was to discover how extensive women's nonparticipation was and the reasons for it. Broad categories reviewed were institutional barriers, social constraints, and psychological factors. Within these categories were factors common to current research findings and reports in the professional literature: age and gender restrictions, racial/ethnic constraints, self-concept barriers, and family constraints.

In 1977, in a discussion paper prepared for a meeting on Developments in Recurrent Education, several participation barriers were presented which prevail in current literature: job status or

place in the hierarchical structure, supervisory and peer support, peer influence, relevance, interest, and self-confidence (Rubenson, 1977).

Many studies concerned with deterrents to adult participation in learning situations refer to Cross (1981,1987) and her categorization of learning barriers: institutional barriers, situational barriers, and dispositional barriers (Merriam, 1991; Schlossberg, 1989; Smith, 1990). Institutional barriers are all procedures and practices which "exclude or discourage working adults from participating in educational activities" (p. 98). One study found that factors such as "an actual or perceived lack of managerial sincerity in encouraging participation, or the lack of resources needed to provide training to would-be participants" (Miller & Pritchard, 1992, p. 415-416) could result in low-participation rates. The focus of a study by Blais, Duquette, and Painchaud (1989) was concerned specifically with women in work-related educational activities and what participation deterrents affected them and caused their participation to be lower than men's. The study concentrated on women in a traditionally female occupation, nursing. Data analysis of their questionnaire resulted in five clusters: "Low Priority for Work-Related Activities, Absence of External Incentives, Incidental Costs, Irrelevance of Additional Formal Education for Professional Practice, and Lack of Affective Support" (Blais, Duquette, & Painchaud, 1989, p. 224). Another report referred to classified staff as the silent partners

in their higher education institutions and discussed policy inequities which affect them. When inequities in policies, such as those defining excused time for classes and financial provision for training programs result from supervisor discretion or discrepancies in the financial capabilities of departments, the inequities are sometimes viewed as punitive measures (Sherberg and Cetone, 1988).

Situational barriers are those which result from an individual's life situation at a particular time. Perhaps one of the greatest situational barriers is when an individual is expected to change a life role. Munnelly (1987), in discussing worker involvement in the organization's decision-making, stated that participation leads to the expectation of role-change. Such a change of a life role may create for the worker a barrier to participation in organizational learning experiences. Situational barriers are also discussed by Rolzinski and Charner (1987) in relationship to the focus of improved educational opportunities. The focus should be "directly on the conditions and situations relevant to and identifiable by the adult worker" (Rolzinski & Charner, 1987, p. 82).

Dispositional barriers result from individuals, self-perceptions and attitudes about themselves as learners. Cross (1987) cautioned against dropping respondents who claim they are not interested in education; they should, instead of being dropped, be asked the reasons they aren't interested. In this way, there

would be higher counts for dispositional barriers. One of the most emphasized dispositional barriers is low self-esteem. In discussing her Chain-of-Response Model, Cross (1987) pointed out that individuals' low self-confidence contributes to doubts about their probable success. She uses the terms failure threatened and deficiency oriented (Cross, 1981).

Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) subdivided the institutional barrier category into two subcategories: institutional barriers, failure to communicate to adults the learning experiences available to them; and, informational barriers, the adults' failure to make use of the information available to them regarding educational opportunities. Miller and Prichard (1992) discussed situational factors in the workplace as an explanation of low-participation, e.g. "an actual or perceived lack of managerial sincerity in encouraging participation, or the lack of resources needed to provide training to would-be participants" (p. 415-416).

Another way of looking at barriers to learning is to identify the ways in which individuals may resist learning. Mitchell (1993), in his handbook for trainers, listed seven forms of resistance: "1. Parochial self-interest, 2. Lack of trust, 3. Different assessments of different information, 4. Low tolerance for change, 5. Fear of losing face, 6. Peer-group pressure, 7. Mistaken first impressions" (p. 24). These seven forms might well appear across the span of Cross's three categories: institutional barriers, situational barriers and dispositional barriers.

An additional method of categorizing inhibitors to adult participation in learning activities has been discussed by Boshier (1973) and Mahoney (1991). Both used the categories of internal variables and external variables. Boshier (1973) specified internal psychological variables and external environmental variables. Later, Mahoney (1991) referred to the variables as "baggage" which adversely affects adults' abilities to participate in learning activities. He described internal variables as the individual's interpersonal conflicts, health, and attitudes toward problems and situations. He described external variables as the individual's situations at home, work, or in the community.

Attempts have been made to synthesize research findings on participation deterrents. In 1986, Scanlan found that research suggested six to nine factors that could influence an adult's participation in educational activities:

. . .individual, family, or home-related problems. . .; cost concerns. . .; questionable worth, relevance, or quality of available educational opportunities; negative perceptions regarding the value of education in general. . .; lack of motivation or indifference toward learning. . .; lack of self-confidence in one's learning abilities. . .; general proclivity toward nonaffiliation. . .; incompatibilities of time and/or place. . . (p. 35-36).

In summary, although educators, researchers and other learning specialists have been attempting to identify barriers to learning

for many years, little can be found in the professional literature concerning classified staff in public institutions of higher education and the deterrents to their participation in staff development activities. More studies are needed to serve as reliable bases for planning and evaluation with a variety of adult learner populations. In recent years, studies have concentrated on specific populations in order to ensure that a measuring instrument is specific enough for the individuals being studied. Factors discussed above are apparent in the evolution of the instrument, Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G).

Deterrents to Participation Scale

The survey method for collecting data on deterrents to participation has been used for many years. Cross (1981) quite succinctly states the case for the use of surveys in this type of research.

The survey method, whether by interview or questionnaire, gives broad coverage, shows a certain faith in the capacity of people to analyze their own behavior, and is highly useful in identifying different barriers for the various population groups. (p. 108)

In 1984, Scanlan & Darkenwald published results of a study to identify the variables which deter adults' participation in continuing education. The population for the study was a large number of professionals in the health field. Six factors were

identified: Disengagement, Lack of Quality, Family Constraints, Cost, Lack of Benefit, and Work Constraints. They also attempted to discover any underlying pattern to the deterrents and to discover the utility of the deterrents in predicting participation. They concluded that "with the exception of Factor 6 [Work Constraints], all of the deterrent factors emerged as strong predictors of participation" (Scanlon & Darkenwald, 1984, p. 163). The resulting questionnaire was named Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS).

In 1985, Darkenwald and Valentine "sought to identify the factors that deter the general public from participating in organized adult education" (p. 177). They modeled their instrument, Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G), on the earlier DPS instrument (Scanlan & Darkenwald, 1984). The survey was mailed to randomly selected households in the United States in an attempt to reach the general adult population. The study identified six factors: "Lack of Confidence, Lack of Course Relevance, Time Constraints, Low Personal Priority, Cost, and Personal Problems" (p. 177). The authors concluded that:

These conceptually meaningful factors hold promise both for 'theory-building in the area of participation and for the development of practical strategies to increase the number of adults who engage in organized learning activities (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985, p. 177).

A later study (Garrison, 1988) investigated dropout, one of three types of behavior exhibited by adults participating in

organized adult education: nonparticipation, participation, and dropout. In comparing the results to Darkenwald & Valentine's (1985) deterrent factors, Garrison found the learner's ability absent from the deterrent constructs and suggested that other dropout factors, such as inability to defer to others, inability to take orders, and lack of endurance, might also be deterrents.

The DPS-G was utilized by Drake (1988) to identify deterrents to participation of agriculture teachers in credit and non-credit courses. Deterrents identified were: Lack of Course Relevance, Lack of Confidence, Cost, Time Constraints and Personal Priority, Lack of Encouragement, and Personal Problems. Drake concluded that educators, educational planners, and personnel at the state level needed a more complete understanding of participation barriers.

Also in 1988, Darkenwald modified the DPS-G for use with the British adult population and replicated his American study. Factors in both studies "were comparable and represented clearly defined, conceptually meaningful components of the deterrent construct" (Darkenwald, 1988b, p. 130). Darkenwald did find, however, that the relationships between respondent demographics and attitude scores were notably different. (Darkenwald, 1988a)

A specific data collection instrument called Deterrents to Participation--Form LL (DPS-LL) was developed to view the deterrents to low-literate adults' participation in adult basic education and determine six types of low-literate adults based on their perceived deterrents to participation in adult basic

education (Hayes, 1988). Hayes used five factors in his survey: Low Self-Confidence, Social Disapproval, Situational Barriers, Negative Attitude to Classes, and Low Personal Priority. Each of the six types of low-literate adults he described are high in two or more deterrent factors, thus identifying sub-groups.

In 1989, Martindale and Drake employed the DPS-G to "(a) validate the instrument with a different population and (b) investigate the reasons Air Force enlisted personnel at two bases did not participate in voluntary, off-duty education" (p. 63). The researchers found consistency of the factors in their study and two previous studies (Scanlan & Darkenwald, 1984; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985) and felt the consistency lent support to using the DPS-G with different populations. This study identified eight factors: Lack of Confidence, Lack of Course Relevance, Time Constraints, Cost, Lack of Interest, Lack of Convenience, Lack of Encouragement, and Family Problems.

A doctoral dissertation by Kowalik (1989) sought to determine the validity of the DPS-G. His sample consisted of 1000 alumni from a large public university. His factor analysis, which resulted in eight factors, agreed favorably with that of Martindale and Drake (1989). When a six factor structure was produced, it agreed less favorably with that of Darkenwald and Valentine's (1985). The findings of his study were that the factor structure of the DPS-G was "fairly robust", and showed fairly good replication. He further

found that the comparison to Martindale and Drake's eight factors showed an even stronger replication.

In 1990 Ericksen conducted doctoral research employing the DPS-G to investigate the problem of small business managers' attitudes and barriers to participation in adult educational activities. His population was 600 small business managers in Nebraska. The study determined that the DPS-G was a reliable instrument, and the four factors identified were in alignment with the DPS-G's six factors.

In 1990 Valentine & Darkenwald (1990) used the DPS-G to "identify and describe distinctive types of adults [in adult education], defined with respect to the six deterrent factors" (p. 29). One purpose of the study was to identify "the extent to which different types of would-be learners experience these factors" (Valentine & Darkenwald, 1990, p. 29). They identified five types of adults and the combination of deterrents which characterized them.

Identification of learners relies on the collection of a variety of data. Demographics are one important part of the total body of information utilized in researching learners and their behavior.

Demographic Variables

Demographics have been used in surveys to identify individual and group characteristics and their relationships to other

variables. Merriam and Caffarella (1991) discussed the changing demographics which affect the provision of learning in our American society, and Sudman and Bradburn (1991), in their text on surveys, discussed their support of standardization of demographic questions "so that survey data collected by different researchers will be more comparable and more useful for secondary and trend analyses" (p. 174).

Rubenson (1977) urged collecting even more detailed demographic data. He pointed out that too often researchers consider only the effects of demographic categories, e.g. age, previous education, etc., in an attempt to discover the differences between subgroups. In doing so, they miss the variations within the categories. According to Ross (1989), the issue of educating culturally diverse groups is difficult to discuss since there is lack of data. He agreed that identifying data collection parameters would be conducive to cross-sectional and longitudinal studies.

Specific demographics, such as gender (McLean & Rocheford, 1991) and age (Galbraith, 1983), are also identified as deterrents to participation and have appeared in the literature. Cross (1987) stated that age reveals particular socialized perceptions about "the role of education at various life stages" (p. 57).

There are additional demographics which might create barriers to participation. Houle (1992) acknowledged age and gender and also stated that "nonparticipants in adult education can be distinguished. . . as having less schooling, lower income, . . .

linguistic disadvantages, foreignness of birth. . . ; race, age, and gender sometimes provide bases for differentiation" (p. 107). Literacy and multicultural issues might also act as participation deterrents (Mitchell, 1993) and might be included in the demographics.

Cross (1987) pointed out in several instances that some demographics may be reflecting the influence of other demographics. For example, she pointed out that race may be less of a participation deterrent than expected, because it may actually be reflecting a lower educational attainment level, which is the real participation deterrent. She also illustrated the point by saying that although females' participation in education seems to be on the increase for the past decade and more, females are more concerned with the cost of education and have a somewhat lower educational attainment because they will be more likely than males to have to finance their own education.

Demographics not only provide direct information concerning the population of a study, but can also serve as catalysts or links between two or more other variables. To establish a tradition of dependable research in the social sciences, standardized demographics should be considered.

Summary

Research concerning non-participation of adults in educational activities is a concern of educators, educational planners, and

adult education organizations. Studies to identify reliable, valid instruments which measure participation deterrents have been published over the past two decades and more, and the studies of such researchers as Darkenwald and Valentine (1985, 1990) and Martindale and Drake (1989) offer encouragement and a springboard for other researchers. It is possible that results from the various studies may be used to neutralize participation deterrents and allow participation in educational activities for a variety of populations as researchers focus on specific populations.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology for the conduct of this study. The sections include: population and sampling design, research design, variables, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and statistical treatment. The information will aid the reader in determining the appropriateness of the methods used in this study.

Population and Sampling Design

The theoretical population for this research was State of Colorado full-time higher education state classified staff. The target population was the full-time higher education state classified staff in the Colorado State University System: Colorado State University, Ft. Lewis College, and the University of Southern Colorado.

A random sampling technique was utilized to identify the subjects of the study at Colorado State University. The California Table for Selecting Sample Size (Morris, 1977, p. 71) was employed to determine sample size. The total population of subjects at Ft. Lewis College and University of Southern Colorado was surveyed due to the small numbers of classified staff. Deterrents to

Participation Scale--Staff Development surveys (see Appendix A) were mailed to the sample population of classified staff. One follow-up postcard was sent (see Appendix B). The personnel/human resource services directors at each institution were interviewed in person. The researcher recorded responses using a specifically designed survey which listed the DPS-SD questions under the appropriate factors (see Appendices C and D).

Research Design

A correlational research design was employed to examine relationships between selected demographics and perceived deterrents to voluntary participation of classified staff in staff development activities. The research design included comparisons of the identified perceived participation deterrents of classified staff and those identified by the personnel/human resource services directors.

Variables

The dependent variables in this research were the participation deterrents factors as perceived by classified staff and personnel/human resource services directors: Factor 1--Lack of Confidence, Factor 2--Lack of Relevance, Factor 3--Time Constraints, Factor 4--Low Personal Priority, Factor 5--Cost, Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems. The independent variables were gender, age, educational credentials, family income, employment

status, racial/ethnic group identification, number of staff development activities in which respondent participated, years of employment as classified staff, and location of employment.

Instrumentation

The sample population of classified staff was asked to complete a survey which is a modified form of the Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G), referred to as Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD). The six factors from the DPS-G were retained for the DPS-SD. The DPS-SD was expertly reviewed by Dr. Gordon G. Darkenwald, co-author of the DPS-G. Dr. Wiley Lewis, Professor of Survey Methods at Colorado State University, and Dr. Kay U. Herr Gillespie, Assistant Director of Instructional Services at Colorado State University, reviewed the DPS-SD for face validity and readability. Reliability was established with a pilot study conducted at Colorado State University (Ft. Collins) with 30 respondents. Cronbach's Alpha was employed to test reliability of the modified survey, DPS-SD. Based on the potential aging changes within an adult population of respondents and the guidelines of survey construction, the survey was printed on white paper, employed large, clear type, and was printed with sufficient spacing for greater contrast and reading ease. The personnel/human resource services directors were interviewed concerning their perceptions of the deterrents to staff's participation in staff development activities.

Pilot Study

A pilot study with 30 respondents was conducted on the DPS-SD. The respondents were classified staff at Colorado State University and were selected by haphazard or accidental sampling. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to test the results, employing Cronbach's Alpha for reliability testing. All alphas on the six factors from the survey were approximately .5 or greater. No changes were made in the DPS-SD as used in the research study.

Data Collection Procedures and Analysis

Data were collected by a mailing of the DPS-SD survey to a random sample of full-time Colorado State University System classified staff and all full-time classified staff at Ft. Lewis College and University of Southern Colorado. One follow-up post card was sent. Survey results were compared to the information provided by the three personnel/human resource services directors during interviews.

Statistical Treatment

Frequencies and percentages were described and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized for the statistical analysis. Cronbach's Alpha was employed for reliability testing. Pearson Product Moment (PPM), T-test, and One-way ANOVA were used for comparisons and correlation. Significance levels were

established at .05 for all testing. Although the Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G) has been used with other populations, it has not been modified and used with a population similar to the sample in this study. The modified scale was the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD). Significance levels were established to be rigorous enough, but not too restrictive for an initial study of this population.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents the collected data, statistical analysis, and interpretation of the data. The purpose of the study was to identify deterrents to higher education classified staff's voluntary participation in staff development activities on the three Colorado State University System campuses: Colorado State University, Ft. Lewis College, University of Southern Colorado. Correlations between classified staff's perceived participation deterrents and their demographics were computed. Additionally, comparisons of staff's perceptions of participation deterrents and those perceived by the personnel/human resource services directors on the three campuses were made. The population for the study was classified staff on the three Colorado State University System campuses. The sample population was a random sampling of Colorado State University staff and the total populations of classified staffs at Ft. Lewis College and the University of Southern Colorado due to their small numbers. Classified staff completed a survey, the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD). The three personnel/human resource services directors were interviewed. A review of literature revealed there was little information on the subject of nonparticipation by classified staff

in staff development activities. The findings of the study may assist in identification of participation deterrents in the workplace and their eventual neutralization.

The research questions for this study were:

1. What are the perceived participation deterrents identified on the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) by public higher education classified staff?
2. What are the differences, between institutions, of the participation deterrents perceived by the public higher education classified staff?
3. Which of these participation deterrents are identified by classified staff at the three institutions as most important?
4. What are the relationships between perceived participation deterrent factors and demographic variables?
5. What are the differences between participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and those perceived by personnel/human resource services directors?
6. What are the differences between the participation deterrents perceived by the three personnel/human resource services directors?

Collected Data

This study was conducted on the three Colorado State University System campuses: Colorado State University, Ft. Lewis College, and the University of Southern Colorado. The DPS-SD surveys were mailed to 655 classified staff on the three campuses, and there were 298 total usable surveys returned for a rate of 45%. For Colorado State University 323 surveys were mailed, and 172 were returned and usable (53%). For Ft. Lewis College 145 surveys were mailed, and 62 were returned and usable (43%). For the University of Southern Colorado 187 surveys were mailed, and 64 were returned and usable (34%). A survey was unusable when the employee was part-time, employed for too short a time, was unavailable to complete the survey, or did not wish to participate.

Following is a presentation of the demographic findings of the study. Statistical data is then presented in the order of the research questions. Percentages may not always equal 100% due to rounding.

Demographics

The use of demographics in surveys helps in identifying individual and group characteristics and their relationships with other variables. Demographics, when collected similarly on a number of studies, may make cross-sectional and longitudinal studies more feasible and allow researchers to identify specific variables for specific research studies. In this study, demographics provided a

description of the respondents and were studied in relation to the participation deterrents. Seven demographic variables are discussed below: gender, age, highest educational credential, total family income before taxes, racial/ethnic group identification, staff development activities participated in during 1993 and 1994, and total years as classified staff in the Colorado State System. All respondents were full-time classified staff.

Table 1 presents information regarding the gender of classified staff respondents on each of the three Colorado State University System campuses.

Table 1. Gender of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD

Gender	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
Female	126 (73%)	42 (68%)	43 (67%)	211 (71%)
Male	<u>46 (26%)</u>	<u>20 (32%)</u>	<u>21 (33%)</u>	<u>87 (29%)</u>
N=	172 (58%)	62 (21%)	64 (21%)	298

The majority of respondents were female, approximately 71%. Male respondents comprised approximately 29% of all respondents. From all three campuses, there were more female than male respondents.

Table 2 presents frequencies of classified staff respondents' ages. Ages are presented by decades, and the total of each age group is listed.

Table 2. Age of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD

Age	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
20s	6 (04%)	1 (02%)	8 (12%)	15 (05%)
30s	43 (25%)	15 (25%)	13 (20%)	71 (24%)
40s	71 (42%)	28 (47%)	26 (41%)	125 (43%)
50s	41 (24%)	14 (23%)	16 (25%)	71 (24%)
60s	<u>8 (05%)</u>	<u>2 (03%)</u>	<u>1 (02%)</u>	<u>11 (04%)</u>
N=	169 (58%)	60 (20%)	64 (22%)	293

The mean age of all respondents was 44.4. The mean age for CSU respondents was 44.7, for FLC respondents was 45.1, and for USC respondents was 43.1.

The highest educational credentials of the classified staff respondents are presented in Table 3. Five educational credential categories are used and total numbers of respondents in each category are also listed. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 3. Highest Educational Credentials of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD

Educational Credential	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
No credential	2 (01%)	0 (00%)	2 (03%)	4 (01%)
H.S./GED	79 (46%)	32 (52%)	22 (35%)	133 (45%)
Associate Degree	26 (15%)	10 (16%)	16 (25%)	52 (18%)
Bachelor Degree	53 (31%)	17 (27%)	21 (33%)	91 (31%)
Graduate Degree	<u>12 (07%)</u>	<u>3 (05%)</u>	<u>2 (03%)</u>	<u>17 (05%)</u>
N=	172 (58%)	62 (21%)	63 (21%)	297

Approximately 45% of all respondents to this question had high school diplomas or GEDs. Thirty-one percent (31%) had earned bachelor degrees and 18% had earned associate degrees. Of the remaining respondents, 6% held graduate degrees and less than 1% held no educational credentials.

Table 4 contains information on classified staff's total family income before taxes. Five income categories are used and totals are compiled.

Table 4. Total Family Income Before Taxes of Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD

Family Income	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
Less than \$15,000	5 (03%)	2 (03%)	3 (05%)	10 (03%)
\$15,000 to \$29,999	45 (27%)	16 (27%)	21 (34%)	82 (29%)
\$30,000 to \$44,999	50 (30%)	18 (31%)	15 (25%)	83 (29%)
\$45,000 to \$59,999	38 (23%)	16 (27%)	11 (18%)	65 (23%)
\$60,000 or more	<u>28 (17%)</u>	<u>7 (12%)</u>	<u>11 (18%)</u>	<u>46 (16%)</u>
N=	166 (58%)	59 (21%)	61 (21%)	286

The majority of respondents, 58%, fell in the \$15,000 to \$44,999 income range, and 23% earned \$45,000 to \$59,999. Ten respondents, 3%, earned less than \$15,000 and 46 respondents, 16%, earned \$60,000 or more.

Respondents' racial/ethnic group identifications are compiled in Table 5. Five racial/ethnic groups are used.

Table 5. Racial/Ethnic Group Identification by Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD

Ethnicity	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
Black/ African American	1 (00%)	0 (00%)	2 (03%)	3 (01%)
Native American, Alaskan Native	3 (02%)	0 (00%)	1 (02%)	4 (01%)
Asian or Pacific Islander	2 (01%)	0 (00%)	0 (00%)	2 (01%)
Hispanic	10 (06%)	7 (12%)	17 (28%)	34 (12%)
White, Non-Hispanic	<u>153 (91%)</u>	<u>52 (88%)</u>	<u>40 (67%)</u>	<u>245 (85%)</u>
N=	169 (59%)	59 (20%)	60 (21%)	288

The largest group of respondents was White, Non-Hispanic, comprising 85% of total respondents. Hispanic was the next largest group of respondents with 12%. The smallest numbers of respondents were in the Black/African American, Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander groups, with approximately 1% each.

Table 6 presents information on the number of staff development activities in which classified staff participated during 1993 and 1994, to the date of the survey. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 6. Staff Development Activities Participated in by Classified Staff Respondents on the DPS-SD

No. of Activities	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
0	41 (24%)	17 (27%)	11 (17%)	69 (23%)
1-4	111 (65%)	41 (66%)	50 (78%)	202 (68%)
5+	<u>19 (11%)</u>	<u>4 (06%)</u>	<u>3 (05%)</u>	<u>26 (09%)</u>
N=	171 (58%)	62 (21%)	64 (21%)	297

Sixty-eight percent (68%), the majority of respondents, participated in one to four staff development activities during the specified period of time. Sixty-nine (69) respondents, 23%, did not participate in any activities, and 26 respondents or 9% participated in five or more staff development activities.

Table 7 reports the total number of years the classified staff respondents have been employed in the Colorado State System. Totals are presented in five categories. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Table 7. Total Years Employed as Classified Staff in Colorado State System as Reported on the DPS-SD

Years Employed	CSU	FLC	USC	TOTAL
1-5	36 (21%)	22 (37%)	20 (32%)	78 (27%)
6-10	43 (25%)	14 (23%)	15 (24%)	72 (25%)
11-15	32 (19%)	15 (25%)	12 (19%)	59 (20%)
16-20	27 (16%)	4 (07%)	7 (11%)	38 (13%)
21+	<u>33 (19%)</u>	<u>5 (08%)</u>	<u>8 (13%)</u>	<u>46 (16%)</u>
N=	171 (58%)	60 (20%)	62 (21%)	293

Approximately 52% of respondents to this question have been employed by the Colorado State System for 1-10 years, 33% have been employed for 11-20 years, and 16% have been employed for over 20 years. The largest single group have been employed for 1-5 years (27%) and the smallest single group for 16-20 years (13%).

Research Questions

Results of statistical tests are reported below as they answer the study's research questions. Each research question is presented and pertinent data are reported. Significant differences are discussed following the tables.

The classified staff respondents for this study were asked to answer questions on the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) which was a modified form of the Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G). Questions 1 through 35 concerned participation deterrents, and the 35 questions comprised 6 factors:

- Factor 1--Lack of Confidence
- Factor 2--Lack of Relevance
- Factor 3--Time Constraints
- Factor 4--Low Personal Priority
- Factor 5--Cost
- Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems.

Each question was answered by circling a number on a five-point Likert scale:

- 1 NOT IMPORTANT
- 2 SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT
- 3 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
- 4 QUITE IMPORTANT
- 5 VERY IMPORTANT

Respondents indicated that a question was not applicable by non-response to the question. No value was assigned to blank responses.

Research Question 1: What are the perceived participation deterrents identified on the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) by public higher education classified staff?

Table 8 presents the means of classified staff's perceived participation deterrents by factor and campus.

Table 8. Means of Classified Staff's Perceived Participation Deterrents on the DPS-SD

DPS-SD Factor	CSU MEANS (*)	FLC MEANS (*)	USC MEANS (*)	TOTAL MEANS (*)
1. Lack of Confidence	1.63 (6)	1.35 (6)	1.48 (6)	1.54 (6)
2. Lack of Relevance	2.51 (3)	2.19 (3)	2.44 (2)	2.43 (3)
3. Time Constraints	3.10 (1)	3.08 (1)	3.36 (1)	3.15 (1)
4. Low Personal Priority	2.32 (4)	1.91 (4)	1.85 (5)	2.15 (4)
5. Cost	2.66 (2)	2.57 (2)	2.38 (3)	2.59 (2)
6. Personal/ Work Problems	1.94 (5)	1.90 (5)	2.01 (4)	1.95 (5)

* Means are ranked from highest (1) to lowest (6)

All three groups of staff agreed on the most important factor, Factor 3--Time Constraints, and the least important factor, Factor

1--Lack of Confidence. CSU and FLC identified all the factors in the same order. USC's identification differed from CSU and FLC in reversing the factors in the second and third positions of importance and the factors in the fourth and fifth positions of importance. The largest spread of the three means on any of the individual factors was .47.

Comments from DPS-SD Survey

Respondents also made comments on the survey. They are discussed below by campus and factor. Based on the total number of comments, respondents from the three campuses commented on the same top four factors in the same order. They are listed from most to least important: (1) Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems, (2) Factor 3--Time Constraints, (3) Factor 5--Cost, and (4) Factor 2--Lack of Relevance.

Colorado State University

The largest number of comments (21) on the CSU surveys concerned Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems. The three prevalent comments were: (1) that supervisors/management did not encourage or permit participation in staff development activities and even forbid or actively discouraged participation, (2) that there was no work coverage so that an individual could attend staff development activities during the work day, and (3) that many valuable staff development activities were offered only in Denver. Additional

deterrents in this factor were: registering for limited space was a race, hearing about events in time to register, being unable to leave work because of the nature of the job, having a supervisor who placed an unreasonable limit on the amount of participation in staff development activities, finding it impossible to park on campus for activities if working off the main campus, believing CSU does not value its classified staff, believing staff development is not a high priority at CSU, having supervisors/management expect classified staff to work their time and not attend any activities during the work day, having departments use budget for materials instead of people, and needing more job-specific activities.

The next largest number of comments (12) were concerned with Factor 3--Time Constraints. The three main concerns were: (1) that there was not enough time to attend classes/staff development activities and make up work time, (2) that there was not enough time to complete work assignments, which was prohibitive to participating in staff development activities, and (3) that many appropriate and valuable activities for the individual, based on job assignments, were too far away in Denver and in other states and took too much time to attend.

Eleven (11) comments were made concerning Factor 5--Cost. The two main concerns were: (1) that there was no money in the department/work unit to support classified staff participation, even when monies were available for faculty, and (2) that the individual did not have the funds to pay out-of-pocket. Additional

comments were: management/administration financially supported higher classifications' attendance in staff development activities, but did not support lower classifications' participation; the institution did not value its staff and, consequently, did not provide funding for staff development; and, budget cuts made participation more difficult.

The remaining comments concerned Factor 1--Lack of Confidence (2 comments), Factor 2--Lack of Relevance (3 comments), and Factor 4--Low Personal Priority (2 comments). Comments regarding these three factors were: lack of confidence/intimidation in competing with regular and continuing education students in classes--Front Range Community College was a better atmosphere, many of the staff development activities were redundant and unchallenging and the facilitators were unqualified, activities were not specific or high level enough for technical jobs, and attendance at staff development activities outside work hours took time away from family and other interests.

Supportive comments included: encouragement and funding from supervisor, but not enough space in some activities; some support from supervisor, but not enough time or work coverage to participate very often; overall, no restrictions on participation and employer and family very supportive; participated in those the department could afford; went to all that were useful except when time was a problem; in past five years, the attitude of the department and the University has changed and become supportive for

staff training; took advantage of free offerings as department has no funds available for profession-specific seminars; was fortunate to have support to attend staff development activities, classes, etc.; have had great support from boss to participate.

Fort Lewis College

Respondents from Fort Lewis College commented the most times (17) on Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems. The comments fell into three main categories of concern: (1) that staff development activities were only offered in Denver and on the Front Range and were impossible to attend, (2) that supervisors/management did not encourage or permit participation and even forbid or actively discouraged participation through attitude and lack of cooperation in scheduling work time and make-up time, and (3) that there was not enough work coverage to participate in staff development activities during work hours. Additional comments were: participation in staff development activities caused backlog in work load which was difficult to catch up on, supervisors/managers created an oppressive and demoralizing atmosphere for staff who attempted to participate in staff development activities, bosses had double standards when they approved of their own participation but not the participation of those supervised, entire office staff worked hard and could not manage participation in staff development activities which resulted in lack of preparation for testing for higher classifications and lack of promotion and pay increases, and

supervisor/manager told classified staff that employees could no longer take classes at FLC.

University of Southern Colorado

USC respondents attached comments regarding Factor 6-- Personal/Work Problems more times (15) than other factors. The comments predominantly were: (1) that many worthwhile staff development activities were offered in Denver and Colorado Springs which were too far away to attend, (2) that supervisors/managers were openly opposed to classified staff learning and sometimes made it impossible to participate in staff development activities, and (3) that due to staff shortage and work load, it was impossible to get away during work hours to participate. Additional concerns were: unequal support from supervisors/management based on employee's basis of hire, supervisor/manager's preference to participate and trickle information down to those supervised, no back-up to participate and improve professionally, management not encouraging training, supervisors were inflexible and unsupportive, and failure to utilize the expertise and experience of the classified staff in staff development offerings.

Supportive comments included: participated in workshops and staff development activities which were of interest personally or appropriate for work assignment; USC very supportive of staff development; USC offered many fine seminars, but time to attend was restrictive; Provost was very supportive of staff development for

classified personnel and had invited program suggestions from Classified Staff Council for next fiscal year.

Research Question 2: What are the differences, between institutions, of the participation deterrents perceived by the public higher education classified staff?

Table 9 contains the data regarding comparisons of perceived participation deterrents between campuses.

Table 9. One-way ANOVA Comparison of Perceived Participation Deterrents among Staffs at the Three Institutions

DPS-SD Factor	n	Mean	SD	F Ratio	p
1. Lack of Confidence					
CSU	154	1.63	.764	3.20	.042
FLC	57	1.35	.466		
USC	52	1.48	.779		
2. Lack of Relevance					
CSU	154	2.51	1.068	1.82	.164
FLC	55	2.19	1.158		
USC	55	2.44	1.090		
3. Time Constraints					
CSU	161	3.10	.957	1.76	.173
FLC	59	3.08	.942		
USC	59	3.36	1.000		
4. Low Personal Priority					
CSU	163	2.32	.941	7.85	.0005
FLC	55	1.91	.751		
USC	52	1.85	.871		
5. Cost					
CSU	157	2.66	1.251	1.03	.360
FLC	56	2.57	1.235		
USC	53	2.38	1.230		
6. Personal/ Work Problems					
CSU	157	1.94	.812	.21	.810
FLC	56	1.90	.918		
USC	56	2.01	1.105		

n=cases

SD=Standard Deviation

p=Level of Significance

There were significant differences between the staff on the three campuses on Factor 1: Lack of Confidence and on Factor 4: Low Personal Priority.

On Factor 1: Lack of Confidence, CSU is significantly different from FLC, but there is no significant difference between either CSU or FLC and USC.

On Factor 4: Low Personal Priority, CSU is significantly different from both FLC and USC, but FLC and USC are not significantly different from each other.

Research Question 3: Which of these participation deterrents are identified by classified staff at the three institutions as most important?

The ten participation deterrent questions answered by classified staff and possessing the highest means are identified in Table 10. They are ranked by means in descending order of importance.

Table 10. Ten Highest Means on Participation Deterrent Questions by Classified Staff at the Three Institutions

	<u>CSU</u>		<u>FLC</u>		<u>USC</u>	
	QUESTION	MEAN	QUESTION	MEAN	QUESTION	MEAN
1.	Q14	3.57	Q14	3.62	Q14	3.83
2.	Q9	2.99	Q9	3.43	Q9	3.31
3.	Q5	2.96	Q12	3.00	Q30	3.14
4.	Q10	2.94	Q30	2.75	Q13	3.02
5.	Q13	2.93	Q5	2.65	Q12	2.98
6.	Q30	2.83	Q13	2.58	Q5	2.65
7.	Q8	2.80	Q10	2.57	Q23	2.60
8.	Q23	2.78	Q31	2.56	Q19	2.56
9.	Q21	2.71	Q28	2.50	Q31	2.47
10.	Q31	2.68	Q23	2.44	Q8	2.40

The classified staff on the three campuses agreed on seven perceived deterrents of the ten identified as most important:

- Q5 - Because I didn't have time for the studying required.
- Q9 - Because the class/s.d. activity was offered at an inconvenient location.
- Q13 - Because of the amount of time required to finish the class/s.d. activity.
- Q14 - Because the class/s.d. activity was scheduled at an inconvenient time.
- Q23 - Because the available classes/s.d. activities did not seem useful or relevant.
- Q30 - Because I didn't think I could attend regularly.

- Q31 - Because my employer would not provide financial assistance or reimbursement.

Question 14 was identified as most important by staff on all three campuses. The means were noticeably higher than those on the other deterrent questions.

The three questions identified by only one or two campuses were:

- Q8 - Because the classes/s.d. activities available did not seem interesting.
 Q10 - Because I couldn't afford the registration or fees.
 Q21 - Because participation would take time away from my family.

Research Question 4: What are the relationships between perceived participation deterrent factors and demographic variables?

In computing the relationships between perceived staff participation deterrent factors and staff demographics, Pearson Product Moment (PPM) was used for age, highest educational credentials, total family income before taxes, number of staff development activities participated in, and total years employed as classified staff in the Colorado State System. One-way ANOVA was utilized for racial/ethnic group identified with, and T-testing was used for gender. A significance level of .05 was used for all tests.

Table 11 presents comparisons of the female and male staff members on the participation deterrent factors. Data is presented by cases, mean, standard deviation, t-value, and level of significance.

Table 11. T-test Comparison of Female and Male Staff Members on Participation Deterrent Factors

DPS-SD Factors	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p
1. Lack of Confidence					
Female	185	1.54	.674	.10	.42
Male	78	1.53	.824		
2. Lack of Relevance					
Female	183	2.42	1.110	-.16	.27
Male	81	2.45	1.068		
3. Time Constraints					
Female	195	3.24	.960	2.37	.69
Male	84	2.94	.951		
4. Low Personal Priority					
Female	198	2.16	.909	.41	.65
Male	81	2.11	.934		
5. Cost					
Female	185	2.71	1.234	2.45	.83
Male	81	2.30	1.227		
6. Personal/ Work Problems					
Female	185	1.92	.846	-.73	.35
Male	84	2.01	1.010		

n=cases

SD=Standard Deviation

p=Level of Significance

There were no significant differences between classified staff gender and any of the participation deterrents factors.

Table 12 presents the data for correlation of classified staff age and the participation deterrent factors. Cases, Pearson Product Moment value, and the level of significance are listed.

Table 12. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff Age and Participation Deterrent Factors

DPS-SD Factor	n	r	p
1. Lack of Confidence	261	.2177	.000
2. Lack of Relevance	261	.0901	.147
3. Time Constraints	277	.0242	.688
4. Low Personal Priority	267	.0464	.450
5. Cost	264	-.0710	.250
6. Personal/Work Problems	267	-.0052	.932

n=cases
r=Pearson Product Moment
p=Level of Significance

There were significant differences between age and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence: the older the respondent, the less confidence.

Table 13 is the correlation of classified staff's highest educational credential and the six participation deterrent factors presented by cases, Pearson Product Moment value, and level of significance.

Table 13. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff's Highest Educational Credential and Participation Deterrent Factors

DPS-SD Factor	n	r	p
1. Lack of Confidence	261	-.2980	.000
2. Lack of Relevance	262	.0340	.584
3. Time Constraints	277	-.0954	.113
4. Low Personal Priority	268	-.1132	.064
5. Cost	264	-.0065	.917
6. Personal/ Work Problems	267	-.0738	.229

n=cases

r=Pearson Produce Moment

p=Level of Significance

There was a significant difference between the educational credentials and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence. They were

inversely correlated--the lower the education credential the higher the lack of confidence.

Table 14 relates the data resulting from the correlation between the staff's total family income before taxes and the participation deterrent factors. Cases, Pearson Product Moment value, and level of significance are listed.

Table 14. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff Total Family Income Before Taxes and Participation Deterrent Factors

DPS-SD Factor	n	r	p
1. Lack of Confidence	254	-.1663	.008
2. Lack of Relevance	253	.0988	.117
3. Time Constraints	269	.0257	.674
4. Low Personal Priority	260	.0180	.772
5. Cost	257	-.1227	.049
6. Personal/Work Problems	259	-.0746	.232

n=cases

r=Pearson Product Moment

p=Level of Significance

Total family income before taxes and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence were significantly different and were inversely correlated--the lower the family income, the greater the lack of confidence. Total family income before taxes and Factor 5--Cost were also significantly different and they were also inversely correlated--the lower the family income, the more strongly the staff was concerned by the cost of the staff development activity.

Table 15 presents data on the correlation of staff ethnicity and the participation deterrent factors.

Table 15. One-way ANOVA Comparison of Racial/Ethnic Group Identification and Participation Deterrent Factors by Classified Staff

DPS-SD Factor	n	Mean	SD	F Ratio	p
1. Lack of Confidence	254	1.53	.709	1.26	.288
2. Lack of Relevance	254	2.43	1.087	1.42	.228
3. Time Constraints	269	3.13	.964	2.32	.058
4. Low Personal Priority	261	2.14	.911	.49	.747
5. Cost	257	2.59	1.251	.80	.524
6. Personal/ Work Problems	260	1.93	.887	.48	.749

n=cases

SD=Standard Deviation

p=Level of Significance

The were no significant differences between the racial/ethnic group identifications and the participation deterrent factors.

Table 16 reports the correlation of the number of staff development activities participated in by the classified staff and the six participation deterrent factors.

Table 16. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Development Activities Participated in by Classified Staff and Participation Deterrent Factors

DPS-SD Factor	n	r	p
1. Lack of Confidence	262	-.0118	.849
2. Lack of Relevance	263	-.0130	.833
3. Time Constraints	278	.0069	.909
4. Low Personal Priority	269	-.0247	.687
5. Cost	265	.0349	.572
6. Personal/ Work Problems	268	-.0110	.858

n=cases

r=Pearson Product Moment

p=Level of Significance

There were no significant differences between the number of staff development activities the classified staff participated in and the participation deterrent factors.

Table 17 reports the correlation of the total number of years classified staff have been employed in the Colorado State System and the participation deterrent factors.

Table 17. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Classified Staff Total Years of Employment in Colorado State System and Participation Deterrent Factors

DPS-SD Factor	n	r	p
1. Lack of Confidence	260	.1706	.006
2. Lack of Relevance	261	.0249	.689
3. Time Constraints	276	.0690	.253
4. Low Personal Priority	267	.1296	.034
5. Cost	264	-.0391	.527
6. Personal/ Work Problems	267	-.0074	.904

n=Cases
r=Pearson Product Moment
p=Level of Significance

There were two significant differences between years of employment in the Colorado State System and the participation deterrent factors: Factor 1--Lack of Confidence and Factor 4--Low Personal Priority. The more years of employment, the greater the lack of confidence (Factor 1). Also the more years of employment, the lower the personal priority (Factor 4).

Research Question 5: What are the differences between participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and those perceived by personnel/human resource services directors?

Table 18 presents data comparing the participation deterrents perceived by the classified staff and those perceived by the personnel/human resource services directors on the three campuses.

Table 18. T-test Comparison of Perceived Participation Deterrent Factors by Staffs and Personnel Directors at the Three Institutions

DPS-SD Factor	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p
1. Lack of Confidence					
Directors	3	1.83	.205		
Staff	263	1.54	.720	.69	.49
2. Lack of Relevance					
Directors	3	3.72	.255		
Staff	264	2.43	1.095	7.99	.004
3. Time Constraints					
Directors	3	4.13	.416		
Staff	279	3.15	.965	1.76	.080
4. Low Personal Priority					
Directors	3	3.60	.902		
Staff	270	2.32	.915	.98	.328
5. Cost					
Directors	3	3.50	1.093		
Staff	266	2.59	1.244	1.27	.207
6. Personal/ Work Problems					
Directors	3	2.54	.191		
Staff	269	1.95	.899	1.14	.254

n=cases

SD=Standard Deviation

p=level of significance

There was a significant difference between the participation deterrent perceptions of the staff and those of the personnel/human resource services directors on Factor 2--Lack of Relevance.

Research Question 6: What are the differences between the participation deterrents perceived by the three personnel/human resources services directors?

Since there were only single observations, one personnel/human resource services director per campus, it was not possible to run statistical testing for levels of significance; however, the numeric differences, by institution, are reported.

Table 19. Means of Perceived Participation Deterrent Factors by Personnel/Human Resource Services Directors on the Three Colorado State University System Campuses

DPS-SD Factor	<u>MEANS</u>		
	CSU	FLC	USC
1. Lack of Confidence	2.00	1.88	1.60
2. Lack of Relevance	4.00	3.67	3.50
3. Time Constraints	3.80	4.60	4.00
4. Low Personal Priority	3.60	2.60	1.80
5. Cost	3.67	4.50	2.33
6. Personal/ Work Problems	2.75	2.38	2.58

The narrowest span of means, .37, on the same factor for the personnel/human resource services directors occurred on Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems. The broadest span, 2.17, occurred on Factor 5--Cost. The range of means was similar for Factor 1--Lack of Confidence, Factor 2--Lack of Relevance, and Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems. Also similar in range of means were Factor 4--Low Personal Priority and Factor 5--Cost.

Comments of the Directors

The status of staff development for classified staff on the three campuses was discussed with the personnel/human resource services directors. None of the institutions currently has written policies or procedures concerning staff development for classified staff. Staff at the three institutions can use the tuition waiver, or employee study privilege, for taking academic courses.

Colorado State University does not offer many centralized activities, but there are numerous offerings at the department level, and campus-wide offerings by departments such as the Computer Training & Support Services. One centralized activity is the Professional Development Institute which occurs between Fall and Spring semesters. There are two and a half days of programs on a variety of professional and personal growth topics. The PDI is open to all faculty and classified staff. Currently, CSU is in transition, having recently designated personnel in Continuing Education to direct staff development for classified staff campus-wide.

Ft. Lewis College, in the recent past, has conducted needs surveys and had a planning committee for staff development. Personnel changes and staff shortages have created a delay in planning staff development. Budget has recently been established to explore staff development for classified staff. A committee will be gathering information and establishing a resource center.

The University of Southern Colorado offers a variety of staff development activities sponsored by different campus and community groups. One activity is the Education Development Committee which is for all employees. The EDC has a budget and is programmatic. There is also CONNECTIONS, which is for customer service training, and the Cross Training Committee, which is for all areas of the campus. The institution is currently revamping orientation for all employees and has more campus-wide activities than department-sponsored ones. The Provost Office provides funds for staff development. The following USC offices also provide staff development: Affirmative Action Office, Personnel, and Business Services. Convocation Week is held one week before the beginning of Fall semester and the Hirsch Lecture Series is free with reservations.

Following is a synthesis of comments made by the personnel/human resource services directors during the interviews.

Factor 1--Lack of Confidence

The directors felt that lack of confidence was not a big problem compared to other factors such as time. They also agreed that lack of support from friends and co-workers or absence of positive reinforcement should be differentiated from peer pressure against participating in staff development activities. The suggestion was made that staff may be more intimidated by academic

courses than by workshops and other staff development activities designed specifically for them and their job duties.

Factor 2--Lack of Relevance

If staff have foreknowledge or past experience with an activity or its facilitator, they may feel that the activity is lacking in relevance or the facilitator is unqualified or poorly qualified. Needs assessments can assist staff development planners and directors in providing relevant activities.

Factor 3--Time Constraints

All directors agreed that this was the most important deterrent to participation in staff development activities. Even when an activity is custom-tailored to all staff on a campus, lack of time and office coverage can prevent participation. The point was made again that having time to participate in activities is more likely during work hours than outside work hours. This also was true of the location of the activity, when the activity was offered at some distance from the job site. Not having enough time for studying was more appropriate for those taking academic classes.

Factor 4--Low Personal Priority

The major comment concerning this factor was the reiteration of activities occurring during work hours or outside work hours.

Those outside work hours were lower in priority when it meant giving up leisure time. Brown bag lunch meetings have been successful and will be continued where offered.

Factor 5--Cost

There are no designated, centralized funds for staff development activities for classified staff. There are department monies used for such activities and also monies available through administrative offices for specific programs. There are funds designated for the state-mandated study privilege of six (6) credits per academic year at all three institutions. It was suggested that perhaps more appropriate than the wording "because my employer would not provide financial assistance or reimbursement", the question should read "because my employer could not provide financial assistance or reimbursement."

Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems

Arrangement for child care was less of a problem during work hours than outside work hours. This was also true when extensive travel was required to attend staff development activities. Transportation and travel problems were ongoing when activities were offered at remote state locations, e.g. Denver, Colorado Springs. It was suggested that the personal health problem or disability deterrent may encompass hidden disabilities such as Carpal Tunnel Syndrome, tendinitis, or other ergonomic, work-

related conditions. If there are problems regarding respect for the staff's ethnic or racial identifications, they have not been communicated to the directors; this does not preclude their existence.

Summary

This chapter presented statistical analyses of data collected in the study. A modified form of the Deterrents to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G) known as the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) was used to collect data on classified staff's perceived participation deterrents. Comparisons and relationships between participation deterrent factors and respondents' demographics were presented. Personnel/human resources services directors from each campus were interviewed for information concerning their perceptions of deterrents to classified staff's participation in staff development activities, and their perceptions were compared with staff perceptions. Comments from both staff and directors were reported. Differences between the perceived participation deterrents of the three campuses' classified staff were identified. Also differences between perceived participation deterrents of the three campuses' personnel/human resource services directors were discussed. Statistically significant differences were reported.

CHAPTER V
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study collected data concerning public higher education classified staff's perceived deterrents to participation in staff development activities. The data were collected from the three Colorado State University System campuses: Colorado State University, Ft. Lewis College, and the University of Southern Colorado. Data were also collected through interviews with the three institutions' personnel/human resource services directors. All data were used: (1) to determine the most frequently perceived participation deterrents, (2) to establish comparisons and relationships between the deterrents and the respondents' demographics, (3) to identify the personnel/human resource services directors' perceptions of staff's participation deterrents, (4) to compare staff's perceived deterrents to those of the directors, (5) to compare the three campuses' staffs regarding perceived participation deterrents, and (6) to compare the three campuses' personnel/human resource services directors' perceived participation deterrents.

Procedure

A survey, the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD), which was a modified form of the Deterrents

to Participation Scale--General (DPS-G), was used to collect the data. A pilot study was run to test the reliability of the modified instrument. Data were derived from a random sampling of classified staff at Colorado State University and all classified staff at Ft. Lewis College and the University of Southern Colorado due to their small populations. The survey was mailed to respondents and one follow-up was mailed approximately a week later. In-person interviews were conducted with the three institutions' personnel/human resource directors at their campuses. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for all statistical treatment. Frequencies, percentages, and correlation coefficients were computed.

Findings

Findings are presented as they relate to the research questions.

Research Question 1: What are the perceived participation deterrents identified on the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) by public higher education classified staff?

1. The classified staffs on the three campuses agreed on the most important factor, Factor 3--Time Constraints.
2. The classified staffs on the three campuses agreed on the least important Factor, Factor 1--Lack of Confidence.
3. The staffs at Colorado State University and Ft. Lewis College agreed on the order of the factors from most to least important.

3. The staffs at Colorado State University and Ft. Lewis College agreed on the order of the factors from most to least important.

Research Question 2: What are the differences, between institutions, of the participation deterrents perceived by the public higher education classified staff?

1. There was a significant difference between the staffs of the three campuses on Factor 1--Lack of Confidence.
2. There was a significant difference between the staffs of the three campuses on Factor 4--Low Personal Priority.

Research Question 3: Which of these participation deterrents are identified by classified staff at the three institutions as most important?

1. Of the ten participation deterrent questions identified as most important, staffs on the three campuses agreed on seven of them. They were:

- Q5 - Because I didn't have time for the studying required.
- Q9 - Because the class/s.d. activity was offered at an inconvenient location.
- Q13 - Because of the amount of time required to finish the class/s.d. activity.
- Q14 - Because the class/s.d. activity was scheduled at an inconvenient time.
- Q23 - Because the available classes/s.d. activities did not seem useful or relevant.
- Q30 - Because I didn't think I could attend regularly.
- Q31 - Because my employer would not provide financial assistance or reimbursement.

Research Question 4: What are the relationships between perceived participation deterrent factors and demographic variables?

1. There were no significant differences between classified staff gender and any of the participation deterrent factors.
2. There was a significant difference between classified staff age and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence--the older the respondent, the greater the lack of confidence.
3. There was a significant difference between the educational credentials and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence. They were inversely correlated--the lower the educational credential the greater the lack of confidence.
4. There was a significant difference between family income and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence. They were inversely correlated--the lower the family income the greater the lack of confidence.
5. There was a significant difference between family income and Factor 5--Cost. They were inversely correlated--the lower the family income the greater the concern over the cost of staff development activities.
6. There were no significant differences between the racial/ethnic groups identifications and the participation deterrent factors.
7. There were no significant differences between the number of staff development activities in which the staffs participated and the participation deterrent factors.

8. There was a significant difference between the total years of employment in the Colorado State System and Factor 1--Lack of Confidence--the more years of employment the greater the lack of confidence.
9. There was a significant difference between the years of employment in the Colorado State System and Factor 4--Low Personal Priority--the more years of employment, the lower the personal priority.

Research Question 5: What are the differences between participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and those perceived by personnel/human resource services directors?

1. There was a significant difference between the participation deterrent perceptions of the classified staff and those of the personnel/human resource services directors on Factor 2--Lack of Relevance.

Research Question 6: What are the differences between the participation deterrents perceived by the three personnel/human resource services directors?

1. Since there was only one observation per institution, no statistical test for level of significance could be run.
2. Numeric spans on the means of the individual factors ranged from .37 on Factor 6--Personal/Work Problems to 2.17 on Factor 5--Cost.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on the findings of this study and information derived from the literature search.

1. Usable data may be collected using the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD).
2. Time Constraints and Lack of Confidence are participation deterrent factors which affect classified staff in staff development activities and need to be considered in the planning and operationalization of staff development activities.
3. Although classified staff employed at the three Colorado State University System campuses may agree on some participation deterrents to staff development activities, each staff still identifies participation deterrents unique to their group and location of employment.
4. Some participation deterrents are common to adult learning situations based on the complex life roles of the learners, e.g. Time Constraints, Low Personal Priority, Cost.
5. Age, level of educational credential, total family income before taxes, and total years of employment in the Colorado State System are demographics which impact classified staff participation in staff development activities. They need to be considered in the planning and operationalization of staff development activities.

6. The small number of respondents in the personnel/human resource services directors group did not provide a large enough group for extensive statistical treatment.
7. The personnel/human resource services directors know only of the deterrents which are communicated to them.
8. Respondents to the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) were predominantly female.
9. Respondents to the DPS-SD were predominantly White, Non-Hispanic.
10. Mean responses on the DPS-SD were low on the Likert scale. No mean on the questions from any of the three campuses was above 3.83 on the five-point scale. The majority of the means were below 3.00.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Further Research

1. More research should be conducted on modifying the Deterrents to Participation Scale--Staff Development (DPS-SD) for use with support staff in work situations. Specifically, more studies should be conducted, using the Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS-SD), for use with classified staff in public higher education institutions.

- a. Additional factors, perhaps derived from splitting existing factors, may provide additional and more reliable data, e.g. split Personal and Work Problems into two separate factors.
- b. "Voluntary participation" should be more clearly defined in the survey instructions.
- c. Based on the low Likert scale responses, the value scale labels should be re-evaluated and, perhaps, re-written.
- d. Questions should be included in the survey concerning the specific employment location so that relationships can be established using the institution's demographic profile of the total classified staff group employed at that institution and the individual respondent.
- e. A more precise definition of staff development should be supplied respondents in the survey instructions.
- f. Specification of college credits, those outside of or short of a degree/certification, should be allowed on the educational credential demographic question.
- g. A sharper distinction should be made on the Likert scale between "Not Applicable" and "Not Important".

- h. Questions should be re-written specifically for classified staff in public higher education institutions, e.g. I don't attend staff development activities concerned with working with students since that is not part of my job.
 - i. Questions concerning the study privilege, or tuition waiver, of taking academic courses and those for activities considered as staff development offerings should be separated.
 - j. Factor labels, e.g. Cost, should be clarified, e.g. Cost Concerns.
 - k. Distinctions should be made for "during work hours" and "outside work hours."
2. Personnel/human resource services directors should investigate employment location factors which significantly deter classified staff from participating in staff development activities, e.g. city transportation limitations, distance from state-sponsored program offerings, etc.
 3. The issue of Time Constraints should be addressed at each employment location.
 4. Continuing research should be conducted concerning similarities and differences of classified staff and personnel/human resource services directors' perceptions of deterrents to classified staff's participation in staff development activities. Multiple observations on each campus

of persons concerned with staff development activities for classified staff would allow correlational studies.

5. Personnel/human resource services directors should employ multiple data collection techniques to gather information from classified staff concerning staff development activities, e.g. needs survey, polling, interviews, interest groups, "interviews on the street", brown bag lunches with the staff development directors, etc.
6. The DPS--SD survey should also be conducted with part-time employees. This may require modification of some questions.
7. A different survey should be used with new employees, e.g. those with less than one year of service. The survey might be more concerned with initial training activities and learning barriers in such situations.
8. Standardization of demographic questions on surveys concerned with adult learning situations should be considered. Further research needs to be conducted on this issue.
9. Further research should be conducted on those respondents who consider themselves participators and those who consider themselves non-participators.
10. Research concerning the types of deterrents affecting specific types of development activities should be undertaken.

Recommendations to the Field

1. Based on interview comments and the researcher's observation, knowledge of the physiological and psychological ramifications of adult learners should be an element in the planning of staff development activities for the classified staff, since classified staff are adult learners.
2. New and unique methods of delivery of staff development activities for classified staff should be considered beyond the standard programs of utilizing a speaker or showing a video, e.g. independent projects based on contracts between the staff members and their supervisors, cross-departmental and cross-divisional job sharing experiences for better understanding of department purposes and work flow, participation in campus-betterment projects, etc.
3. Channels for the improvement of classified staff self-confidence should be developed.
4. Institutions should develop and/or employ a geographic/socio-economic profile of the employment location, i.e. city and state, to provide data regarding classified staff in their total environment, e.g. the effect of local transportation schedules on job issues, the effects of child care provision on work scheduling, etc.
5. Other instruments, such as employee satisfaction surveys and adult learning preference surveys, should be run to obtain a better profile of the employees as adult learners.

6. Communication channels should be developed by staff development directors to obtain information regarding the constantly changing needs of classified staff for staff development activities. The communication channels should also be established to permit non-punitive feedback.

References

- Blais, J.-G., Duquette, A., & Painchaud, G. (1989). Deterrents to women's participation in work-related educational activities. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(4), 224-234.
- Boshier, R. (1973). Educational participation and dropout: A theoretical model. Adult Education, 23(4), 255-282.
- Cheren, M. (1990). Promoting active learning in the workplace. In Robert M. Smith and Associates, Learning to learn across the life span (pp. 267-288). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cozby, P. C. (1989). Methods in behavioral research. Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Cross, K. P. (1981). Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cross, K. P. (1987). Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Darkenwald, G. G., & Valentine, T. (1985). Factor structures of deterrents to public participation in adult education. Adult Education Quarterly, 35(4), 177-193.
- Darkenwald, G. G. (1988a). Attitudes toward adult education in Britain and the United States. (In: Miriam Zukas, Ed. Papers from the Transatlantic Dialogue. Leeds, England: School of Continuing Education, University of Leeds). p.131-135.
- Darkenwald, G. G. (1988b). Comparison of deterrents to adult education participation in Britain and the United States. (In: Miriam Zukas, Ed. Papers from the Transatlantic Dialogue. Leeds, England: School of Continuing Education, University of Leeds). p. 126-130.
- Drake, J. B. (1988). Factor structure of deterrents to agriculture teachers' participation in credit and non-credit courses. Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 29(2), 49-54.
- Eatman, R. W. (1992). Barriers to employee participation in company sponsored education and training programs. (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 5307A.

- Ellsworth, J. H., Pierson, M. J., Welborn, R. B., & Frost, C. J. (1991). Typology of factors that deter participation with an educational institution. Journal of Adult Education, 20(1), 15-27.
- Ericksen, Charles Gunnard Jr. (1990). Influence of barriers to participation and attitudes toward adult education on small business managers' participation in adult education. (Doctoral dissertation, Montana State University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 5109.
- Galbraith, M. W. (1983). The older employee as a concern of staff developers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 383).
- Garrison, D. R. (1988). A deductively derived and empirically confirmed structure of factors associated with dropout in adult education. Adult Education Quarterly, 38(4), 199-210.
- Harris, S. O. (1992, October). Stateline. p. 2.
- Harris, S. O. (1993, February). Stateline, p. 2.
- Hayes, E. R. (1988). A typology of low-literate adults based on perceptions of deterrents to participation in adult basic education. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(1), 1-10.
- Houle, C. (1981). Continuing learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Houle, C. (1992). The literature of adult education: A bibliographic essay. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kerka, S. (1986). Deterrents to participation in adult education: An overview. ERIC Digest No. 59. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 889).
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kowalik, T. F. (1989). The validity of the Deterrents to Participation Scale - General: Factor replicability, predictive power, and effect of social desirability. (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 5105A.
- Kreitlow, B. W. (1990). Staff development: What works and why. Adult Learning. 1(7), 7.

- Mahoney, V. L. M. (1991). Adverse baggage in the learning environment. In R. Hiemstra (Ed.), Creating environments for effective adult learning. (New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, Number 50.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Marsick, V. J., Ed. (1987). Learning in the workplace. London: Croom Helm.
- Martindale, C. J., & Drake, J. B. (1989). Factor structure of deterrents to participation in off-duty adult education programs. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(2), 63-75.
- McLean, G. N., & Rocheford, R. M. (1991). The influence of gender on participation in an adult professional training setting: A pilot study. (Project Number Forty-Six). St. Paul, Minn.: St. Paul Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 908)
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1991). Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Miller, R. W., & Prichard, F. N. (1992). Factors associated with workers' inclination to participate in an employee involvement program. Group & Organization Management, 17(4), 414-430.
- Mirabile, R. J. (1991). Identifying the employee of the future. The Journal of Business Strategy, 12(3), 32-36.
- Mitchell, G. (1993). The trainer's handbook - The AMA guide to effective training. New York: AMACOM.
- Morris, W., & Gold, B. K. (1977). Student accountability model (SAM): Operations manual. Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges.
- Morse, S. W. (1984). Employee educational programs: Implications for industry and higher education. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7, 1984). Washington, D.C.: ASHE - Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Munnely, C. (1987). Learning participation: The worker's viewpoint. In V. J. Marsick (Ed.), Learning in the workplace (pp. 79-95). London: Croom Helm.
- Phillips, J. J. (1991). Measuring the return on HRD. Employment Relations Today, 18(3), 329-42.

- Rolzinski, C. A., & Charner, I. (1987). Improving practice: Lessons from the case studies. In I. Charner & C. A. Rolzinski (Eds.), Responding to the educational needs of today's workplace (pp. 75-85). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Romer, R. (1993, April). Stateline, p. 2.
- Romer, R. (1993, October). Stateline, p. 2.
- Rubenson, K. (1977). Participation in recurrent education: A research review. (CERI/RE/77.16) Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
- Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (1992). Surviving your dissertation - A comprehensive guide to content and process. Newbury Park, California: SAGE Publications.
- Scanlan, C. S., & Darkenwald, G. G. (1984). Identifying deterrents to participation in continuing education. Adult Education Quarterly. 34(3), 155-166.
- Scanlon, C. S. (1986). Deterrents to Participation: An adult education dilemma. ERIC Information Series No. 308. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 768).
- Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Improving higher education environments for adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Sherberg, E., & Cetone, K. L. (1988). Attraction and retention of classified staff: The silent partners. In: The Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency, and Competitiveness. Final Report and Working Papers (pp. 780-785). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 812)
- Smith, C. S., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Human resources strategy and planning in higher education. Human Resource Planning. 13(1), 13-25.
- Smith, R. M. (1990). Learning to learn across the life span. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Staff. (1993, October 7). Professional-development plan targets staff. Comment, p. 1.
- Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1991). Asking questions - A practical guide to questionnaire design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Valentine, T., & Darkenwald, G. G. (1990). Deterrents to participation in adult education: Profiles of potential learners. Adult Education Quarterly, 41(1), 29-42.

Westervelt, E. M. (1975). Barriers to women's participation in postsecondary education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Wheless, V. E., & Howard, R. D. (1983). An examination of the non-faculty university employee as a human resource. Toronto, Ontario: Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 559)

APPENDIX A

**COVER LETTER AND
DETERRENTS TO PARTICIPATION
SCALE--STAFF DEVELOPMENT**

April 4, 1994

Dear Fellow Classified Staff:

I need your help to complete my doctoral research.

I have been a classified staff employee at Colorado State University for 20 years. During that time, I have been interested in the staff development activities offered to us and why we can not or may not participate in them.

Five years ago, I began a doctoral program to study post-secondary staff development and adult learning. I am now conducting my dissertation research on the deterrents to classified staff participation in staff development activities. Discovering why we don't or can't participate can assist our employing agencies and departments in removing identified barriers; without this information, barriers may not be recognized.

I am surveying the three campuses of the Colorado State University System - Ft. Lewis College, University of Southern Colorado, and Colorado State University. I can only conduct my research with your help. I would appreciate your taking the time to complete the attached survey. The demographic information, e.g. age, gender, etc., can identify deterrents for specific groups of classified staff employees. *All information from the survey is important.*

You may notice a number on the upper corner of the survey. This is only so that I know not to send you a follow-up letter after you have completed and returned your survey.

YOUR PARTICIPATION WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL. Only compiled results of the surveys will be used. If you would like a copy of the results of the survey please indicate this on your survey or mail a separate request to me.

I would appreciate return of the surveys by April 22. Thank you for helping me complete my studies.

Nan Reed

School of Occupational & Educational Studies
209 Education
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, CO 80523

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Your answers are strictly confidential.

DIRECTIONS: Every year, classified staff participate in some kind of staff development activity. Examples include classes, workshops, seminars, and independent projects offered by the State of Colorado, employing institutions, departments, and units. However, classified staff sometimes find it hard to participate in these activities, even when they want to. Try to think of staff development activities - any staff development activities - in which you wanted to participate during 1993 and 1994, but didn't. Then look at the reasons below and decide how important each one was in your decision not to participate in a staff development activity. (Please note: in the questions below, the phrase "**STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY (s.d. activity)**" refers to any type of organized learning activity connected with your employing institution, department, or work unit including classes, workshops, seminars, and independent projects. Initial task training in a new job should not be considered here.)

PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONE NUMBER FOR EACH REASON. IF A REASON DOESN'T APPLY, DO NOT CIRCLE A NUMBER.

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN YOUR DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE?

REASONS	NOT IMPORTANT	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	QUITE IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
1. Because I felt I couldn't compete with younger students/employees.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Because I don't enjoy studying.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Because of a personal health problem or disability.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Because I didn't think I'd be able to finish the class/s.d. activity.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Because I didn't have time for the studying required.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Because I wanted to learn something specific, but the class/s.d. activity was too general.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Because I didn't meet the requirements for the class/s.d. activity.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Because the classes/s.d. activities available did not seem interesting.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Because the class/s.d. activity was offered at an inconvenient location.	1	2	3	4	5

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN YOUR DECISION *NOT* TO PARTICIPATE?

REASONS	NOT IMPORTANT	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	QUITE IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
10. Because I couldn't afford the registration or fees.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Because I felt I was too old to participate in the class/s.d. activity.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Because I didn't know about classes/s.d. activities available for classified staff.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Because of the amount of time required to finish the class/s.d. activity.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Because the class/s.d. activity was scheduled at an inconvenient time.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Because my family did not encourage participation.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Because of transportation problems.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Because the classes/s.d. activities available were of poor quality.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Because I was not confident of my learning ability.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Because my supervisor did not encourage/support my participation.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Because I'm not interested in participating in classes/s.d. activities.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Because participation would take time away from my family.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Because I had trouble arranging for child care.	1	2	3	4	5

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN YOUR DECISION *NOT* TO PARTICIPATE?

REASONS	NOT IMPORTANT	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	QUITE IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
23. Because the available classes/s.d. activities did not seem useful or relevant.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Because I wasn't willing to give up my leisure time.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Because the class/s.d. activity was offered in an unsafe area.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Because the classes/s.d. activities offered would not help me in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Because I felt unprepared for the class/s.d. activity.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Because I couldn't afford miscellaneous expenses like travel, food, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Because the class/s.d. activity was not on the right level for me.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Because I didn't think I could attend regularly.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Because my employer would not provide financial assistance or reimbursement.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Because I didn't think the class/s.d. activity would meet my needs.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Because I prefer to learn on my own.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Because my friends/co-workers did not encourage my participation.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Because previous classes/s.d. activities were not respectful of my racial/ethnic origins or language.	1	2	3	4	5

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF. REMEMBER THAT YOUR ANSWERS ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| 36. | What is your gender? (circle one number) | 1 | Female | <u>COMMENTS:</u> |
| | | 2 | Male | |
| 37. | What is your age? (write in number of years) | _____ | years | |
| 38. | What is your <i>highest</i> educational credential?
(circle one number) | 1 | No credential | |
| | | 2 | High school diploma/GED | |
| | | 3 | Associate degree | |
| | | 4 | Bachelor's degree | |
| | | 5 | Graduate degree | |
| 39. | What is your approximate total family income
<i>before taxes?</i> (circle one number) | 1 | Less than \$15,000 | |
| | | 2 | \$15,000 to \$29,999 | |
| | | 3 | \$30,000 to \$44,999 | |
| | | 4 | \$45,000 to \$59,999 | |
| | | 5 | \$60,000 or more | |
| 40. | What is your current employment status?
(circle one number) | 1 | Employed full-time | |
| | | 2 | Employed part-time | |
| 41. | Circle the number of the racial/ethnic group
with which you identify.
(Circle one number) | 1 | Black/African American | |
| | | 2 | Native American, Alaskan Native | |
| | | 3 | Asian or Pacific Islander | |
| | | 4 | Hispanic | |
| | | 5 | White, Non-Hispanic | |
| 42. | How many staff development activities have
you participated in during 1993 and 1994?
(circle one number) | 1 | 0 | |
| | | 2 | 1-4 | |
| | | 3 | 5 or more | |
| 43. | How many total years have you worked as
classified staff in the Colorado State
System? (circle one number) | 1 | 1-5 | |
| | | 2 | 6-10 | |
| | | 3 | 11-15 | |
| | | 4 | 16-20 | |
| | | 5 | more than 20 | |
| 44. | Where do you work now? (circle one number) | 1 | Colorado State University | |
| | | 2 | Ft. Lewis College | |
| | | 3 | University of Southern Colorado | |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ENERGY IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP POST CARD

FOLLOW-UP POST CARD

Recently you received a survey seeking your help in a study of deterrents to classified staff's participation in staff development activities. If you have already mailed your completed survey, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I would appreciate your completing the survey and returning it in the next few days. Your response helps strengthen the results of the study. If you need another survey, please let me know. Nan Reed, SOES, 209 Education, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, CO 80523, (303)221-5068. **Thanks again for your help with my research.**

APPENDIX C

**PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICES
DIRECTOR SURVEY**

INTERVIEW

PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCE DIRECTORS

Please consider each of the following participation deterrents in relation to the full-time classified staff on your campus. Assign a Likert scale ranking, as listed below, to each of the items under the factors, based on your understanding of what deters your classified staff from participating in staff development activities. In the classified staff survey, "*STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY*" refers to any type of organized learning activity connected with the employing institution, department, or work unit, including classes, workshops, seminars, and independent projects. Initial task training in a new job should not be considered here. Please add comments and attach any documentation you might have concerning staff development for classified staff at your institution, e.g. mission/vision statement regarding staff development for classified staff, institutional policy/guidelines concerning staff development for classified staff, etc.

The Likert scale rankings are:

1 - Not important

2 - Slightly important

3 - Somewhat important

4 - Quite important

5 - Very important

PERSON INTERVIEWED

INSTITUTION

DATE OF INTERVIEW

Thanks for your time and energy.

LIKERT SCALE RANKINGS

- 1 - Not Important
- 2 - Slightly Important
- 3 - Somewhat Important
- 4 - Quite Important
- 5 - Very Important

FACTOR: LACK OF CONFIDENCE

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN STAFF'S DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE?

Ranking	Participation Deterrent	Comments
	1. Because they were not confident of their learning abilities.	
	2. Because they felt they couldn't compete with younger students/employees.	
	3. Because they felt they were too old to participate in the class/staff development activity.	
	4. Because they felt unprepared for the class/staff development activity.	
	5. Because they didn't feel think they's be able to finish the class/staff development activity.	
	6. Because their friends/co-workers did not encourage their participation.	
	7. Because they didn't meet the requirements for the class/staff development activity.	
	8. Because the family did not encourage participation.	

LIKERT SCALE RANKINGS

- 1 - Not Important
- 2 - Slightly Important
- 3 - Somewhat Important
- 4 - Quite Important
- 5 - Very Important

FACTOR: LACK OF RELEVANCE

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN STAFF'S DECISION *NOT* TO PARTICIPATE?

Ranking	Participation Deterrent	Comments
	1. Because the available classes/staff development activities did not seem useful or relevant.	
	2. Because they didn't think the class/staff development activity would meet their needs.	
	3. Because the classes/staff development activities available did not seem interesting.	
	4. Because the classes/staff development activities available were of poor quality.	
	5. Because they wanted to learn something specific, but the class/staff development activity was too general.	
	6. Because the class/staff development activity was not the right level for them.	

LIKERT SCALE RANKINGS

- 1 - Not Important
- 2 - Slightly Important
- 3 - Somewhat Important
- 4 - Quite Important
- 5 - Very Important

FACTOR: TIME CONSTRAINTS

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN STAFF'S DECISION *NOT* TO PARTICIPATE?

Ranking	Participation Deterrent	Comments
	1. Because of the amount of time required to finish the class/staff development activity.	
	2. Because they didn't think they could attend regularly.	
	3. Because they didn't have time for the studying required.	
	4. Because the class/staff development activity was scheduled at an inconvenient time.	
	5. Because the class/staff development activity was offered at an inconvenient location.	

LIKERT SCALE RANKINGS

- 1 - Not Important
- 2 - Slightly Important
- 3 - Somewhat Important
- 4 - Quite Important
- 5 - Very Important

FACTOR: LOW PERSONAL PRIORITY

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN STAFF'S DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE?

Ranking	Participation Deterrent	Comments
	1. Because they were not interested in participating in a class/staff development activity.	
	2. Because they were not willing to give up their leisure time.	
	3. Because they don't enjoy studying.	
	4. Because participation would take time away from the family.	
	5. Because the classes/staff development activities offered would not help them in the job.	

LIKERT SCALE RANKINGS

- 1 - Not Important
- 2 - Slightly Important
- 3 - Somewhat Important
- 4 - Quite Important
- 5 - Very Important

FACTOR: COST

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN STAFF'S DECISION NOT TO PARTICIPATE?

Ranking	Participation Deterrent	Comments
	1. Because they couldn't afford miscellaneous expenses like travel, food, etc.	
	2. Because they couldn't afford the registration or fees.	
	3. Because their employer would not provide financial assistance or reimbursement.	

LIKERT SCALE RANKINGS

- 1 - Not Important
- 2 - Slightly Important
- 3 - Somewhat Important
- 4 - Quite Important
- 5 - Very Important

FACTOR: PERSONAL/WORK PROBLEMS

HOW IMPORTANT WAS EACH REASON IN STAFF'S DECISION *NOT* TO PARTICIPATE?

Ranking	Participation Deterrent	Comments
	1. Because they had trouble arranging for child care.	
	2. Because the supervisor did not encourage/support their participation.	
	3. Because of a personal health problem or disability.	
	4. Because the class/staff development activity was offered in an unsafe area.	
	5. Because they didn't know about classes/staff development activities available for classified staff.	
	6. Because pervious classes/staff development activities were not respectful of their racial/ethnic origins or language.	
	7. Because of transportation problems.	

APPENDIX D

**PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICES
DIRECTOR INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

TITLE OF PROJECT:

PhD Dissertation: "Perceived Deterrents to Classified Staff's Voluntary Participation in Staff Development Activities"

NAME OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:

Dr. Barbara J. Nelson

NAME OF CO-INVESTIGATOR:

Nancy L. Reed

CONTACT NAME/PHONE NUMBER FOR QUESTIONS/PROBLEMS:

Nancy L. Reed
303-221-5068

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH:

The purposes of this doctoral research are: 1) To identify participation deterrents to staff development as perceived by CSU System classified staff, 2) To explore relationships between perceived participation deterrents and respondents' demographics, 3) To discuss the relationship between participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and those perceived by personnel/human resource services directors, and 4) To explore the differences, by institution, of participation deterrents perceived by classified staff and personnel/human resource services directors.

PROCEDURES/METHODS TO BE USED:

Classified staff (all staff at Ft. Lewis College and University of Southern Colorado; random sample at Colorado State University) will be surveyed utilizing the Deterrents to Participation Scale -- Staff Development (DPS-SD).

Personnel/Human Resource Services Directors will be interviewed in person and the information recorded on a survey-based form. Documentation provided by the directors will be utilized in the doctoral research.

RISKS INHERENT IN THE PROCEDURES:

No foreseeable risks. I understand that it is not possible to identify all potential risks in an experimental procedure, but I believe that reasonable safeguards have been taken to minimize both the known and the potential, but unknown, risks.

BENEFITS:

The identification of participation deterrents to staff development as perceived by the classified staff will provide data for the individual and the institution to utilize in neutralizing such deterrents and allowing increased participation. The survey may contribute to data collection methods regarding deterrents to adult's participation in

learning activities.

CONFIDENTIALITY:

Classified staff - No names will be used on surveys; only compiled data from surveys will be used.

Personnel/Human Resource Services Directors - Will be referred to by title, not name; will sign Informed Consent form.

LIMITATION OF LIABILITY:

Because Colorado State University is a publicly-funded, state institution, it may have only limited legal responsibility for injuries incurred as a result of participation in this study under a Colorado law known as the Colorado Governmental Immunity Act (Colorado Revised Statutes, Section 24-10-101, et seq.) In addition, under Colorado law, you must file any claim against the University within 180 days after the date of the injury.

In light of these laws, you are encouraged to evaluate your own health and disability insurance to determine whether you are covered for any injuries you might sustain by participating in this research since it may be necessary for you to rely on your individual coverage for any such injuries. If you sustain injuries which you believe were caused by Colorado State University or its employees, we advise you to consult an attorney.

Questions concerning treatment of subjects' rights may be directed to LaVina Matzdorff at 303-491-6355.

PATICIPATION:

I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary. If I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent and stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

I have read and understand the information stated and willingly sign this consent form. My signature also acknowledges that I have received, on the date signed, a copy of this document containing two pages.

Subject name (printed)

Subject signature

Date

Investigator or co-investigator
signature

Date