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## ABSTRACT

Adult educators acknowledge that one of their greatest challenges is to develop strategies that increase participation by members of the lower socio-economic groups in adult education programs. To develop such strategies adult education researchers must systematically modify or remove barriers to participation and study the resulting effects. A frequently named barrier to participation is cost. Knowledge concerning the impact of fees on enrollment and attendance is incomplete. Consequently this study examined the extent to which socio-economic and motivational variables interacted to determine enrollment and attendance behavior when fees were modified for leisure-oriented adult education courses. Three hypotheses were tested.

1. There are significant differences in the social, economic, demographic, or motivational characteristics of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.
2. There is a significant difference in the number of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.
3. There is a significant difference in the attendance behavior of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.

This was essentially a correlational study but it had characteristics of a quasi-experimental design. However, unlike a quasi-experimental design which sometimes involves random assignment of subjects to treatment groups, this study involved random assignment of courses to a fee and non-fee condition. Seven hundred and twenty-one adults enrolled in one of 51 leisure-oriented courses
offered at Guildford Park and Cloverdale Community Schools in Surrey. On the second session of each course proctors administered two questionnaires: the E.P.S. (Boshier, 1971) and a socio-economic/ demographic questionnaire. A daily attendance record was maintained for each course. The data was analyzed using a variety of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistical techniques suited to the analysis of nominal, interval, ordinal, and dichotomous data.

The results supported the following conclusions. There did not appear to be an important overall difference between the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of participants in fee and non-fee courses. The overall differences were of little administrative value in the determination of whether different fee strategies attracted participants with different individual characteristics. Removal of the registration fee did not appear to result in greater participation by members of the lower socio-economic groups, as compared to their participation in fee courses. Removal of the fee appeared to benefit the traditional 'middle-class' participants, but did little to attract the traditional non-participant-members of the lower socio-economic. groups.

It appeared that the absence of a fee was a powerful inducement which increased gross enrollment. Both socio-economic and motivational variables influenced enrollment behavior; however, no single variable accounted for large amounts of variance in fee status. Socioeconomic variables accounted for more of the fee status variance than did motivational variables. Attencance in fee courses was significantly better than attendance in non-fee courses. The findings
confirmed that both socio-economic and motivational variables accounted for differences in attendance behavior. Individuals with the most education, higher personal and family incomes, more dependants, and previous participation in adult education programs had the best attendance. Socio-economic variables accounted for more variance in attendance behavior than did motivational variables. However, motivational variables were more powerful predictors of attendance behavior than they were of enrollment behavior.

Removal of the registration fee can be a powerful tool to increase enrollment of the traditional participant. However, this study confirmed that both enrollment and attendance behaviors are complex phenomena stemming from multivariate origins. It appears that attempts to increase participation by members of lower socio-economic groups will require more than providing 'entitlement'. The results support the conclusion that personal and environmental variables which impel or inhibit participation must be modified if members of all socioeconomic groups are to benefit from participation in leisure-oriented adult education programs.
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## CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

## The Problem

Adult education participation research has traditionally focused on descriptive studies of participants and non-participants. It appears that participation in adult education programs in general, and leisure-oriented programs in particular, is primarily engaged in by the middle and upper socio-economic groups. Past research has also identified numerous barriers to participation. One frequently named barrier is cost. The lower one's socio-economic status, the greater cost becomes a barrier to participation. However, all socio-economic groups appear to consider cost to be a barrier (Johnstone \& Rivera, 1965; Miller, 1967).

Adult educators frequently acknowledge that one of their greatest challenges is to develop strategies that increase participation by members of the lower socio-economic groups. To develop such strategies adult education researchers must systematically modify or remove barriers and study the resulting effects upon participation.

This study used a correlational design which approximated a quasi-experimental research design to examine effects associated with an assumed barrier to participation-cost. There were three reasons for selecting 'cost' as the barrier to be studied.

1. Cost to the participant can be systematically controlled by the researcher and administrator.
2. The effects of cost on enrollment and attendance patterns are not clearly understood.
3. Educators and recreationalists are becoming more aware of
the need for and value of ' $\in d u c a t i o n a l ~ e n t i t l e m e n t ' ~$ (Faure, 1972; Nash, 1965). However, accompanying this awareness is a concern that implementation of educational entitlement would only benefit traditional participants in the middle and upper socio-economic groups.

## Purpose of Study

This study had three main purposes. First, it examined socioeconomic and motivational characteristics of fee and non-fee paying participants in a leisure-oriented adult education program. This examination was undertaken to explore two questions.

1. Did differences exist between the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of fee and non-fee paying participants? The answer to this question indicated whether different fee strategies attracted participants with different socio-economic and motivational characteristics. This information could be of value to adult education administrators attempting to modify or increase enrollment patterns.
2. When both fee and non-fee courses were offered, did nonfee courses 'attract' a greater proportion of participants from the lower socio-economic status groups than fee courses? The answer to this question indicated whether the absence of a registration fee resulted in greater participation by members of lower socio-economic groups as compared to their participation in fee courses.

The second purpose was to determine whether differences existed between enrollment patterns of participants in fee and non-fee courses.

The third purpose of this study was to examine whether differences existed in attendance patterns of participants in fee and non-fee courses. This examination was undertaken to explore the question, "Did differences exist between the attendance patterns of fee and non-fee paying participants?".

## Significance of Study

This study is useful to adult educators for these reasons. It added to knowledge concerning the influence of registration fees on enrollment and attendance patterns of participants in leisure-oriented adult education programs. It showed adult educators how removal of registration fees might influence enrollment and attendance behavior. It demonstrated whether 'free' adult education courses attracted participants with socio-economic and motivational characteristics the same as or different from those of participants in 'fee paying' adult education courses. It enhanced understanding of relationships between socio-economic and motivational characteristics of participants, particularly as they influenced enrollment and attendance patterns. It provided information which could guide future studies concerning the impact of fees on participation.

Definition of Terms
The following definitions were used in this study.

1. Verner's definition of adult education was adopted:
"The action of an external education agent in purposefully ordering behavior into planned systematic experiences that can result in learning for those for whom such activity is supplemental to their primary role in society and which involves some continuity in an exchange relationship between the agent and the learner so that the educational process is under constant supervision and direction" (1962, p. 2).
2. An adult was defined as an individual eighteen years of age or older on the second session of the course for which he had registered.
3. Enrollment:

A person was enrolled if he attended the second session of the course and completed two questionnaires associated with this study.
4. Attendance:

Attendance was defined as being present for any one or more of the course sessions. Attendance data was only maintained for individuals who could be matched with their enrollment questionnaires.

## Plan of Study

Chapter I gives an introduction to the problem, states the purpose and significance of the study and defines terms used. Chapter II reviews literature pertinent to this study and introduces the hypotheses. The literature reviewed concerns educational entitlement, adult education participants, attendance behavior, and fees and their effects. Chapter III describes the research design, the subjects involved in this study, the procedures used to collect data, the three questionnaires used, and the computer programs used for data analyses. Chapter IV describes the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of the subjects. It also presents the test of Hypothesis $I$ and a discussion of the results of this test. Chapter $V$ presents the test of Hypothesis II, a discussion of the results of this test, and a discussion of the AID III analysis on particlpant characteristics as predictors of enrollment in fee or
non-fee courses. Chapter VI presents the test of Hypothesis III, a discussion of the results of this test, and a discussion of the AID III analysis on participant characteristics as predictors of attendance behavior. Chapter VII contains a summary of the study, study conclusions, and a discussion of the significance of the findings.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND THE INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY HYPOTHESES

## Educational Entitlement

The concept of educational entitlement is not new to Western
Society. Plato, in a statement about education said, "Differential treatment on the basis of merit is inescapable, but that fairness requires that first all be given the opportunity to develop those meritorious qualities" (Blackstone, 1974, p.165). By the middle of the eighteenth century, it was generally agreed that elementary education was a right (Rosenthal, 1966, p.511). Free secondary education was almost an universal right in Europe and North America by 1920. The UNESCO report "Learning to Be" (Faure, 1972) stated that an individual's educational needs involved social, scientific, technological, artistic, vocational, manual, and physical education. Furthermore, the level and content of the education to which a person had a right depended upon the educational needs of the individual and the society.

Educational entitlement literature is now focused on the right to universal post-secondary education (The Carnegie Commission Report, 1973; Rosentha1, 1966; Norton, 1964; Tesconi \& Hurivitz, 1974; Harvey \& Lennards, 1973). Throughout the literature on post-secondary educational entitlement, it was generally acknowledged that tuition costs were a barrier to post-secondary education which should be removed. The Carnegie Commission Report (1973) and Benson \& Hodgkinson (1974) were emphatic on this point. They stated that wealth, or the lack of it, was the greatest deterrent to participation in post-secondary education. Other frequently mentioned barriers to participation in post-secondary education were age, social class, and geographic location.

The right to continuing education was supported in the entitlement literature (Faure, 1972; Carnegie Commission, 1973; Rosenthal, 1966; Cross, 1974). Pertinent to this study was the fact that entitlement literature referred not only to learning activities related to vocational or academic goals but also to leisure-oriented adult education as components of continuing education. Leisureoriented or general interest/recreational learning activities, as they were also called, included social, cultural, artistic, physical, and life skills education (Johnstone \& Rivera, 1965; Nash, 1965; MacLean et. al., 1972).

Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) indicated that general interest, leisure-oriented, and recreational learning activities accounted for approximately 48 percent of all adult education programs in the United States. However, they concluded that these courses were a luxury of the wealthy. Furthermore, there was an unwillingness on the part of lower socio-economic groups to participate in non-vocational programs. They saw this lack of participation in leisure-oriented programs by members of lower socio-economic groups as a critical challenge facing adult educators. They suggested:
" ..... there is a reasonably strong case for the contention that the lower classes in our society could benefit the most from instruction for use of leisure ..... The paradox is that the segment of the population which may realize the greatest increment of free time in an age of automation is, on the one hand, the least well-prepared to handle it, and on the other, the least likely to turn to continuing education to develop and expand its spare-time interest" (1965, p.22).

Adult Education Participants
Three variables seemed to distinguish adult education par-
ticipants from non-participants-education, occupation, and income
(Johnstone \& Rivera, 1965; Booth, 1961; Brunner, et. al, 1959). Participants generally had more formal education than non-participants. Participants were usually more likely to have white-collar jobs than blue-collar jobs; they were also more likely to have higher incomes than non-participants. Participants also tended to be younger than the average non-participant with males and females participating in nearly equal numbers (Johnstone \& Rivera, 1965).

The motivational characteristics of participants varied considerably. In the United States, Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) found that men were more concerned with vocational goals, while women tended to enroll in courses more often in response to home, family life, and leisure time interests. In Canada, Dickinson (1966) reported that over 75 per cent of individuals enrolled in general interest courses were female. Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) reported that women were more inclined to take courses to expand their social horizons or to get away from their daily routines. Similar results were reported in Canada (Haag, 1976; Boshier, 1977). Both Boshier (1977) and Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) reported younger men were less inclined to have leisurecentred goals than older men.

The participants' social status also influenced the type of courses in which they were likely to enroll. Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) reported both men and women from lower socio-economic status groups were less inclined to enroll in leisure-oriented courses than higher socioeconomic status participants. Similar results were reported by Haag (1976) and Boshier (1977). People at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale tended to enroll in courses to learn skills that helped them to cope with everyday living. Boshier (1977) also concluded that
low socio-economic participants were more likely motivated by economic conditions to change deficient education, income, and occupation conditions. Individuals at the upper end of the scale enrolled for personal development and the enrichment of spare time.

Douglah (1968) and Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) concluded that adult education was clearly a middle and upper class phenomenon. This was particularly true for leisure-oriented and general interest courses. Johnstone \& Rivera explained:
> "Part of this tendency can be explained by the fact that learning and education are perceived and evaluated in radically different ways by people on different rungs of the social ladder. Lower class adults not only value higher educational attainment less, but they assess the worth of education strictly in terms of the tangible advantages which can be gained from having it. They see little value in obtaining knowledge for its own sake. .... Indeed for the typical lower class adult, the concept of 'learning' and spare time enjoyment convey quite opposite meanings" (1965, p.21)

> Miller (1967) attempted to create a model to identify crucial variables affecting participation. His 'force-field analysis' was based on the results of previous participation studies, Maslow's motivational theories, and the known socio-educational characteristics of the various socio-economic groups. His framework supported the generalizations identified by participation researchers and suggested possible interrelationships between clusters of variables. For Miller the essence of participation research was this interrelationship. He maintained that "until we begin a search for significant relationships instead of static categories, our data on motivation leaves us helpless ..." (1967, p.2).

## Attendance Behavior

differentiate between persisters and dropouts. In their opinion most of these studies were unsystematic, fragmented, unsubstantiated, or incomparable. Verner \& Davis classified 26 variables in these studies into two main groups: personal factors such as sex, age, intelligence and motivation; and situational factors such as time, place, and length of course. They concluded that age, education, marital status, occupation, income and rate of social participation appeared to be most related to attendance persistence. However, the research was not clear as to the extent of the relationships.

Dickinson \& Verner (1967) reported that first attenders had lower attendance persistence than repeaters. They also found that a significant difference existed between persisters and dropouts by occupation, with housewives being the most persistent attenders. They found no significant differences in attendance persistence by sex, education, years of residence in the community, or by travel time. However, age, marital status, and number of dependents did influence attendance. The older married participants with children were the most persistent attenders. Dickinson \& Verner also reported that the best attendance occurred in short (under ten sessions) general interest courses.

Alam \& Wright (1968) also reviewed attendance persister and dropout literature. Although many influences were identified, relationships reported were usually inconsistent. Comparisons were complicated by inconsistent definitions of persistence and dropout. Nevertheless, they concluded that the persister was not very different from the dropout. Differences that did exist were small and of little value. If a theme can be drawn from the attendance literature, it is
that variables which influenced enrollment and persistence were similar.

A defect associated with the above studies was that they involved univariate or bivariate analysis. Boshier (1973) argued that dropout stemmed from multivariate origins. He suggested that dropout was a complex phenomenon determined by the extent to which participants achieved a 'goodness of fit' with their environment. Thus, his congruence model suggested that dropout occurred as a result of an interaction of motivational, psychological, socio-demographic, and 'sub-environmental' mediating variables. Boshier suggested that univariate or bivariate analysis of persistence was naive because single variable effects often disappeared when multivariate effects were examined (such as in regression equations).

One variable which influenced attendance persistence was excluded from this portion of the literature review. This variable was the registration fee. Although its effects on participation and dropout were probably mediated by other variables, the registration fee was clearly of considerable significance. Unfortunately it has not been the subject of determined study. Its influence on enrollment and attendance persistence is discussed in the following section.

## Fees and Their Effects

Adult education financing has been a traditional topic of discussion and debate. There have been arguments for and against various financing strategies, but it is almost universally agreed that there is a lack of funding for adult education. Clarke (1958) concluded that adult education's financial problems stemmed from its 'marginality'.

He stated that:
" ..... one of the striking features of adult education in this country, organizationally, is that adult education agencies have very little freedom to develop on their own terms. They are nearly always dependent rather than independent, located within large organizations that are mainly concerned with other tasks. Adult education programs, within universities, public schools, trade unions, museums, and libraries all share this dependency. Furthermore, adult educators are handicapped in becoming established because their aims and programs are not integrally related to the core tasks of the parent organization. Within adult education, both programs and educators are, in a word, marginal" (1958, p.1).

Most adult education programs are created through a combination of local and provincial (state) financing, federal aid, and student tuition or registration fees. Kempfer \& Wood (1952) indicated that taxes paid approximately ninety per cent of the costs of adult education programs in more than fifty per cent of the adult education institutions surveyed in the United States. They concluded that the principle of free public education for adults had widespread acceptance. In his United States study, O1ds (1952) reported that state aid had a direct and positive influence on enrollment in adult education programs. Programs supported largely by state aid enrolled a much higher proportion of the adults in their districts than did programs supported largely by other sources. Olds noted the lowest rates of enrollment in districts where fees or tuitions were the main source of support. He found that in two schools where no fees were charged, more low income adults enrolled than in three schools which obtained 40 per cent or more of their income from fees. The five programs studied by Olds were leisure-oriented. He observed that:
" ..... a low or no fee policy does not in itself insure the full participation of the least educated groups in the community" (1952, p.53).
and that " ..... high fees tend to limit the participation of the lower income, less educated people, who are perhaps most in need of adult education" (1952, p.101).

Furthermore, " ..... policy decisions on fees can be improved through adequate information on the characteristics of adults who are enrolled and those who are not enrolled, including motivations, income, education, age, and sex" (1952, p.101-102).

Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) reported that both participants and non-participants considered the fee to be a barrier to enrollment. In their survey the fee was identified as a barrier to enrollment 33 per cent more often by persons of low socio-economic status than by individuals of medium socio-economic status. Furthermore, individuals of medium socio-economic status identified the fee as a barrier twenty per cent more often than persons in the upper socio-economic group. Johnstone \& Rivera reported that 43 per cent of individuals with high participation 'readiness' and 48 per cent of the study population stated they could not afford adult education programs. Younger adults were found, on the average, to be fourteen per cent more likely to identify financial considerations as a barrier to enrollment than middle-aged and older adults.

It has also been argued that fees influence attendance and dropout rates. Tobert (1936) contended that a moderate fee stimulates attendance. Wright (1952) observed that in 35 adult education programs with higher fees, attendance was better than in 118 adult education programs with lower fees. She concluded that adult education programs that charged fees had substantially greater holding power than those without fees. Olds (1952) also concluded that fees could result in greater persistence.

There have been few attempts to explain purported influence of fees on enrollment and attendance. Lamoureux (1975) discussed two
consumer pricing theories which could have possible application to adult education fee policies. The 'economic demand theory' states the higher the price charged, the less the quantity people will buy. The 'consumer behavior theory' states there is no simple explanation of how prices influence a buyer's purchase decisions. This theory assumes that price is only one of many interacting variables which influence a purchase. Elements of both theories can be identified in the conclusions of Olds (1952) and Wright (1952).

## The Hypotheses

In this study an analysis was conducted to determine the effect of the registration fee on enrollment and attendance behavior. This multivariate analysis was not based on any deductively derived model; rather, it was an exploratory attempt to create a model to explain fee paying behavior and the impact of fees on enrollment and attendance behavior. Such a model could assist the adult education administrator to develop fee policies that increase enrollment and thus expand 'entitlement' to general interest programs.

With courses randomly assigned into a fee and non-fee condition, data was collected and analyzed to test the following hypotheses:
I. There are significant differences in the social, economic, demographic, or motivational characteristics of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.
II. There is a significant difference in the number of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.
III. There is a significant difference in the attendance behavior of participants enrolled in fee and in non-fee courses.

## CHAPTER III

METHOD

Design
This was essentially a correlational study but had characteristics of a quasi-experimental design. However, unlike a quasi-experimental design which can involve random assignment of subjects to treatment groups, this study involved random assignment of courses to a fee and non-fee condition. The situation can be portrayed as follows:

| $R_{c}$ | $X_{i}$ | $0_{1}$ | $X_{i}$ | $0_{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $R_{c}$ | $X_{i i}$ | $0_{2}$ | $X_{i i}$ | $0_{4}$ |

This diagram employs nomenclature provided by Campbell \& Stanley (1963). $R_{c}$ indicates the random assignment of courses to a 'fee' $\left(X_{i}\right)$ or 'non-fee' $\left(X_{i i}\right)$ condition. $0_{1}$ and $O_{2}$ were initial observations of participants undertaken during the second session of their fee or non-fee courses. Note that subjects were not randomly assigned to fee or non-fee courses; rather they selected their course presumably on the basis of their own needs and interests and information contained in the brochure. Observation $3\left(\mathrm{O}_{3}\right)$ and Observation $4\left(\mathrm{O}_{4}\right)$ involved the monitoring of attendance behaviour. In Campbell \& Stanley's nomenclature, $R$ means randomization of subjects to treatment groups. To reinforce the fact that in this study courses and not subjects were randomized, the letter ' $c$ ' is used to indicate that randomization of courses occurred. Because the presence ( $X_{i}$ ) or absence ( $X_{i i}$ ) of a fee was hypothesized to have an effect immediately prior to and after the act of enrollment, it is portrayed both before and after the initial
observations.

Subjects
Subjects for this study were 721 adults enrolled in 51 courses sponsored by the Community Education Department of School District \#36 (Surrey, B. C.). There were twenty courses at Guildford Community School and 39 courses at Cloverdale Community School (see Appendix A for course additions and cancellations). All courses began the week of April 21, 1975. Appendix A shows the distribution of subjects by school, course, day of course, fee status, number of sessions per course, official number of subjects enrolled, and actual number of subjects who met the enrollment criteria per course.

## Procedure

Guildford Community School and Cloverdale Community School were chosen for this study because of their size, location and past fee policy. In both schools a policy of providing both fee and non-fee courses had been in effect for several years. Thus, it was possibie to manipulate registration fees without changing established school board policies. Prior to 1975 the decision to impose a fee was based on some 'rationale'. In this program - Spring 1975 - it was made randomly.

The Community Education Coordinators at both schools were approached and a total of 59 courses selected for the study. To be included in the study each course had to meet three criteria: the course had to be on the school site; the course had to have four or more sessions; the course could not have a pre-assigned registration fee. In some instances the Community School Coordinators had assigned a course as 'non-fee' at the request of the instructor. Twenty courses
were selected at Guildford Community School and 39 courses at Cloverdale Community School.

Each course was listed and assigned a serial number. A table of random numbers was then used to assign each course to a fee or nonfee condition. There were 29 fee courses and 30 non-fee courses. 'Fee' courses were then allocated a fee by the Community Education Coordinators in accordance with school board policy. All 59 courses included in the study were then listed in the Surrey Community Education and Recreation Program Brochure (Spring 1975) in a manner that was consistent with courses offered at other community schools and recreation facilities. Approximately one week prior to the registration week of April 21, 1975, a copy of the brochure was mailed to every household in Surrey.

No minimum enrollment criterion was set. Nevertheless, one non-fee and nine fee courses were cancelled on registration night as no participants registered for them. The registration fee for the twenty fee courses that did continue ranged from six to fourteen dollars. The mean registration fee for both schools was $\$ 9.10$ while the mode was $\$ 8.00$ per fee course. At Guildford Community School the mean registration fee for the ten fee courses was $\$ 8.90$. The mean registration fee for the ten fee courses at Cloverdale Community School was $\$ 9.30$.

A letter (Appendix B) was sent to secretarial staff at the school board office and at both community schools explaining the purpose of the study and outlining desired responses should they receive questions concerning fee policies. No complaints were reported concerning the registration fee at either school. A letter (Appendix B) was also sent to each instructor outlining the aims of the research and the procedures to be followed during the study. Neither the secretarial
staff, nor the course instructors were told that the true aim of the study was to determine the effect of the registration fee on enrollment and attendance behavior. Every effort was made to insure that participants were also unaware of the true aims of the study.

Prior to the start of the study, thirteen proctors were recruited and briefed on their roles. Practice sessions were held where proctors role-played procedures associated with administration of instruments and developed responses to be used when answering subjects' questions. Each proctor received standardized instructions (Appendix B) and a timetable outlining his activities.

Proctors administered the E.P.S. and socio-economic/demographic questionnaires on the second session of each course. Subjects were told that the questionnaires were confidential and anonymous. However, because of the need to subsequently match attendance data with data yielded by the socio-economic and motivational questionnaires, it was necessary to be able to identify the subjects in each course. The procedures designed to accomplish this were not foolproof and some subjects were concerned that the questionnaires were not anonymous (See Appendix B: Proctor's Introductory Comments). Proctors were instructed to identify these subjects, who were then excluded from the study.

Hypothesis I was tested using data from both the socio-economic and motivational questionnaires. In all, 721 subjects were deemed to have satisfied the enrollment criteria. This represented 63.92 per cent of the total number of participants registered in the 51 courses. Four hundred and ninety-nine subjects were enrolled in non-fee courses and 222 subjects in fee courses. This data was used to test hypothesis II. To test hypothesis III a daily attendance record was maintained for each
class. Details of the strategies employed to maintain adequate attendance data are described in the 'Letter to the Instructors' and 'Collection of Attendance Data' (Appendix B).

## Instrumentation

To test hypothesis $I$ two questionnaires were administered. The first questionnaire was the Education Participation Scale (E.P.S.) developed by Boshier (1971). The second was designed to collect socioeconomic data on participants (Appendix C). This questionnaire also contained questions concerning previous adult education participation and attitudes towards fees. There were two versions of this questionnaire: one for non-fee payers and the other for fee payers.

Boshier (1971) developed the E.P.S. to investigate Houle's (1961) conceptualization of motivational orientation of adult education participants. The 1971 version of the E.P.S. has 48 items that measure the extent to which certain reasons influenced an individual to enroll in an adult education program. Boshier used 233 randomly chosen participants in his first study in Wellington, New Zealand. He used a six week test re-test study with a different sample to test the reliability of the E.P.S. All items were significant at the .001 level. The E.P.S. thus appears to be a reliable test. Riddell (1977), Boshier (1977), Haag (1976), and Morstain \& Smart (1974) have tested the E.P.S. in North America and their results provide general support for the original Boshier (1971) study.

The socio-economic questionnaires were pilot-tested with approximately 75 participants in two adult education courses at Queen Elizabeth High School, Surrey. Following this pilot test both the fee
and non-fee questionnaires were edited to clarify or remove poorly worded questions. The final form contained 30 items. The 27 variables listed below were common to both the non-fee payer and fee payer version of the questionnaire.

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Country of Birth
4. Years of residence in Canada
5. Years of residence in neighbourhood
6. Neighbourhood of residence
7. Marital status
8. Years of elementary and secondary schooling
9. Years of post-secondary schooling
10. Type of post-secondary schooling
11. Present work status
12. Past work status
13. Description of present occupation
14. Personal income
15. Number of persons employed in household
16. Family income
17. Number of children in family
18. Number of children supported financially
19. Type of accommodation
20. Type of payment: rent or mortgage
21. Amount of monthly housing payment
22. Residence status of young adults
23. Number of cars owned by family
24. Previous adult education participation
25. Number of previous courses attended
26. Travel time to and from course
27. Knowledge of study

Three additional questions were asked of both the non-fee payers and fee payers. These questions were:

## Fee Payers

1. Was the registration fee for this course paid from: your personal income, your family income, or another source?
2. Should a course, such as the one you are now taking, have a registration fee: yes or no?
3. Above what fee would you have considered it too expensive to take this course?

## Non-Fee Payers

1. Would you have registered for this course if you were required to pay a fee: yes or no?
2. If yes, above what fee would you have considered it too expensive to take this course?
3. Should a course, such as the one you are now taking, have a registration fee: yes or no?

After the questionnaires were collected, each questionnaire was coded to show a participant identification number, the school of . enrollment, the course, the day of the course, and the fee status of the course. Upon study of the completed questionnaires, data from several questions was found to be incomplete or incomprehensible. These questions were: 'type of post-secondary education', 'past work status', 'description of present occupation' and 'residence status of young adults'. Consequently, data derived from these questions was excluded from the analysis.

## Data Analysis

Seven hundred and twenty-one sets of questionnaires were analyzed to test hypothesis I. To test hypothesis II the enrollment data of all 721 subjects was analyzed. The attendance persistence data of 439 subjects was analyzed to test hypothesis III. The 439 subjects included in the test of hypothesis III were enrolled in courses with six sessions. The decision to exclude courses of other lengths was made on the basis of Dickinson's (1966) finding that attendance persistence
varied as a factor of course length. For the purposes of this study the first session was not included in the attendance data. This was done to accommodate course changes by subjects and to obtain a stable accurate registration list from the course instructors. Hence, attendance data was based on the second and subsequent sessions. The number of sessions per course for the purposes of this study was one less than the official number of sessions per course-five.

All data concerning enrollment, E.P.S., socio-economic status, and attendance was coded and keypunched (See Appendix $D$ for data coding schedules). Blanks were used to indicate missing or uncomprehensible data. The data was analyzed using the I.B.M. $360 / 168$ series computer at the University of British Columbia Computer Centre. The U.B.C. Computer Centre's Multivariate Contingency Tabulation Statistical Analysis Package (MVTAB) was used to obtain frequency counts and horizontal percentages for all socio-economic, enrollment, E.P.S., and attendance persistence data. MVTAB was also used to generate bivariate tables from nominal socio-economic, enrollment, and attendance data. Ordinal data which met assumptions for correlation was analyzed using the Triangular Regression Package (TRP). The INMSDC subroutine of TRP was used to generate means, standard deviations, and correlation matrices. The subroutine T-TEST was used to test for differences between the main scores of fee payers and non-fee payers. Raw E.P.S. data was factor analyzed using FAN. E.P.S. factor scores were included in TRP runs and analyzed using OSIRIS (AID III). The OSIRIS III subroutine AID III (Automatic Interaction Detector) developed by Sonquist et. al. (1971) was well suited to analysis involving numerous dichotomous and/or nominal variables. This statistical
analysis package was chosen to explore possible interactions between variables that influenced enrollment and attendance behavior.

## Socio-economic and Demographic Data

In all, 721 subjects met the criteria for inclusion in this study. Two hundred and eighty-five subjects ( 39.53 per cent) were enrolled at Guildford Community School and 439 ( 60.47 per cent of the study population) at Cloverdale Community School. One hundred and fifty-nine subjects (22.05 per cent) were male and 562 subjects (77.95 per cent) were female. The average age of the subjects was 36.47 years (S.D. $=14.02$ years). ${ }^{1}$ Approximately three-quarters of the subjects were born in Canada. Slightly more than 89 per cent were from countries where English was the official language. The average length of residence in Canada was 31.65 years (S.D. $=15.04$ years). The average length of residence in the subject's present neighbourhood was 11.10 years (S.D. $=10.69$ years).

Ninety per cent of the participants lived within the boundaries of School District $\# 36$ (Surrey). The remainder lived in the Greater Vancouver Regional District with the exception of two subjects who commuted from Victoria. Five hundred and eleven participants (70.87 per cent) were married. One hundred and fourteen ( 15.81 per cent) were not married. Seventy (9.71 per cent) were either separated, divorced, or widowed (Appendix E).

1. Where deemed pertinent, tables of the univariate variables discussed in Chapter IV have been compiled. If they are not included in the text of Chapter IV, they are located in Appendix $E$.

Four hundred and twenty-four participants ( 58.81 per cent) had completed twelve years of elementary and secondary schooling. The average number of years of schooling was 11.10 years (S.D. $=1.77$ years). Three hundred and ninety-three subjects ( 54.51 per cent) had completed one or more years of post-secondary education. The average number of years of post-secondary schooling for these individuals was 1.55 years (S.D. $=2.00$ years) .

Approximately one-third of the subjects were housewives with no employment outside the home. Another third of the subjects indicated that they were employed full-time outside the household.

The average personal income of the subjects was $\$ 5,999.78$ (S.D. $=\$ 5,520.10$ ). One hundred and sixty-two subjects ( 22.47 per cent) reported personal incomes of less than $\$ 500$ per year. Two hundred and eighty participants ( 38.83 per cent) reported there was only one income earner in their household. Two hundred and forty subjects (33.29 per cent) stated there were two income earners in their household. In all, 348 of the subjects ( 48.27 per cent) stated there were two or more income earners in the household. The average number of income earners per household was 1.72 persons (S.D. $=1.05$ persons). The average family income was $\$ 15,664.30$ (S.D. $=\$ 6,908.62$ ).

Approximately 31 per cent of the subjects had no children
(Table 1). The participants had an average of 1.68 children (S.D. $=$ 1.52). Slightly more than a third of the subjects reported that they had no children to support financially. The average number of children supported financially was 1.37 (S.D. $=1.34$ ).

TABLE 1

Distribution of Participants by Number of Children in Family and by Number of Children Supported Financially

| Number of Children | n | Per cent | Number of Children Supported Financially | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 224 | 31.07 | 0 | 254 | 35.23 |
| 1 | 104 | 14.42 | 1 | 124 | 17.20 |
| 2 | 162 | 22.47 | 2 | 157 | 21.78 |
| 3 | 138 | 19.14 | 3 | 106 | 14.70 |
| 4 | 45 | 6.24 | 4 | 27 | 3.74 |
| 5 | 16 | 2.22 | 5 | 10 | 1.39 |
| 6 | 6 | . 83 | 6 | - | - |
| 7 or more | 5 | . 69 | 7 or more | 2 | . 28 |
| no response | 21 | 2.92 | no response | 41 | 5.68 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |  | 721 | 100.00 |

Four hundred and thirty-two participants (59.92 per cent)
lived in single family dwellings. One hundred and eighty-eight participants (26.07 per cent) paid rent; the remainder paid a mortgage, had free accommodation, or owned their accommodation outright. The average monthly payment for housing was $\$ 186.70$ (S.D. $=\$ 130.97$ ). Table 2 shows the distribution of subjects by type of accommodation. Table 3 shows the distribution of subjects by the amount of their monthly housing payment.

## TABLE 2

Distribution of Participants by Type of Accommodation

| Type of Accommodation | $\mathfrak{n}$ | Per Cent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mobile Home | 11 | 1.53 |
| Apartment or Condominium | 75 | 10.40 |
| Townhouse | 19 | 2.64 |
| Duplex or Triplex | 27 | 3.74 |
| Single Family Dwelling | 432 | 59.92 |
| Acreage | 138 | 19.14 |
| No response | 19 | 100.00 |

TABLE 3

Distribution of Participants by Amount of Monthly Housing Payment

| Amount of Monthly Payment in Dollars | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 132 | 18.31 |
| \$ 1-100 | 47 | 6.52 |
| \$101-200 | 222 | 30.79 |
| \$201-300 | 159 | 22.05 |
| \$301-400 | 59 | 8.18 |
| \$401-500 | 17 | 2.36 |
| \$501 - 600 | 1 | . 14 |
| \$601 or more | 3 | . 42 |
| No response | 81 | 11.23 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

Approximately 45 per cent of the subjects owned two or more motor vehicles. Another 45 per cent owned only one automobile with the remainder stating they owned no motor vehicles. The average number of motor vehicles per family was 1.49 vehicles (S.D. $=.80$ vehicles).

The subjects were almost evenly divided between those who had participated in previous adult education courses (46.88 per cent) and those who had not participated previously ( 48.54 per cent). Of the subjects who had attended adult education courses before, 137 ( 40.53 per cent) had attended one course. In all, approximately 82 per cent of the
previous attenders had attended one, two, or three courses. The average number of courses previously attended by all of the subjects was 1.13 courses (S.D. = 1.84 courses). The average reported travel time to and from the course site was 16.48 minutes (S.D. $=10.27$ mimutes). Fewer than one in five of the subjects took more than twenty minutes to travel to the course.

Of the 222 subjects who paid a fee, 204 ( 91.89 per cent)
indicated they paid from personal or family incomes. The remainder had their fees paid by a welfare agency; were pensioners and therefore paid no fees; or had their fees paid by some other source. One hundred and seventy-seven of the fee payers ( 79.73 per cent) indicated that adult education courses 'should have a registration fee'. Thirty-six of the fee paying subjects ( 16.22 per cent) indicated there should be no fee while five (2.25 per cent) had 'no opinion' on this question and four subjects. (1.80 per cent) did not answer this question.

TABLE 4
Distribution of Fee and Non-Fee Payers by Their Response to the Question
"Should a course, such as the one you are now taking, have a registration fee?"

| Response to Question | n | Fee Payers <br> Per cent | Non-Fee Payers <br> n | Per cent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 177 | 79.73 | 185 | 37.07 |
| No | 36 | 16.22 | 254 | 50.90 |
| No opinion | 5 | 2.25 | 20 | 4.01 |
| No answer | 4 | 1.80 | 40 | 8.02 |

When asked if there should be a fee, 185 non-fee payers (37.07 per cent) said 'yes' and 254 ( 50.90 per cent) said 'no'. Twenty non-fee payers ( 4.01 per cent) had 'no opinion' while 40 ( 8.02 per cent) did not respond to this question (Table 4). Three hundred and ninety non-fee payers ( 78.16 per cent) indicated they were prepared to pay a registration fee. Ninety-four ( 18.84 per cent) said they would not pay a registration fee to attend the course for which they had enrolled. The fifteen remaining non-fee payers ( 3.01 per cent) did not answer the question. Fee payers and non-fee payers, who indicated that they were prepared to pay a registration fee, were asked to indicate the maximum fee they would pay for a leisure-oriented adult education course. The mean threshold fee for fee payers was $\$ 15.79$ (S.D. $=\$ 9.07$ ) with the mode being $\$ 10.00$. The mean threshold fee for non-fee payers was $\$ 13.83$ (S.D. $=\$ 8.90$ ) with the mode being $\$ 10.00$. This difference was significant (t = 2.44, df = 562, p<.05).

## Motivational Orientation Data

Motivational orientation data was collected on 690 of the 721 subjects using Boshier's (1971) Education Participation Scale. This data was subjected to principal components analysis and orthogonal rotation. Orthogonal rotation was chosen because it maximizes a lack of correlation between factors. Cattell's (1966) scree test, which examines eigenvalues, indicated that the clearest structure would be produced by rotation of the first five factors. The resulting structure was similar to that obtained by Boshier \& Riddell (1978), Boshier (1977), Haag (1976), and Morstain \& Smart (1974). Items loading .40 or more following rotation were included in each factor. The five motivational
orientation factors were named: 1: Job Advancement, 2: Social Contact, 3: External Expectations, 4: Escape/Stimulation, and 5: Cognitive Interest. Table 5 presents the items, loadings, and variance accounted for by each factor.

Factor 1: Job Advancement was concerned with a need to improve skills that would enhance an individual's employment opportunities. Factor 2: Social Contact related to a need to establish or maintain social and personal relationships. Factor 3: External Expectations was concerned with motivation to pursue adult education as a result of pressures, requirements, or instructions from individuals or agencies with which the subject was associated. Subjects who attended for reasons associated with Factor 3 were trying to fulfill the expectations of others (Boshier, 1973). Factor 4: Escape/Stimulation related to the need to escape from a particular environment or to seek stimulation. Factor 5: Cognitive Interest consisted of items related to learning for its own sake.

TABLE 5
E.P.S. Factor Loadings and Variance Accounted
for After Orthogonal Rotation

|  | Iters and Factor Groups | I | II | 111 | IV | V |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | To increase my competence in ay job | .71* | -. 05 | -. 01 | . 08 | . 04 |
| 3 | To secure professional advancement | .63* | -. 03 | . 04 | -. 03 | . 07 |
| 11 | To give me higher status in my job | .65* | . 25 | . 32 | . 05 | . 02 |
| 38 | To metet some formal requirements | . $64 *$ | -. 26 | . 19 | - . 05 | -. 02 |
| 27 | To elarify what I want to be doing 5 years from now | .60* | - . 11 | -. 01 | . 18 | . 11 |
| 33 | To conply with my employers policy | .56* | - . 15 | . 23 | -. 04 | -. 10 |
| 24 | To prepare for service to the community | . 56 * | -. 13 | . 23 | . 10 | . 18 |
| 32 | To improve ary ability to serve zankind | . 54 * | -. 41* $^{*}$ | . 08 | . 04 | . 26 |
| 14 | To acquire a knowledge that will help ac with other educational courses | .54* | -. 12 | . 07 | . 12 | . 32 |
| 16 | To keep up with competition | . $54 *$ | -. 05 | . 35 | . 20 | -. 10 |
| 22 | To help re earn a degree, diplona or certificate | .52* | . 06 | . 39 | . 05 | . 08 |
| 39 | To maintain or improve my social position | . 49 * | -. 43* $^{\text {a }}$ | . 17 | . 10 | -. 04 |
| 34 | To keep up with ochers | .43* | -. 26 | . 36 | . 17 | -. 08 |
| 4 | Become more effectiva as a citizen | . 40 * | -. 07 | . 26 | . 10 | . 36 |
| 12 | To supplement a narrow previous education | . 39 | . 24 | . 25 | . 26 | . 30 |
| 2 | To share a comon interest | -. 15 | -. 27 | . 23 | -. 07 | . 14 |
| 21 | To gain insight inco myself and wy personal problems | . 32 | -. 33 | -. 07 | . 24 | . 32 |
| 25 | To gain insigit into human reiations | . 32 | -.41* | . 01 | . 17 | . 36 |
| 15 | To fulfil a need for personal associations and friendships | . 17 | -.48* | . 12 | .36 | . 19 |
| 37 | To take part in an activity which is customary <br> in the circles in which $I$ move | . 39 | -. $48 *$ | . 16 | -. 07 | -. 01 |
| 45 | To fuprove wy ability to participate in comunity work | .41* | -. $50 *$ | . 15 | .13 | . 25 |
| 28 | To becone acqualnted with congenial people | . 09 | -. $55 *$ | . 24 | . 31 | . 17 |
| 35 | To tmprove my soctal telationships | . 22 | -. 56 * | . 39 | . 22 | . 12 |
| 19 | To participate in group activity | . 10 | -. $65 *$ | . 08 | . 31 | . 15 |
| 44 | To wake net friends | . 05 | -. $67 *$ | . 19 | . 26 | . 13 |
| 47 | To comply with fnstruetions from smmeone eise | . 18 | -. 12 | .61* | -. 04 | . 12 |
| 46 | To comply with the face that people with gtarus \& prestige attend adulc education classes | . 18 | -. 29 | .60* | -. 01 | . 09 |
| 42 | To conply with the suggescions of someona else | . 02 | - . 17 | .57* | . 08 | -. 04 |
| 36 | To carry out the expectations of soceone vith formal authority | .43* | - . 18 | .54* | -. 05 | -. 01 |
| 48 | To assist me when I go overseas | . 18 | -. 10 | . $54 *$ | -. 04 | . 10 |
| 6 | Carry out recommendarions of some authority | . 29 | . 16 | . 54 * | . 06 | . 17 |
| 17 | To meet members of the opposite gex | . 07 | - . 20 | - 88 * | . 14 | -. 05 |
| 40 | To escape an unhappy relationship | . 01 | - . 81 | . $45 *$ | . 15 | - . 04 |
| 10 | To be accepted by others | . 27 | - . 04 | .45* | . 37 | -. 02 |
| 9 | To overcome the frustration of day to day living | . 06 | -. 15 | -. 02 | .73** | . 01 |
| 5 | To get rellef from boredom | - . 08 | -. 03 | . 06 | .72* | -. 03 |
|  | To get a break in the routine of ho:os or work |  | -. $40 *$ | . 04 | .61* | . 06 |
| 26 | To have a few hours away frou responsibilities | -. 02 | -. 39 | . 01 | . 59 * | -.04 |
| 13 | To.stop tyself beccaing a 'cabbage' | . 20 | - . 12 | -. 08 | . 56 * | . 20 |
| 23 | To escape television | . 06 | . 02 | . 26 | .52* | -. 04 |
| 29 | To provide $t$ contrast to the rest of my life | . 14 | -. 26 | . 13 | .45* | . 27 |
| 18 | To escape the intellectual narromess of ary occupation | . 24 | - . 11 | . 16 | .41* | . 12 |
|  | To satisfy an encuiring inind | -. 03 | - . 04 | . 01 | . 08 | .70* |
| 1 | To eeak knowledge for its own sake | . 01 | -. 06 | . 07 | -. 11 | .67** |
| 43 | To learn fust for the sake of learning | - . 11 | -. 23 | -. .G8 | . 15 | .54* |
| 7 | Respund to the fact that I am surrounded by people tho continue to learn | . 26 |  |  | . 21 | . 46 * |
| 41 | To provide a concrast to my previous education | . 24 | - . 01 | . 27 | . 26 | . 36 |
| 30 | To obrala some immediate practical benefit | . 14 | -. 08 | . 07 | -. 07 | .24 |
|  | Sum of aquared factor-ioadings divided by sum of comuralities | . 29 | . 19 | . 19 | . 19 | . 13 |
|  | Varlance accounted for | 22.62 | 7.94 | 4.82 | 3.90 | 3.56 |
|  | cumulative variance accounted for | 22.62 | 30.56 | 35.38 | 39.28 | 42.84 |

Although factor loadings are of interest, they do not reveal the extent to which participants are enrolled for each orientation. Summing over items is one technique to generate 'factor scores' that reveal the extent to which participants were enrolled for a particular orientation (Boshier, 1977). Five factor scores were thus derived by summing over items and dividing by the number of items in a factor (to produce a mean). These are listed below in decreasing order of influence on participation.

| Factor 5: Cognitive Interest | 5.31 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Factor 4: Escape/Stimulation | 3.55 |
| Factor 2: Social Contact | 3.33 |
| Factor 1: Job Advancement | 2.44 |
| Factor 3: External Expectations | 1.72 |

As the factor scores indicate, the subjects were most motivated to participate for reasons of Cognitive Interest and least motivated by External Expectations.

## Test of Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I stated, "There are significant differences in the social, economic, demographic, or motivational characteristics of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses". There were nineteen ordinal (or interval) variables and seven nominal variables used to compare fee and non-fee payers (Tables $6 \& 7$ ). Differences between the means of ordinal data (t-tests) and chi-square tests of nominal data identified significant differences ( $p<.05$ ) on 'number of children in family', 'amount of monthly housing payment', Factor 2: Social Contact, Factor 5: Cognitive Interest, and 'type of accommodation'. Differences in 'type of accommodation' and Factor 2: Social Contact were highly significant ( $p<.01$ ) .

TABLE 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and t-values for Fee and Non-Fee Payers on Twenty Ordinal Variables.

| Variable Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fee } \\ \mathrm{n}=222 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Non-Fee } \\ & n=499 \end{aligned}$ |  | t-value | ds | c-Probability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% | S.D. | * | 5.0. |  |  |  |
| Age | 36.86 yr | 14.46 | 36.30 yr | 13.82 | - . 49 | 704 | . 63 |
| Years of residence in Canada | 30.62 yr | 15.44 | 32.11 yz | 14.85 | 1.21 | 699 | . 22 |
| Years of residence in netghbourhood | 10.21 ys | 10.45 | 11.51 yr | 10.79 | 1.50 | 698 | . 13 |
| Years of secondary schooling | 11.20 yr | 1.67 | 11.06 yr | 1.82 | -. 95 | 705 | . 35 |
| Years of post-secondary schnoling | 1.66 yr | 2.14 | 1.50 yr | 1.94 | - 1.00 | 700 | . 32 |
| Personal income | \$6382 | 5546 | \$5826 | 5506 | - 1.18 | 535 | . 24 |
| Number employed in household | 1.63 | . 999 | 1.77 | 1.07 | 1.64 | 660 | $p<.10$ |
| Family income | \$15585 | 6927 | \$15699 | 6909 | . 19 | 618 | . 83 |
| Number of children | 1.52 | 1.34 | 1.75 | 1.59 | 1.95 | 482** | $p<.05$ |
| Number of chlidren supported | 1.26 | 1.27 | 1.41 | 1.37 | 1.40 | 678 | . 16 |
| Monthly housing payment | \$202.57 | 139.28 | \$179.76 | 126.70 | - 2.04 | 638 | $p<.05$ |
| Number of cars owned by family | 1.52 | . 85 | 1.48 | . 77 | -. 49 | 680 | . 63 |
| Number of previous coursee | 1.07 | 2.03 | 1.16 | : 975 | . 53 | 353** | . 61 |
| Travel eime | 16.27.min | 9.76 | 16.57 min | 10.50 | . 35 | 705 | . 72 |
| Factor 1 : Job Advancement | -. 0570 | . 91 | . 0113 | 1.02 | . 87 | 434** | . 39 |
| Fastor 2 : : Social Contact | -. 1574 | 1.05 | . 0632 | . 97 | 2.66 | 684 | $p<.01$ |
| Fector 3 - External Expectation | . 0151 | 1.15 | -. 0082 | . 03 | - . 26 | 325** | . 77 |
| Factor 4 : Escape/Stimulation | . 0127 | . 95 | - . 0016 | 1.02 | - . 17 | 684 | . 34 |
| Factor 5 : Cognitive Interest | -. 1120 | . 95 | . 0559 | 1.02 | 2.02 | 684 | $p<.05$ |
| Threshold Fee *** | \$15.79 | 9.07 | \$13.83 | 3.90 | 2.64 | 562 | P< . 05 |

* two tailed test.
** T-TEST uses more than one formula for performing t-tests. The most general formula assumes that the parent population approaches normality. This assumption applied to all of the variables except those marked by '菡. In these cases a more sensitive version of the first assumption applied. The assumption is that the population variances are equal.
*** Not included in the test of Hypothesis I.

TABLE 7
Test of Significance for Nominal Characteristics Between Fee and Non-Fee Payers

| Variable Name | $x^{2}$ | df | Probability |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex | .08 | 1 | .77 |
| Type of Accommodation | 17.86 | 6 | $\mathrm{p}<.01$ |
| Previous Participation | .70 | 2 | .71 |
| Country of Birth | 13.28 | 12 | .35 |
| Marital Status | 19.09 | 11 | $\mathrm{p}<.10$ |
| Present Work Status | 18.25 | 11 | $\mathrm{p}<.10$ |
| Payment: Rent or Mortgage | .55 | 2 | .76 |

Non-fee payers had significantly more children than fee payers. Fee payers paid significantly more per month for their accommodation than non-fee payers. Fee payers were more strongly motivated by the need for Social Contact than were non-fee payers. Fee payers were significantly less motivated by Cognitive Interest than were non-fee payers. Fee payers were more likely to live in apartments, duplexes, and single family dwellings than non-fee payers; non-fee payers were more inclined to live on acreage, in mobile homes, and in townhouses than fee payers.

In view of the fact that this research was essentially exploratory, it was considered appropriate to examine significant differences between variables at the $p<.10$ level. Significant differences between fee payers and non-fee payers at this level occurred on 'marital status', 'present work status', and 'number of persons employed in the household'.

Non-fee payers were more likely single, widowed, married less than four years, or married fifteen or more years. Fee payers were more•likely to be separated/divorced, married between five and nine years, or living common-law than were non-fee payers. Fee payers were more likely to work full-time or to be retired than non-fee payers. Non-fee payers were more likely to work part-time, be unemployed, be self-employed, or be housewives than were fee payers. Non-fee payers were slightly more inclined to be from households with three or more persons employed.

For Hypothesis I the level of significance was set at $p<.05$. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted for the five characteristics listed below and rejected for the other 21 characteristics tested:

Number of children in family
Amount of monthly housing payment
Type of accommodation
Factor 2: Social Contact
Factor 4: Cognitive Interest
Thus, non-fee payers and fee payers differed significantly on three of the 21 socio-economic/demographic characteristics and on two of the five motivational characteristics.

Socio-economic, demographic, and motivational data was collected to permit identification of differences in the characteristics of fee and non-fee payers. Significant differences existed on five of the 26 variables studied. Non-fee payers had on the average .23 more children than fee payers. Non-fee payers paid $\$ 23 /$ month more for accommodation than fee payers. Fee payers were more inclined than non-fee payers to occupy apartments, duplexes, or single family homes. Non-fee payers tended to occupy mobile houses, townhouses, or acreage.

Non-fee payers and fee payers had significant differences on only three of the 21 socio-demographic variables studied. In general, participants in non-fee courses appeared to be from the same socioeconomic group as participants in fee courses. The absence of a fee did not appear to result in greater participation by members of the lower socio-economic groups.

Fee payers were significantly more likely to participate to satisfy Social Contact needs than non-fee payers ( $p<.01$ ). Non-fee payers were more inclined to participate to satisfy Cognitive Interest needs than fee payers ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ) Although no significant differences existed between fee and non-fee payers on the motivational orientations Job Advancement, External Expectations, or Escape/Stimulation it is noteworthy that both groups scored low on these factors. Low scores indicated that the subjects were not strongly motivated to participate by these motivational orientations.

Earlier in this chapter, the results of questions concerning 'threshold fees', 'who should pay', and 'willingness to enroll if there was a fee' were presented. These questions were attitudinal in nature and not included in the test of Hypothesis $I$. Approximately nineteen per cent of the non-fee payers indicated they were not prepared to pay a fee. If this variable was an accurate predicter of behavior, enrollment in this program would have been thirteen per cent less had all the courses been assigned a registration fee. On the other hand, approximately 87 per cent of the participants either paid or were prepared to pay a fee. However, approximately 41 per cent of the subjects (sixteen per cent of the fee payers and 55 per cent of the non-fee payers) indicated there should be no fee. These results revealed that differ-
ences in attitude towards fee payment existed within the non-fee and fee paying groups, as well as between these groups. Despite these attitudinal differences, there were few socio-economic and motivational differences between non-fee and fee payers.

## EnROLLMENT PATTERNS AND FEE STATUS

Test of Hypothesis II
Enrollment data was collected on 721 subjects. There were 499 subjects ( 69.21 per cent) enrolled in non-fee courses and 222 ( 30.79 per cent) enrolled in fee courses. The 499 non-fee payers were enrolled in 31 courses. The mean number of subjects per non-fee course was 16.10 subjects. The 222 fee payers were enrolled in 20 fee courses. The mean enrollment per fee course was 11.10 subjects. A comparison of the enrollment patterns in the 31 non-fee courses and the twenty fee courses revealed that the mean enrollment in non-fee courses was 45.05 per cent greater than in fee courses. The percentage difference in the enrollment in fee versus non-fee courses was statistically significant. Based on the results obtained in this study, Hypothesis II was accepted. Non-fee courses had a significantly greater enrollment than fee courses.

The fee status of a course had a profound effect on enrollment rates. Not only did non-fee courses attract significantly larger numbers of participants but non-fee courses were less likely to be cancelled due to poor enrollment. Nine fee courses had to be cancelled while only one non-fee course was cancelled. It is apparent that removal of the registration fee can be a powerful tool to improve enrollment in adult education programs.

Why were more participants attracted to non-fee as compared to fee courses? Unfortunately, there were no clear answers to this question. As indicated in Chapter IV, socio-economic and motivational similarities between non-fee payers and fee payers appeared to be
greater than the differences. Although differences were noted between fee and non-fee payers with regard to their attitudes towards fees and their willingness to pay, there were no indications as to why these differences existed. Nor was there evidence to support the conclusion that members of lower socio-economic groups were more inclined to enroll in non-fee courses.

Interaction Between Predictors of Enrollment
in Fee versus Non-Fee Courses
Despite this difference in enrollment patterns in fee and non-fee courses, analysis of the characteristics of fee and non-fee payers did not reveal major differences between the two groups (Chapter IV). It must be recalled that the foregoing analysis was essentially bivariate and consisted of testing the significant differences between variable means (t-tests) and frequency distributions ( $X^{2}$ ).

Participation in adult education has been purported to occur due to a complex interaction of many variables (Boshier 1973). Thus it was decided to examine the interactions between variables in an attempt to explain fee status enrollment behavior. To pursue variable configurations related to enrollment in a fee or non-fee course the multivariate analysis algorithm embodied in the AID III package of OSIRIS III was used. Apart from its ability to detect interactions between variables, AID III was well suited to present purposes since the independent variables included a mixture of nominal, ordinal, and interval data. Moreover, it appeared that the effects of some variables may have been mediated by the effects of other variables. This is the classic problem in correlation which led McNemar (1969) to coin the term 'suppressor' effect to describe a situation where the effects of
one variable are mediated by or suppressed by the interactive effects of other variables. It is this kind of reasoning which usually leads researchers to use a regression procedure capable of detecting interactive and 'partial' effects of independent variables on a dependent variable.

AID III was also well suited to this analysis because many of the independent variables in this study failed to meet the assumptions for correlation-the heart of regression. Concerning this, Boshier (1977a) said:

> "The heart of AID III is the ability to search among a set of predictors for characteristics which increase the researcher's ability to account for variance in the dependent variable. Each predictor is split dichotomously in a manner which maximizes the variance accounted for ..... The population is divided, through a series of binary splits, into a mutually exclusive series of subgroups. Every observation is a member of one of the subgroups. Each group is chosen so that at each step the two means account for more of the sum of squares (reducing the predictive error) than the means of any other subgroups."
> "The AID III analysis is not like factor or regression analysis. In social research main effects are not necessarily the same or even present ln all parts of a population or sample. Furthermore, interaction effects may be of complex kinds affecting only some subgroups in the population ..... AID III reveals these subgroup effects and is well suited to exploratory research where interrelationships within a model are not exactly specified. AID III formalizes and makes explicit explorations in data so they can be judged, repeated and tested on other populations and samples. It also enables the researcher to dismiss predictors that don't effect the dependent variable."

AID III employed a nonsymmetrical branching process to divide the study population into a series of groups that were either 'high' or 'low' on the dependent variable (Figure 1). In this case the dependent variable was fee versus non-fee paying status. Group 1 represents the total study population ( $n=721$ ) ; it shows the mean ' $y$ ' (dependent
variable: fee versus non-fee paying status) as equal to 1.69. The dependent variable 'fee versus non-fee paying status' was coded $1=$ fee payer and 2 non-fee payer.

Each box below Group 1 is a group numbered in the order in which AID III dichotomously split the predictor with the next highest percentage of variance. That is, the predictor next best able to increase the behavior predictability. Below each box is the name of the predictor (independent variable) on which the next dichotomous split occurred. The Basic Sum of Squares/Total Sum of Squares $\times 100$ shows the percentage of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by that independent variable split.

Each box contains three lines. The first line identifies the variable categories encompassed by that group. The second line gives the number of subjects ' $n$ 'l in that group and line three gives the ' $y$ ' value (fee-status mean) for subjects in that group. Groups that could not be split further have a double bottom line on their box. This indicates that no additional variance could be accounted for by further splitting of that group. In some cases it was not possible due to space constraints to include all the variable categories on line one of the box. Where this happened, line one is preceded by an ' $*$ ' and a number code is used to identify coding categories. Refer to Appendix D to translate these codes to actual variable values.

1. In Figures 1 and 3 , ' $n$ ' and ' $y$ ' were capitalized to maintain legibility during photoreduction.

FIGURE 1
Enrollment Behavior as Predicted by the Interaction of Various Socio-Economic and Motivational Characteristics


The researcher can set the criterion for 'splitting' so in some respects AID III resembles stepwise regression. Because t-tests and comparison of nominal data derived from fee and non-fee payers did not reveal a coherent pattern of differences between the two groups, the AID III analysis was essentially exploratory (Tables $6 \& 7$ ). AID III was instructed to continue splitting independent variables until all possible meaning in the data had been revealed. This resulted in a large number of splits. Although some of the splits accounted for only small amounts of variance, it was possible to detect several interactions between independent variables which determined fee versus nonfee paying enrollment behavior.

Seventeen of the 27 predictors were split 27 times to create 54 groups. Twenty-eight of these groups were final. In all, 35 per cent of the variance in the dependent variable was explained by the predictors studied. Of the seventeen predictors split, the five most powerful were 'day of course', 'family income', 'neighbourhood of residence', 'type of accommodation', and E.P.S. Factor 5: Cognitive Interest. In sequence these predictors accounted for 16.57 per cent, 13.43 per cent, 10.57 per cent, 8.57 per cent and 6.86 per cent of the explained variance in fee versus non-fee payer status. These five predictors accounted for 56 per cent of the explained variance or 19.6 per cent of the total variance (Table 8).

TABLE 8
Relative Power of Variables Predicting
Fee Versus Non-Fee Payer Enrollment Behavior

| Predictor | Number of Partitions | Proportion of Variance Explained | Per cent of Explained Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day of Course | 2 | . 058 | 16.57 |
| Family Income | 4 | . 047 | 13.43 |
| Neighbourhood of Residence | 3 | . 037 | 10.57 |
| Type of Accommodation | 2 | . 030 | 8.57 |
| Factor 5: Cognitive Interest | 2 | . 024 | 6.86 |
| Country of Birth | 2 | . 021 | 6.00 |
| Age | 2 | . 020 | 5.71 |
| Personal Income | 1 | . 017 | 4.86 |
| Sex | 1 | . 012 | 3.43 |
| Travel Time | 1 | . 012 | 3.43 |
| Factor 2: Social Contact | 1 | . 012 | 3.43 |
| Years of Residence in Neighbourhood | 1 | . 011 | 3.14 |
| Factor 3: External Expectations | 1 | . 011 | 3.14 |
| Factor 4: Escape/Stimulation | 1 | . 010 | 2.86 |
| Number of Cars Owned by Family | 1 | . 010 | 2.86 |
| Number of Children Supported Financially | y | . 010 | 2.86 |
| Number of Previous Courses Attended | 1 | . 080 | 2.28 |
| Years of Residence in Canada | 0 | None | 0 |
| Marital Status | 0 | None | 0 |
| Years of Secondary Schooling | 0 | None | 0 |
| Years of Post-Secondary Schooling | 0 | None | 0 |
| Present Work Status | 0 | None | 0 |
| Number Employed in Household | 0 | None | 0 |
| Payment: Rent or Mortgage | 0 | None | 0 |
| Amount of Monthly Housing Payments | 0 | None | 0 |
| Factor 1: Job Advancement | 0 | None | 0 |
| Previous Participation | 0 | None | 0 |
|  | 27 | . 350 | 100.00 |

'Family income' had four partitions while 'neighbourhood of residence' had three partitions. These predictors accounted for approximately one-quarter of the dichotomous splits and one-quarter of the explained variance. In total, thirteen socio-economic variables and four motivational variables accounted for 29.3 per cent and 5.7 per cent of the variance respectively. No single variable accounted for a large portion of the explained variance. Small amounts of the total variance were accounted for by each of the seventeen variables split.

With AID III it is possible for a variable to interact with other variables in different ways, depending on the value of the variable. For example, 'high' personal income may have interacted with another variable differently than 'low' personal income. The ability to identify these different interactions is a strength of AID III. Because AID III was instructed to continue splitting predictors in search of all possible meaning, there were many groups with only a few subjects. This greatly complicated the results and was one reason why Sonquist et. al. (1971) exhorts researchers to obtain a large' $n$ ' when using AID III. Consequently, a decision was made to focus the presentation and discussion of the results on groups of approximately twenty or more subjects.

Two main splits occurred on the predictors 'type of accommodation' and 'day of course'. The first split on 'type of accommodation' produced Group 2 with 564 subjects who lived in mobile homes, apartments/condominiums, townhouses, duplexes/triplexes, or single family dwellings and Group 3 with 157 subjects who lived on acreage (or who did not answer the question). The subjects in Group 2 were more inclined to
be fee payers $(y=1.65)$ while the subjects in Group 3 were more inclined to be non-fee payers $(y=1.8)$. The second split on 'day of course' partitioned Group 2 into Groups 4 and 5. Group 4 had 173 subjects who enrolled in courses held on Monday. The 391 subjects in Group 5 enrolled in courses held on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. The subjects in Group 4 were more inclined to be fee payers $(y=1.53)$ when compared to the subjects in Group 5 who were more inclined to be non-fee payers ( $y=1.71$ ). Groups 3,4 , and 5 head the three main branches of subjects. Each of these main branches will be presented and discussed in turn as they appear from left to right in Figure 1.

Three major branches emanated from Group 4. Subjects in these branches manifested the following characteristics:

## Branch A

(Inclined to be fee payers)

```
Group 35 - Eamily incomes between $16001 - 26000
n=22, y=1..68
Group 29
n=52, y=1.5
Group 25
n=65, y=1.41
Group 16 - were female.
Group l6
Group 10 - personal incomes of $2001 - 20000
n=108, y=1.43 (or did not respond to this question).
Group 4 - attended a course on Monday.
n=173, y=1.53
    and over $28000 (or did not answer).
    - were born in Canada or the U.S.A.
    - lived within the boundaries of Surrey,
    Langley, Aldergrove, or Delta.
```

Branch B
(Less inclined to be fee payers)

| Group 43 <br> $\mathrm{n}=21, \mathrm{y}=1.8$ | - had low Social Contact <br> motivation. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Group 17 |  |
| $\mathrm{n}=29, \mathrm{y}=1.65$ | - were male. |
| Group 10 | - personal incomes of $\$ 2001-20000$ |
| $\mathrm{n}=108, \mathrm{y}=1.43$ | (or did not respond to this question). |
| Group 4 | - attended a course on Monday. |
| $\mathrm{n}=173, \mathrm{y}=1.53$ |  |

Branch C
(Inclined to be non-fee payers)
Group 41 - had low Cognitive Interest $n=39, y=1.87$ motivation.

Group 33 - travelled for six or more minutes $\mathrm{n}=53, \mathrm{y}=1.77$ to the site of the course.

Group 11 - personal incomes from \$0-2000. $\mathrm{n}=65, \mathrm{y}=1.69$

Group 4 - attended a course on Monday. $\mathrm{n}=173, \mathrm{y}=1.53$

An overview of these branches revealed that subjects in Branch A were more inclined to be fee payers than were subjects in Branch $B$, who were more inclined to be fee payers than subjects in Branch C. Within all three branches there were subbranches with subjects who displayed either very 'high' or very 'low' values.

Four major branches emanated from Group 5. Three of these branches had subjects who were inclined to pay a fee, while the other branch had subjects who were more inclined to be non-fee payers. The subjects in these four branches manifested the following characteristics:


Branch G
(Inclined to be non-fee payers)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 9 \\ & \mathrm{n}=153, \mathrm{y}=1.85 \end{aligned}$ | - lived in neighbourhood between six45 years and 51 - 55 years (or did not respond). |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 7 \\ & \mathrm{n}=280, \mathrm{y}=1.78 \end{aligned}$ | - attended a course on Tuesday or Wednesday. |

The major branches of Group 5 had numerous subbranches with subjects with either very high or very low 'y' values. Very high 'y' values were identified in Groups 15,19 and 27 . Low 'y' values were identified in Groups $30,46,36$, and 50 .

Two major branches emanated from Group 3; both branches had subjects with a high inclination to enroll in non-fee courses. Subjects in these branches manifested the following characteristics:

## Branch H

(Inclined to be non-fee payers)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 53 \\ & \mathrm{n}=16, \mathrm{y}=1.93 \end{aligned}$ | - between the ages of 28-32, 38 - 52, or 58-72 years. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 45 \\ & \mathrm{n}=22, \quad \mathrm{y}=1.77 \end{aligned}$ | - family incomes between \$12001-20000, $\$ 22001$ - 24000 , or over $\$ 28000$ (or did not' respond). |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 22 \\ & \mathrm{n}=28, \quad \mathrm{y}=1.64 \end{aligned}$ | - previously attended six or more adult education courses (or did not respond). |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 21 \\ & n=151, \quad y=1.83 \end{aligned}$ | - lived within the boundaries of S.D.\#36, Langley, or Coquitlam. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 3 \\ & \mathrm{n}=157, \quad \mathrm{y}=1.80 \end{aligned}$ | - lived on acreage <br> (or did not answer this question). |


| Branch I |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (Inclined to be non-fee payers) |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 23 \\ & \mathrm{n}=123, \quad \mathrm{y}=1.87 \end{aligned}$ | - previously attended fewer than six adult education courses. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 21 \\ & \mathrm{n}=151, \quad \mathrm{y}=1.83 \end{aligned}$ | - lived within the boundaries of S.D. \#36, Langley, or Coquitlam. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 3 \\ & \mathrm{n}=157, \quad \mathrm{y}=1.80 \end{aligned}$ | - lived on acreage (or did not respond). |

Although the groups in Branches $H$ and I generally had a high ' $y$ ' value, there were several subbranches with groups of subjects who were more inclined to pay a fee. In particular these were subjects with low family incomes (Group 44) and subjects who lived in Clayton Hill or who did not respond (Group 20).

These results were complex. They indicated that both socioeconomic and motivational characteristics influenced the subjects to enroll in either a non-fee or fee status course. Seventeen variables accounted for 35 per cent of the total variance. Although both socioeconomic and motivational characteristics contributed to the prediction of enrollment in either a fee or non-fee course, socio-economic characteristics had a greater influence than motivational characteristics. The overall impression of these findings was one of complex interactions that were in many places subtle or obscure. Although the independent variables accounted for 35 per cent of the total variance, no administratively useful profile of fee and non-fee payers was revealed by the AID III analysis. However, some relationships are worthy of discussion.

The predictor that accounted for the greatest amount of explained variance was 'day of course'. Why this particular variable influenced enrollment is not known. The predictor 'family income' was
involved in four splits and accounted for the second highest amount of explained variance. In three of these splits, individuals with higher family incomes were more likely to be enrolled in non-fee courses. The reasons for this fact are not known. Perhaps it could be that higher income earners see 'free' courses as a return for their higher tax contributions. Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) reported that members of the lower socio-economic groups considered cost to be a greater barrier to participation than did any other socio-economic group. Yet in this study, individuals with the lowest incomes were more inclined to pay fees. Perhaps these individuals judged the quality of the course by its cost, in spite of the fact that all courses were sponsored by the same agency.

Why 'neighbourhood of residence' influenced fee status is also unclear. No patterns were apparent in the interactions of this variable with other variables. Nor was there much meaning to the influence of the variable 'type of accommodation'. Individuals who lived on acreage generally had lower accommodation costs and enrolled in non-fee courses. Many of these people were 'farmers' or 'hobby farmers' and it is possible that this could be a clue to their enrollment behavior.

The motivational factor Cognitive Interest was an important variable in explaining enrollment behavior. However, in the two splits on this variable the results were different. Subjects with average or longer travel times and who had strong Cognitive Interest motivation were more inclined to be fee payers than were subjects who travelled the same length of time but who had low Cognitive Interest motivation. When
low Cognitive Interest motivation was associated with 'age' and 'day of course' the subjects were more inclined to be fee payers. Why these interactions occurred is not clear.
'Country of birth' split twice. In both cases native Canadians were more inclined to enroll in non-fee courses than were immigrants. This may be a manifestation of the 'something for nothing' mentality frequently mentioned by Canadian politicians and the press. The variable 'age' also split twice. In one case the young were more inclined to be fee payers and in the other case the young were more inclined to be non-fee payers. In the one split on 'sex', females were more inclined to be fee payers.

One variable was conspicuous by its absence in the results -'years of secondary schooling'. Johnstone \& Rivera (1965) reported that individuals with more education tend to place a higher value on continuing education and leisure-oriented learning. Therefore, it was anticipated that individuals with more education would be more inclined to pay a fee. This was not the case.

Only two of the five variables identified as being significantly different in the bivariate analysis (Chapter IV) of fee payer and nonfee payer characteristics were of importance in explaining variance in this multivariate analysis. These variables were 'type of accommodation' and E.P.S. Factor 5: Cognitive Interest. This raises major concerns about the use of bivariate analysis to predict enrollment behavior.

This study has shown that non-fee courses attracted significantly more participants than did fee courses. Although the study failed to identify any clear reasons for this effect, it appears that socio-
economic status did not have a significant influence on a participant's decision to enroll in a fee versus non-fee course. In spite of the fact that this study employed many of the traditional socioeconomic and motivational variables used to predict enrollment behavior, 65 per cent of the total variance was unexplained.

ATTENDANCE PATTERNS AND EXPLORATION OF ATTENDANCE BEHAVIOR

## Test of Hypothesis III

Attendance behavior data was collected on 439 subjects enrolled in courses with six sessions (See Chapter III). There were 297 non-fee payers ( 67.65 per cent) and 142 fee payers ( 32.35 per cent). A comparison of the attendance patterns in the 21 non-fee courses and the 15 fee courses revealed that the mean attendance in non-fee courses was 3.59 sessions (S.D. $=1.42$ ); the mean attendance of fee payers was 4.02 sessions (S.D. $=1.23$ ). Thus, fee payers attended significantly more sessions than non-fee payers ( $p<.01$ ). Based on this t-probability Hypothesis III was accepted. Fee payers had significantly better attendance than non-fee payers.

FIGURE 2
Per cent Attendance of Fee and Non-Fee Payers by Course Session


Why did fee payers and non-fee payers have significantly different attendance behavior? The answer to this question probably lies in the differences in the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of the fee and non-fee payers. However, as observed in the comparison of these characteristics in the test of Hypothesis I, the similarities between the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of fee and non-fee payers were more pronounced than the differences. Significant differences were observed on five of the 23 variables examined for the test of Hypothesis I. An examination of these differences failed to indicate why fee and non-fee payers had different attendance behavior. Since the subjects in the test of Hypothesis III were a large subgroup of the subjects studied in Hypothesis I, it was decided that little additional information would be obtained by doing a bivariate analysis of the attendance subgroup's socio-economic and motivational data. Rather, the socio-economic and motivational data were analyzed using the AID III program of OSIRIS III in order to explore the antecedents of attendance behavior within a multivariate paradigm.

## Interaction Between Predictors of Attendance Behavior

In Figure 3 the dependent variable was 'attendance behavior'. The possible range for this variable was from 'l' to '5' which indicated the number of course sessions attended by the participants. Group 1 represents the total study population ( $n=439$ ). Also shown in Group 1 is the mean score for the dependent variable ( $\mathrm{y}=3.72$ ). Each box below Group 1 was a group numbered in the order in which AID III dichotomously split the predictor accounting for the next highest percentage

FIGURE 3

## Attendance Behavior as Predicted by the Interaction of Various Socio-economic and Mativational Characteristics


of variance. The first line in each box identifies the coding categories for that group. The second line gives the number of subjects ' $n$ ' in that group and line three gives the ' $y$ ' value (dependent mean) for subjects in that group. Groups that could not be split further have a double bottom line. In some cases it was not possible due to space constraints to include all of the predictor values on line one. Where this occurred, line one is preceded by an ' $\star$ ' and a number code is used to identify coding categories. Refer to Appendix $D$ to translate these codes to actual variable values.

Five motivational and 23 socio-economic variables were included in the AID III analysis. Collectively, eighteen independent variables were split dichotomously 28 times to create 56 groups. In al1 42.6 per cent of the total variance in the dependent variable was accounted for by the predictors studied. Of the eighteen predictors split, the five most important were: 'neighbourhood of residence', 'family income', 'number of persons employed in household', 'years of secondary schooling', and 'fee status'. In sequence these predictors accounted for 13.15 per cent, 9.62 per cent, 8.45 per cent, 7.98 per cent, and 7.98 per cent of the explained variance in attendance behavior. These five variables accounted for 47.18 per cent of the explained variance or 20.1 per cent of the total variance (Table 9).

TABLE 9
Relative Power of Variables Predicting
Fee Versus Non-Fee Payer Attendance Behavior

| Predictor P | Number of Partitions | Proportion of Variance Explained | Per cent of Explained Variance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighbourhood of Residence | 3 | . 056 | 13.15 |
| Family Income | 3 | . 041 | 9.62 |
| Number Employed in Household | 2 | . 036 | 8.45 |
| Years of Secondary Schooling | 3 | . 034 | 7.98 |
| Fee Status | 2 | . 034 | 7.98 |
| Marital Status | 1 | . 031 | 7.28 |
| Day of Course | 1 | . 026 | 6.10 |
| Factor 3: External Expectations | 2 | . 025 | 5.87 |
| Factor 5: Cognitive Interest | 2 | . 023 | 5.40 |
| Factor 4: Escape/Stimulation | 1 | . 022 | 5.16 |
| Factor 1: Job Advancement | 1 | . 017 | 3.99 |
| Factor 2: Social Advancement | 1 | . 014 | 3.29 |
| Years of Residence in Canada | 1 | . 013 | 3.05 |
| Personal Income | 1 | . 013 | 3.05 |
| Years of Residence in Neighbourhood | 1 | . 012 | 2.82 |
| Amount of Monthly Housing Payment | 1 | . 012 | 2.82 |
| Number of Previous Courses Attended | 1 | . 009 | 2.11 |
| Number of Children Supported Financially | y | . 008 | 1.88 |
| Country of Birth | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Sex | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Age | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Years of Post-Secondary Schooling | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Present Work Status | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Type of Accommodation | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Payment: Rent or Mortgage | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Previous Participation | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Travel Time | 0 | None | 0.00 |
| Number of Cars Owned by Family | 0 | None | 0.00 |
|  | 28 | . 426 | 100.00 |

As indicated in Table 9, 'neighbourhood of residence', 'family income' and 'years of secondary schooling' each had three partitions. These three predictors accounted for $331 / 3$ per cent of the splits and 30.75 per cent of the explained variance. In total, five motivational variables accounted for 23.71 per cent of the explained variance while thirteen socio-economic variables accounted for 76.29 per cent of the explained variance. No single variable accounted for a large portion of the explained variance in attendance. Small amounts of total variance were accounted for by each of the eighteen variables that entered the analysis.

Since AID III was instructed to continue splitting predictors in search of all possible meaning, there were many groups with only a few subjects. Consequently, it was decided to focus this discussion on groups of approximately twenty or more subjects.

Two main splits occurred on 'day of course' and 'neighbourhood of residence'. The first split on 'day of course' produced Group 2 with 278 subjects who attended a course on Monday or Tuesday and Group 3 with 161 subjects who attended a course on Wednesday or Thursday. The subjects in Group 2 had poorer attendance $(y=3.56)$ than subjects in Group 3 (y $=4.01$ ): The second split on 'neighbourhood of residence' partitioned Group 2 into Groups 4 and 5. Group 4 had 229 subjects who lived in every neighbourhood except Guildford and Richmond. Group 5 had 49 subjects who lived in Guildford. The subjects in Group 4 had poorer attendance $(y=3.44)$ than subjects in Group $5(y=4.12)$. Groups 3, 4 and 5 marked the starting point of the three main branches of subjects identified by this analysis. Each of these main branches will be presented and discussed in turn as they appear from left to
right in Figure 3.
Two major branches emanated from Group 4. The characteristics of the subjects in these branches are listed below.

## Branch A

(Inclined to have poor attendance)

```
Group 26 - monthly accommodation payments of
n=57, y=3.31
Group 21
n=64, y=3.45
Group 17
n=81, y=3.27
Group 12
n=102, y=3.09
Group 10
n=112, y=3.21
Group }
- were non-fee payers.
n=124,y=3.34
Group }
n=193, y=3.58
Group }
n=229, y=3.44
- monthly accommodation payments of \(\$ 0-400\).
- lived in the community for one to twenty years.
- had average to high Social Contact motivation.
- lived in Newton, Whalley, Sunnyside, Cloverdale, Langley, Delta, Burnaby/ Vancouver, New Westminster, or Coquitlam.
- had one or more individuals employed in household (or did not respond).
- were non-fee payers.
- were engaged, married, or had been married (or did not respond).
- lived in all areas except Guildford and Richmond.
```

There were subbranches of Branch A with very good or very poor attendance. Group 6 had 36 single subjects with below average attendance. In Groups 16,46 and 56 there was a pattern of very poor attendance. These subjects had high Cognitive Interest motivation (Group 56), low External Expectations motivation (Group 46), and low Social Contact motivations (Group 16). Subjects with low Job Advancement motivation (Group 48) had poor attendance. Subjects who were non-fee payers and who had no one employed in the household had excellent
attendance (Group 11).

## Branch B

(Inclined to have good attendance)

```
Group 31 \(\mathrm{n}=37, \mathrm{y}=4.51\)
```

Group 29
$\mathrm{n}=57, \mathrm{y}=4.21$
Group 9
$\mathrm{n}=69, \mathrm{y}=4.01$
Group 7 - were engaged, married, or had been $\mathrm{n}=193, \mathrm{y}=3.58$

Group 4 - lived in all areas except Guildford $\mathrm{n}=229, \mathrm{y}=3.44$

- had eleven to thirteen years of secondary schooling.
- family incomes between \$2001 - 22000 and \$24001 - 28000 .
- were fee payers. married (or did not respond). and Richmond.

Although Branches $A$ and $B$ emanated from Group 4, they had very different attendance behavior. Branch A subjects generally had less than average attendance while Branch $B$ subjects had better than average attendance.

Branch C emanated from Group 5. Subjects in Branch C generally had above average attendance.

Branch C

| Group 41 <br> $\mathrm{n}=14, \mathrm{y}=4.42$ | - had twelve or thirteen years of <br> secondary schooling. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Group 36 - had high Cognitive Interest <br> $\mathrm{n}=28, \mathrm{y}=3.92$ motivation. <br> Group 35 - had low External Expectations <br> $\mathrm{n}=43, \mathrm{y}=4.27$ motivation. <br> Group 5 - lived in Guildford. <br> $\mathrm{n}=49, \mathrm{y}=4.12$  |  |

Group 3 had one major branch that on the fourth split formed two smaller branches. Generally, the major branch and the two smaller
branches had subjects with better than average attendance. The major branch has been labelled 'DE' and the two smaller branches labelled 'D' and 'E'. The subjects in these branches manifested the following characteristics:

## Branch D

| Group 32 <br> $\mathrm{n}=40, \mathrm{y}=3.52$ | - non-fee payers. | Group 39 <br> $\mathrm{n}=32, \mathrm{y}=4.56$ | - previously attended <br> one to five courses |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (or did not re- |  |  |  |

## Branch E

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Group } 25 & \text { have two to four } \\
\mathrm{n}=53, \mathrm{y}=4.26 & \text { children (or did } \\
& \text { not respond). }
\end{array}
$$



Branch DE

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Group } 22 \\ & n=108, \quad y=4.00 \end{aligned}$ | - lived in Guildford, Newton, Whalley, or Sunnyside. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Group 19 | - family incomes of more than \$4001 |
| $\mathrm{n}=139, \mathrm{y}=4.16$ | (or did not respond to this question). |
| Group 15 | - had ten to thirteen years of secondary |
| $\mathrm{n}=144, \mathrm{y}=4.11$ | schooling (or did not respond to this question). |
| Group 3 | - attended a course on Wednesday or |
| $\mathrm{n}=161, \mathrm{y}=4.01$ | Thursday. |

There were several subbranches of these branches with subjects who had either very good or very poor attendance. Group 14 with seventeen subjects who had less than nine years of secondary schooling, Group 44 with six subjects who had very low personal incomes, and Group 18 with five individuals who had low family incomes all had poor attendance. Subjects in Group 45 with middle to high personal incomes, subjects in Group 33 who were fee payers, and subjects in Group 23 who lived in

Cloverdale, Langley, Delta, Burnaby/Vancouver, and Coquitlam (or did not respond to this question) all had good attendance.

The interrelationships identified by the AID III analysis revealed that both motivational and socio-economic predictors influenced attendance behavior.: Eighteen of the 28 variables that were examined accounted for 42.6 per cent of the total variance. As was indicated earlier five motivational variables accounted for 23.71 per cent of the explained variance while thirteen socio-economic variables accounted for 76.29 per cent of the explained variance.

The reasons behind the presence and influence of some of the variables is unclear. Attendance was poorest on Monday with a gradual improvement through Tuesday and Wednesday and the best attendance on Thursday. The reason for this influence is unknown. It may be that the need to 'escape' was greater as the week advanced, however the variable Escape/Stimulation was not identified as a predictor of attendance behavior. The variable 'neighbourhood of residence' also had a strong influence on attendance, but the direction of the influence varied. In one case it was associated with better than average attendance, while in another case it was associated with poorer attendance. The variable 'number employed in household' also influenced attendance in different ways. When associated with non-fee payment, subjects who had no one employed in the household had better than average attendance. When associated with less than average 'years of secondary schooling', those individuals from households with one or fewer individuals employed had poor attendance.

Motivational variables accounted for more splits and more of the explained variance ( 10.1 per cent) in the prediction of attendance than they did in the prediction of enrollment behavior ( 5.7 per cent). Individuals in Group 16 with low Social Contact motivation had poorer attendance behavior than subjects in Group 17 with average to high Social Contact motivation. However both Groups 16 and 17 had less than average attendance behavior. Individuals with low Social Contact motivation (Group 16), low to average External Expectations motivation (Group 46), and average to high Cognitive Interest motivation (Group 56) had very poor attendance. Individuals with low Social Contact motivation, low to average External Expectations motivation, and low Cognitive Interest motivation (Group 57) had better attendance behavior than the previous groups but still had below average attendance. Individuals with high External Expectations motivation (Group 47) had only a slightly better than average attendance behavior ( $y=3.80$ ). In Branch C the interaction between the motivational variables External Expectations and Cognitive Interest produced the same general trend in attendance behavior (Groups 35,36 and 37 ). Subjects with low to average External Expectations motivation and low Cognitive Interest motivation had better attendance than subjects with low to average External Expectations motivation and average to high Cognitive Interest motivation. An overview of the five E.P.S. factors did not reveal a consistent relationship between motivational orientations and attendance behavior. The direction of influence of the E.P.S. factors are summarized in Table 10. This table is interpreted as follows:

The 'factor score meaning' has regard to the direction of loadings on the five factors. Therefore an individual with a 'low' factor score
meaning was less motivated by that factor. An individual with a 'high' factor score meaning was more motivated by that factor. The relationships between 'factor score meaning' and 'attendance behavior' were deduced from the AID III analysis.

TABLE 10
Relationship Between E.P.S. Factors and Attendance Behavior

| E.P.S. <br> Factor | Factor Score Meaning <br> (degree of motivation) | Attendance <br> Behavior |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Advancement | lower <br> higher | poor <br> good |
| Social Contact | lower <br> higher | poor <br> good |
| External Expectations | lower <br> higher | poor/good <br> poor/good |
| Escape/Stimulation | lower | high |
| Cognitive Interest | higher | lower |

Although most of the interrelationships between the predictors were subtle or obscure, several clear relationships were identified. Fee payers had better attendance behavior than non-fee payers: the one exception being subjects who had the highest family incomes. Generally subjects who had some or all of the following characteristics had the best attendance behavior.

- subjects with the most years of secondary schooling.
- subjects with higher personal incomes.
- subjects with higher family incomes.
- subjects who had attended previous courses.
- subjects with more children to support financially.

This analysis identified a complex interaction of socioeconomic and motivational variables that influenced attendance. The variables identified as influences of attendance did not completely coincide with the variables identified in earlier studies. These results supported Verner \& Davis (1964) in that 'income', 'education', and 'marital status' were strong predictors of attendance. However, this study did not identify 'age' as important. Nor did the results of this study coincide with those of Dickinson \& Verner (1967). In the present study 'age' did not have a strong influence on attendance, whereas education did. Dickinson \& Verner reported that 'age' did influence attendance and that education did not. The fact that different results were obtained in this analysis from the results of earlier studies was not surprising. This was a multivariate analysis which examined interactions between variables as predictors of attendance, whereas past studies tended to use univariate or bivariate analysis.

A recurring theme of past research has been the similarities in the variables that influenced enrollment and attendance. In this study, of the ten most important variables that influenced enrollment and attendance only four variables influenced both enrollment and attendance. They were 'neighbourhood of residence', 'day of course', E.P.S. Factor 5: Cognitive Interest, and 'family income'. The ways in which these variables interacted with other variables and the influence they
had on enrollment and attendance differed greatly.
Although 42.6 per cent of the total variance in attendance was identified, there remained a considerable amount of unexplained variance. The socio-economic and motivational variables utilized, although comprehensive, have only partially explained the attendance behavior in fee and non-fee courses.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND SIGNIFICANCE

Summary
This study had three main purposes. First, it examined socioeconomic and motivational characteristics of fee and non-fee paying participants in a leisure-oriented adult education program. This examination was undertaken to explore two questions.

1. Did differences exist between the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of fee and non-fee paying participants?
2. When both fee and non-fee courses were programned, did non-fee courses attract a greater proportion of participants from the lower socio-economic status groups than fee courses?

The second purpose was to determine whether differences existed between enrollment patterns of participants in fee and non-fee courses. The third purpose of this study was to examine whether differences existed in attendance patterns of participants in fee and non-fee courses. Knowledge concerning the impact of fees on enrollment and attendance is incomplete, so this study examined the extent to which variables interacted to determine enrollment and attendance behavior. The multivariate analysis used herein was not based on any deductively derived model, but was exploratory in nature.

Courses were randomly assigned into a fee and non-fee condition and three hypotheses examined.

1. There are significant differences in the social, economic, demographic, or motivational characteristics of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.
2. There is a significant difference in the number of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.
3. There is a significant difference in the attendance behavior of participants enrolled in fee and non-fee courses.

Figure 4 schematically summarizes the study design and results. This study was essentially correlational but had characteristics of a quasi-experimental design. However, unlike a quasi-experimental design which sometimes involves random assignment of subjects to treatment groups, this study involved random assignment of courses to a fee and non-fee condition. Fifty-nine courses were advertized in the Spring (1975) Community Education brochure which was distributed by mail to all households in School District $\# 36$ (Surrey). Seven hundred and twentyone adults enrolled in one of 51 courses. On the second session of each course proctors administered two questionnaires: the E.P.S. (Boshier, 1971) and a socio-economic questionnaire. A daily attendance record was maintained for each course. The data was analyzed using a variety of univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistical techniques suited to the analysis of nominal, interval, ordinal, and dichotomous data.

FIGURE 4
Schematic Summary of Study Method and Results


The motivational data collected identified five motivational factors.

## Mean Factor Score

Factor 1: Job Advancement 2.44
Factor 2: Social Contact 3.33
Factor 3: External Expectations 1.72
Factor 4: Escape/Stimulation 3.55
Factor 5: Cognitive Interest 5.31

The extent to which subjects were enrolled for a particular orientation was indicated by the mean factor score. The subjects were most motivated by Cognitive Interest and least motivated by External Expectations.

In the test of Hypothesis $I$ there were nineteen ordinal variables and seven nominal variables used to compare fee and non-fee payers. Significant differences at the $p<.05$ level were identified on 'number of children', 'amount of monthly housing payment', Factor 2: Social Contact, Factor 5: Cognitive Interest, and 'type of accommodation'. Non-fee payers had significantly more children than fee payers. Fee payers paid significantly more per month for their accommodation. Fee payers were more highly motivated by the need for Social Contact than non-fee payers. Fee payers were significantly less motivated by Cognitive Interest than non-fee payers. Fee payers were more likely to live in apartments, duplexes, triplexes, and single family dwellings than non-fee payers, who were more inclined to live in mobile homes, townhouses, or on acreage.

Significant differences between fee and non-fee payers were observed at the $p<.10$ level for 'marital status', 'present work status', and 'number employed in household'. Non-fee payers were more likely to
be single, married less than four years, or married fifteen or more years. Fee payers were more likely to be separated/divorced, married between five and nine years, or to be living common-law. Fee payers were more likely to be working full-time, while non-fee payers were more likely to work part-time or to be housewives. Fee payers were slightly more inclined to be from households with one or two individuals employed. Non-fee payers were slightly more inclined to be from households with three or more persons employed.

Hypothesis I was accepted for the five variables that were significantly different at the level of $p<.05$. Hypothesis $I$ was rejected for the other 21 variables tested for significant differences between fee and non-fee payers. Comparison of mean scores for fee and non-fee payers and examination of frequency counts on nominal variables suggested that similarities between fee and non-fee payers generally outweighed differences. The absence of a fee did not appear to result in an increase in enrollment by members of lower socio-economic groups.

Seven hundred and twenty-one subjects were included in the test of Hypothesis II. There were 499 (69.21 per cent) subjects enrolled in non-fee courses and 222 (30.79 per cent) enrolled in fee courses. The mean enrollment in non-fee courses was 16.10 subjects and the mean enrollment in fee courses was 11.10 subjects. Non-fee courses attracted substantially more subjects per course than fee courses. Consequently Hypothesis II was accepted. Non-fee courses had a significantly greater enrollment per course than fee courses (Figure 4).

Failure to identify major single variable differences in the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of fee and non-fee paying
participants led to the use of AID III to explore multivariate interactions that influenced fee status. Twenty-seven variables were examined in this AID III analysis. In all, 35 per cent of the total variance in the dependent variable was explained by the predictors studied. Seventeen independent variables contributed to the prediction of fee status enrollment behavior. The five most powerful were 'day of course', 'family income', 'neighbourhood of residence', 'type of accommodation', and Factor 5: Cognitive Interest. In sequence these predictors accounted for 16.57 per cent, 13.43 per cent, 10.57 per cent, 8.57 per cent and 6.86 per cent of the explained variance in fee versus non-fee enrollment status. In total, thirteen socio-economic variables accounted for 29.3 per cent of the total variance, while four motivational variables accounted for 5.7 per cent of the total variance. Although the AID III analysis identified three distinct groups of participants, the differences were subtle.

Hypothesis III was tested with data derived from 439 subjects who enrolled in courses of six sessions duration. There were 297 (67.65 per cent) non-fee payers and 142 ( 32.35 per cent) fee payers. The mean attendance in non-fee courses was 3.59 sessions, while the mean attendance in fee courses was 4.02 sessions. Fee payers attended more class sessions than non-fee payers ( $p<.01$ ). Hypothesis III was accepted. Fee payers had significantly better attendance than non-fee payers. However, examination of the socio-economic or motivational data revealed little about which variables might have explained this behavior. Thus AID III was again employed; this time to explore the possibility that interactions between socio-economic and motivational
variables might explain differences in attendance behavior.
Five motivational and 23 socio-economic variables were involved in this AID III analysis. Eighteen variables were found to contribute to the prediction of attendance behavior. Collectively, they accounted for 42.6 per cent of the total variance in the 'attendance' variable. The five most powerful predictors were 'neighbourhood of residence', 'family income', 'number employed in household', 'years of secondary schooling', and 'fee status'. Collectively, these variables accounted for 47.18 per cent of the explained variance.

Although both socio-economic and motivational variables contributed to the prediction of attendance behavior, socio-economic variables were dominant. However, motivational variables were stronger predictors of attendance behavior than they were of enrollment behavior.

## Conclusions

The results of this study support the following conclusions.

1. There did not appear to be an important overall difference between the socio-economic and motivational characteristics of participants in fee and non-fee courses (Figure 4). The overall differences were of little administrative value in the determination of whether different fee strategies attracted participants with different individual characteristics.
2. Removal of the registration fee (in essence, providing entitlement) did not appear to result in greater participation by members of the lower socio-economic groups, as compared to their participation in fee courses. Removal of the registration fee appeared to benefit the traditional 'middle-class' participants, but did little to attract the traditional
non-participants-members of the lower socio-economic groups.
3. It appeared that the absence of a fee was a powerful inducement which increased gross enrollment. Thus, non-fee courses had fewer cancellations than fee courses.
4. It appeared that both socio-economic and motivational variables influenced a participant's enrollment in a fee or non-fee course. The antecedents of fee status were complex. No single variable accounted for large amounts of variance in fee status.
5. Attendance in fee courses appeared to be significantly better than attendance in non-fee courses. Removal of the registration fee appeared to result in poorer attendance. However, even in 'free' courses, participants attended more than 70 per cent of the course sessions. 6. It appeared that both socio-economic and motivational variables accounted for differences in attendance behavior. This is not a novel conclusion; it supports other studies such as those by Boshier (1973) and Johnstone \& Rivera (1965). It appeared that individuals with more education, higher personal and family incomes, more dependants, and more frequent participation in previous adult education programs had the best attendance. Those individuals with less education, lower incomes, fewer dependants, and no previous participation in adult education programs had poorer attendance. The antecedents of attendance were complex and no single variable accounted for large amounts of variance in attendance behavior. It appeared that socio-economic variables accounted for more variance in attendance than did motivational variables.
6. It appeared that motivational variables were more powerful predictors of attendance behavior than they were of enrollment in fee and non-fee courses.

## Significance

What is the significance of this study for participation research and adult education administration? The manipulation of registration fees can dramatically alter the enrollment patterns of participants. The adult education administrator has a powerful tool to change enrollment patterns. However, as a strategy to increase participation by the traditional non-participant, the manipulation of fees appeared to have little effect. This is an argument against entitlement for leisure-oriented adult education programs. Although 35 per cent of the variance in enrollment behavior was explained, no single variable was dominant. This again demonstrated the need for multivariate analysis. However, even with multivariate analysis, 65 per cent or the variance was unexplained. There are several possible explanations for this result. Perhaps in different circumstances, i.e. higher fees, the variables studied might have been able to predict more of the variance. There is the possibility that 'other' variables might have accounted for more of the variance, but what they might have been is unknown. Perhaps the decision to enroll was existential in nature, evoked by some chance encounter.

Although 42.6 per cent of the variance in attendance was explained, 57.4 per cent of the variance remained unexplained. Perhaps people were more inclined to use what they paid for; or the fact that the course was 'free' may have adversely influenced the performance of the instructor, thus evoking the influence of intra-classroom variables. It may also be possible that different unknown variables accounted for the remaining variance.

This study confirmed that participation is a complex phenomenon stemming from multivariate origins. It appears that attempts to increase participation by members of lower socio-economic groups will require more than providing 'entitlement'. Using terminology from the Miller (1967) force-field analysis, it appears that efforts to increase participation by members of lower socio-economic groups will require modification of both personal and environmental variables which impel or inhibit participation in leisure-oriented adult education.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY SCHOOL, COURSE, DAY, FEE STATUS, NUMBER OF SESSIONS/COURSE, OFFICIAL ENROLLMENT, AND STUDY ENROLLMENT

Distribution of Subjects by School, Course, Day, Fee Status, Number of Sessions/Course, Official Enrollment, and Study Enrollment

| School and Course Name | Day | Fee Status | Number of Sessions | Official <br> Enrollment | Study <br> Enrollment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GUILDFORD COMMUNITY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Yoga 非 | M | F | 10 | 20 | 15 |
| 2. ESP | M | F | 6 | 30 | 27 |
| 3. Aquariums | M | F | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| 4. Piano | M | NF | 6 | 25 | 12 |
| 5. Yoga \#\#2 | M | F | 6 | 15 | 11 |
| 6. Stained-G1ass * | T | NF | 6 | 20 | 10 |
| 7. Pleasure Boating | T | F | 6 | 9 | 5 |
| 8. Hairstyling | T | F | 6 | 24 | 22 |
| 9. Decoupage | T | F | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 10. Typing | T | NF | 6 | 32 | 22 |
| 11. Map and Compass | T | NF | 8 | 24 | 14 |
| 12. Astrology ** | T | NF | 6 | 24 | 19 |
| 13. Drawing | W | NF | 6 | 38 | 12 |
| 14. Stained-Glass * | W | NF | 6 | 18 | 10 |
| 15. International Cooking | W | F | 6 | 8 | 7 |
| 16. Ceramics | W | NF | 6 | 28 | 20 |
| 17. Guitar *** | W | F | 6 | 13 | 7 |
| 18. Oil Painting | Th | NF | 6 | 23 | 8 |
| 19. Astrology ** | Th | NF | 6 | 31 | 17 |
| 20. Stained-Glass * | Th | NF | 6 | 16 | 10 |
| 21. Chinese Cooking | Th | F | 10 | 30 | 30 |
| SUBTOTALS |  | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{NF}=11 \\ \mathrm{~F}=10 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  | 21 | 21 | 21 | 438 | 285 |

* Two Stained-Glass courses were originally scheduled, one on Tuesday, the other on Wednesday. Both courses were over subscribed so a third course was created to accommodate the extra participants on Thursday.
** The Thursday Astrology course was over subscribed. Thus a second course was created to accommodate the extra participants on Tuesday.
*** Guitar was originally scheduled to start the first week of the program. However the first session was delayed one week and the course length reduced to five sessions. The subjects in this course were included in the enrollment analysis, but excluded from the attendance data.

| School and Course Name | Day | Fee Status | Number of Sessions | Official <br> Enrollment | Study <br> Enrollment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CLOVERDALE COMMUNITY SCHOOL |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1．Dog Obedience ${ }^{1}$ | M | F | 10 | 48 | 16 |
| 2．Music is for You 2 | M | NF | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| 3． 10 Speed Repairs | M | NF | 4 | 16 | 7 |
| 4．Vegetable Gardening | M | NF | 4 | 61 | 51 |
| 5．Oil Painting | M | F | 6 | 8 | 7 |
| 6．Taxidermy ${ }^{3}$ | M | NF | 10 | 21 | 7 |
| 7．Ceramics | M | NF | 6 | 37 | 19 |
| 8．Quilting | M | NF | 6 | 37 | 26 |
| 9．Metrics is for You | M | NF | 6 | 30 | 15 |
| 10．Yoga $⿰ ⿰ 三 丨 1$ | M | F | 6 | 18 | 13 |
| 11．Garden Pests | T | NF | 6 | 19 | 17 |
| 12．Yoga \＃2 | T | F | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| 13．Vegetarian Cooking | T | NF | 6 | 24 | 9 |
| 14．Horsecare | T | NF | 6 | 28 | 23 |
| 15．Log House Building 4 | T | NF | 6 | 28 | 21 |
| 16．Batiking | T | NF | 6 | 16 | 10 |
| 17．Chinese Cooking | T | NF | 10 | 30 | 28 |
| 18．Sewing | T | F | 6 | 16 | 15 |
| 19．Flower Arranging | T | NF | 6 | 18 | 15 |
| 20．Square Dancing 5 | T | F | 6 | 15 | 3 |
| 21．Photography | W | NF | 6 | 28 | 25 |
| 22．Beauty Care 6 | W | NF | 6 | 30 | 20 |
| 23．Rod Building | W | F | 6 | 9 | 8 |
| 24．Woodworking 7 | Th | F | 6 | 9 | 9 |
| 25．Astrology | Th | NF | 6 | 20 | 18 |
| 26．Candle Making ${ }^{8}$ | Th | NF | 6 | 12 | 5 |
| 27．Square Dancing | Th | F | 6 | 32 | 9 |
| 28．Fly Tying ${ }^{9}$ | Th | F | 10 （6） | 13 | 10 |
| 29．Bartending 10 | Th | NF | 8 （6） | 22 | 12 |
| 30．Women＇s Fitness 11 | Th | NF | 6 | 34 | 15 |
| SUBTOTALS | 30 | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{NF}=20 \\ \mathrm{~F}=10 \end{array}$ | 30 | 690 | 436 |
| TOTALS A，B，C | 51 | $\begin{aligned} \mathrm{NF} & =31 \\ \mathrm{~F} & =20 \end{aligned}$ | 51 | 1128 | 721 |

1．Dog Obedience was over subscribed，hence a second course was scheduled．The author was not informed of this change，consequently the second course was not included in the study．
2．Music is For You was cancelled by the instructor on the third session．Therefore this course was not included in the attendance analysis．
3. The instructor and subjects in Taxidermy were hostile to the proctors. Consequently the attendance data was incomplete and inaccurate. Taxidermy was excluded from the attendance analysis.
4. The Log House Building Course was moved from the school for the fifth and sixth sessions. Hence this course was excluded from the attendance analysis.
5. The time for Square Dancing was frequently changed by the instructor. Consequently the attendance data was incomplete. This course was excluded from the attendance analysis.
6. Beauty Care was reduced from six to five sessions by the instructor. Hence this course was excluded from the attendance analysis.
7. Woodworking was originally scheduled for Tuesday. At the choice of the instructor and students it was rescheduled for Thursday.
8. The instructor voluntarily added an extra session to the Candle Making courses. Consequently this course was excluded from the attendance study.
9. Fly Tying was originally scheduled for ten sessions. However, by mutual consent of the students and instructor this course was reduced to six sessions. It was therefore included in the attendance analysis.
10. Course reduced from eight to six sessions by instructor. Included in attendance analysis.
11. The instructor moved the location of Women's Fitness several times, hence attendance data was incomplete. This course was not included in the attendance analysis.
A. All courses were evening courses, except for Garden Pests and Yoga \#2 at Cloverdale Community School which were at 10:00 a.m. and 10:30 a.m. respectively.
 Guildford which was held twice a week.
C. Fifty-nine courses were included in the study: 20 at Guildford School and 39 at Cloverdale School. One course, Low Cost Family Holidays, was cancelled at Guildford for lack of enrollment. Two courses were added which resulted in a total of 21 courses. At Cloverdale School nine courses were cancelled due to poor enrollment. They were Crocheting, Outdoor Sketching, Conservation and Outdoor Education, Silk Screening, Women's Fitness (Wednesday), Figure Drawing, Taxidermy: Mammals, Popular Guitar, and Open Crafts. Thus 30 courses were included in the study.
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## Letter To Secretarial Staff

Dear $\qquad$ :

You are probably aware that many courses will be offered at 'no charge' during the Spring Community Education Services Program at Guildford Park and Cloverdale Community Schools. The information in this letter will be of help to you when answering questions you may receive concerning the fee policy at these centres.

The Surrey School Board has approved a 'special project' to introduce a mixed fee - non-fee program to Guildford Park and Cloverdale Community Schools. This program is similar to the program presently in operation at Holy Community School.

Approximately one-half of the courses will have a 'fee'; the remaining courses will be 'free'. A variety of activities are available in both fee and non-fee courses. The affects that this project has on participation is being carefully evaluated and will influence future programming decisions.

To help us gauge the public response to this project, would you please keep a record of all inquiries you have concerning the fee policy at these two schools. Please record the date, the name and telephone number of the inquirer. Also record your opinion as to that individual's response: i.e. satisfied with answer, understanding, upset, etc.

Please submit your record of calls to Margaret (secretary to the Supervisor of Community Education Services) on April 30th. Thank you for your co-operation. Should you have any questions please call Don McKinnon or you may contact me at

Yours sincerely,

Gary Baker, Adult Education Research Centre.

## Letter To Instructors

Dear (Instructor's name) :
The Adult Education Research Centre at U.B.C. is conducting a study of the Spring Cormunity Education Program. This study is being done with the support and co-operation of the Surrey School Board. Two questions will be examined.

1. What type of people attend community education programs and why do they attend these programs?
and 2. What are the attendance patterns of these individuals?
To explore the first question the program participants will be asked to complete a questionnaire. We plan to administer this questionnaire during the second week of the program (April 28 - May 2). Your co-operation would be appreciated.

A surveyor will introduce himself/herself to you at the start of your class. We would like the questionnaire to be administered approximately 15 minutes after the class starts. It will take 20 25 minutes to complete. You are encouraged to plan your class accordingly.

In each of the remaining class sessions a surveyor will visit your class to take a 'formal roll call'. Again your co-operation would be appreciated. The surveyor will contact you to determine how he/she might take this attendance with a minimum of interruption. You are still encouraged to maintain your attendance register.

Should you have any questions about this study or how it is being conducted please call Don McKinnon or Gary Baker

Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

Don McKinnon,
Supervisor of Community
Education.

Gary Baker, Adult Education Research Centre.

## Proctor Instructions

## CHECK LIST

1. Pick-up questionnaires and pencils from the commity school coordimator's office 15 minutes before first class.
2. Locate room and introduce yourself to the instructor. Arrange to administer questionnaire approximately 15 minutes after the class starts.
3. Administer questionnaire :

- record Time In
- present introductory comments
- distribute questionnaires
- answer questions
- collect questionnaires
- thank participants and instructor
- record Time Out

4. Record number of completed questionnaires (number of participants) on Data Sheet. Include comments: i.e. problem questions, complaints about loss of class time, etc.
5. Bundle questionnaires with COURSE DATA SHEET ON TOP (use rubber bands).
6. Take completed questionnaires to coordinator's office and run to your next class!
7. Repeat steps $2-6$.

## Proctor's Introductory Comments

Good evening! My name is $\qquad$ - I am a volunteer surveyor from the Adult Education Research Centre at U.B.C.

The Adult Education Research Centre, with the co-operation of the Surrey School Board, is studying the Surrey Community Education Program. We hope to find the answers to two questions.

1. What type of person enrolls in community education courses?
2. Why do people enroll in these courses?

This information will be of great help in planning future community education programs.

To answer these questions we obviously need your help and cooperation.

You can help by completing this two part questionnaire. (HOLD IT UP FOR THEM TO SEE.) Believe me it is shorter than it looks! This. questionnaire is confidential - your name is not required. If you would like to take part in this study, please raise your hand and $I$ will give you the questionnaire. Should you need a pencil, I have some here.

## INSTRUCTIONS

1. At different times during the study, it will be necessary for us to separate the two parts of the questionnaire. You can help us match the parts together again by writing the LAST 3 DIGITS of your telephone number in the top RIGHT CORNER of the first white page and the first yellow page. (HOLD UP A SAMPLE.) By using these numbers it is not very likely that we will have two questionnaires with the same number.
*-NOTE: Should they suspect that this reveals their identity, tell them it would be almost impossible to trace them from the 3 numbers, even if we wanted to.
2. Start with the white part. Read the instructions and the headings at the top of each page carefully. Do the questions quickly ... your first response is the best?
3. When you have finished the first part, go directly to the yellow part. Be frank. If you have any questions or problems, please ask for help.

THANK YOU for your time and help. If you would like to see the results of this study, call the community school coordinator's office and leave your name and address. We will then send a summary of the results to you.

## Proctor's Course Data Sheet

SCHOOL IDENTITY NUMBER $\qquad$
COURSE $\qquad$ INSTRUCTOR $\qquad$

ROOM NUMBER $\qquad$ APPROXIMATE \# IN CLASS $\qquad$

CLASS TIME $\qquad$

TIME IN $\qquad$ TIME OUT $\qquad$ TOTAL TIME $\qquad$

NUMBER IN COURSE $\qquad$

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED $\qquad$

COMMENTS

## Collection Of Attendance Data

School District $\# 36$ requires each instructor to maintain an accurate attendance record in an official register. Copies of the registrar for each course were obtained by the two Community Education Coordinators following the second session of each course. These were then turned over to the author.

The registers were then used to cross match the subjects to their questionnaires. This was done by matching the last three digits of their telephone numbers. In some cases sex, age, and neighboùrhood were used to make the match.

Attendance was then checked for each course on each session. A proctor or the author visited each course and took attendance. This record was double checked at that time against the instructor's attendance record.

## APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRES

Socio-economic Questionnaire: Non-Fee Course

Socio-economic Questionnaire: Fee Course

## Socio-economic Questionnaire: Non-Fee Course

 COMMUNITY SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRENOTE - CONFIDENTIAL No name required. Please be frank!

1. Are you male or female? (Put a check mark ( $\checkmark$ ) in the correct box.)

2. What is your birthdate? (Please write it in the box.)

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Day | Month | Year |

3. a) What is your country of birth? (Please write it in the box.)

b) If you were NOT born in Canada, how many years have you lived in this country?
years
4. a) How long have you lived in this community?

b) In which neighbourhood do you live? (Please check the correct box.)

Guildford
Newton


Whalley

Sunnyside - White Rock
Cloverdale

Other. ( Name it on the line below. )
5. What is your PRESENT marital status? (Check only one box.)

6. How many years of elementary and high school have you completed?

7. a) How many months or years of occupational, academic, technical, vocational, or clerical training and education have you completed since leaving high school?

For example: attended a clerical, technical, vocational, or academic school; took an apprenticeship program; or enrolled in a company job training program.

None

1 - 6 months
7-12 months
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 years
8 or more years

If you checked "None", go directly to question \#8.

$\square$

$\square$
b) Please list ALL the certificates, diplomas, degrees, tickets, etc. that you have received for this training and education. Also name the skills or subjects learned.

| Certificates, Diplomas, <br> Degrees, tickets, etc. earned | Skill or Subject |
| :--- | :--- |
| Secretarial diploma | typing |
| Journeyman ticket |  |
| Bachelor of Education |  |
| welding |  |
| teaching |  |$\quad$

8. Which of the following statements MOST CLOSELY describes your PRESENT working status?
Work full-time at household duties
Have household duties and work part-time
Work full-time for a salary, wage or commission
Unemployed, looking for a full-time job
Temporarily laid-off
Self-employed
Retired
Full-time student but working part-time
Student and work part-time
have never worked for a salary, wage, or commission,
a check mark in this $\square$ and go directly to question
9. Please describe in detail the most recent work for which you earned a wage, salary, or commission.

For example: foreman in a warehouse, responsible for 20 workers or part-time janitor for an insurance company.
10. What was YOUR PERSONAL GROSS income in 1974? Include wages, investment income, social assistance or unemployment benefits, and family allowance benefits.

| under $\$ 500$ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 501-1000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 1001-2000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 2001-4000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 4001-6000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 6001-8000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 8001-10,000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 10,001-12,000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 12,001-14,000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 14,001-16,000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 16,001-18,000$ | $\square$ |
| $\$ 18,001-20,000$ | $\square$ |
| over $\$ 20,000$ | $\square$ |

11. How many individuals in your household were employed, either full-time or part-time in 1974?

12. What was your FAMILY'S GROSS income in 1974? Total the incomes of
 earner in your family, your answer to this question will be the same as your answer to question $\# 10$.
less than $\$ 2000$
\$2001 - 4000
$\$ 4001$ - 6000
\$6001 - 8000
$\$ 8001$ - 10,000
\$10,001 - 12,000
$\$ 12,001-14,000$
\$14,001-16,000
\$16,001 - 18,000
$\$ 18,001-20,000$
\$20,001 - 22,000
\$22,001-24,000
\$24,001-26,000
\$26,001-28,000
$\$ 28,001-30,000$
over $\$ 30,000$




$\square$
13. a) How many children do you have?

## None

1

2

3
4
5
6
7 or more





b) How many children are financially supported on your FAMILY'S income.
14. Do you live in a

Condominium or apartment


Townhouse


Duplex or triplex


Single family house $\square$
Single family house on more than one acre


Mobile home $\square$
15. a) What is the monthly rent or mortgage payment in your household?

|  | Rent | Mortgage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None |  | - |
| \$1-50 |  |  |
| \$51-100 |  |  |
| \$101-150 |  |  |
| \$151-200 |  |  |
| \$201-250 |  |  |
| \$251-300 |  |  |
| \$301-350 |  |  |
| \$351-400 |  |  |
| \$401-500 |  |  |
| \$501-600 |  |  |
| \$601-700 |  |  |
| over \$700 |  |  |

b) If you are a young adult or teenager and you live with your parents, do you pay rent?

Yes


No $\square$
16. How many cars do you and your spouse own?

17. a) Did you attend a night school or recreation course in 1973 or 1974?

Yes
No

b) If yes, please indicate how many courses you attended in those years.

18. How long will it take you to travel home after this session tonight?

19. a) Would you have registered for this course if you were required to pay a fee?

Yes


No

b) If yes, above what fee would you have considered it too expensive to take this course?

20. Should a course, such as the one you are now taking, have a registration fee?

Yes


No

21. Were you aware that a study was being made of the Spring Community Education Program (night school program) before you attended the first session?

## Yes

No

Socio-economic Questionnaire: Fee Course
COMMUNITY SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

NOTE - CONFIDENTIAL
No name required. Please be frank:

1. Are you male or female? (Put a check mark ( $V$ ) in the correct box.)

Male
Female
2. What is your birthdate? (Please write it in the box.)

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Day | Month | Year |

3. a) What is your country of birth? (Please write it in the box.)

b) If you were NOT born in Canada, how many years have you lived in this country?
years
4. a) How long have you lived in this community?

b) In which neighbourhood do you live? (Please check the correct box.)

Guildford
Newton
Whalley
Sunnyside - White Rock
Cloverdale
Other. ( Name it on the line below. )


Other. ( Nane it on tine below.)
$\square$
5. What is your PRESENT marital status? (Check only one box.)
Never married
Separated or divorced
Widowed
Married $0-4$ years
Married 5 - 9 years
Married 10 - 14 years
Married 15 - 19 years
Married 20 or more years
Other (Please describe on the line below)
6. How many years of elementary and high school have you completed?

7. a) How many months or years of occupational, academic, technical, vocational, or clerical training and education have you completed since leaving high school?

For example: attended a clerical, technical, vocational, or academic school; took an apprenticeship program; or enrolled in a company job training program.

b) Please list ALL the certificates, diplomas, degrees, tickets, etc. that you have received for this training and education. Also name the skills or subjects learned.

Examples

| Certificates, Diplomas, <br> Degrees, tickets, etc. earned | Skill or Subject |
| :--- | :--- |
| Secretarial diploma | typing |
| Journeyman ticket |  |
| Bachelor of Education | welding |
| teaching |  |

8．Which of the following statements MOST CLOSELY describes your PRESENT working status？
Work full－time at household duties
Have household duties and work part－time
Work full－time for a salary，wage or commission
Unemployed，looking for a full－time job
Temporarily laid－off
Self－employed
Retired
Retired，but working part－time
Full－time student
Student and work part－time

NOTE－If you have never worked for a salary，wage，or commission， place a check mark in this $\square$ and go directly to question $⿰ ⿰ 三 丨 ⿰ 丨 三 10$ ．

9．Please describe in detail the most recent work for which you earned a wage，salary，or commission．

For example：foreman in a warehouse，responsible for 20 workers or part－time janitor for an insurance company．
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
10. What was YOUR PERSONAL GROSS income in 1974? Include wages, investment income, social assistance or unemployment benefits, and family allowance benefits.

11. How many individuals in your household were employed, either full-time or part-time in 1974?

12. What was your FAMILY'S GROSS income in 1974? Total the incomes of ALL the people counted in question 非11. If you are the only wage earner in your family, your answer to this question will be the same as your answer to question $\# 10$.
less than $\$ 2000$
\$2001 - 4000
\$4001 - 6000
\$6001 - 8000
\$8001 - 10,000
\$10,001 - 12,000
\$12,001 - 14,000
\$14,001-16,000
\$16,001 - 18,000
\$18,001 - 20,000
$\$ 20,001-22,000$
$\$ 22,001-24,000$
$\$ 24,001-26,000$
\$26,001-28,000
\$28,001 - 30,000
over $\$ 30,000$

13. a) How many children do you have?

b) How many children are financially supported on your FAMILY'S income?
14. Do you live in a

Condominium or apartment
Townhouse


## Duplex or triplex



Single family house $\square$
Single family house on more than one acre

Mobile home
15. a) What is the monthly rent or mortgage payment in your household?

|  | Rent | Mortgage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| None |  | $\pm$ |
| \$1-50 |  |  |
| \$51-100 |  |  |
| \$101-150 |  |  |
| \$151-200 |  |  |
| \$201-250 |  |  |
| \$251-300 |  |  |
| \$301-350 |  |  |
| \$351-400 |  | , |
| \$401-500 |  |  |
| \$501-600 |  |  |
| \$601-700 |  |  |
| over \$700 |  |  |

b) If you are a young adult or teenager and you live with your parents, do you pay rent?

## Yes <br> No

16. How many cars do you and your spouse own?

17. a) Did you attend a night school or recreation course in 1973 or 1974?

Yes
No


b) If yes, please indicate how many courses you attended in those years.

18. How long will it take you to travel home after this session tonight?

19. Was the registration fee for this course paid from:

Your personal income


Your family income


Other: (Please specify on the line below)

20. a) Should a course, such as the one you are now taking, have a registration fee?

Yes


No

b) Above what fee would you have considered it too expensive to take this course?

21. Were you aware that a study was being made of the Spring Community Education Program (night school program) before you attended the first session?

## Yes



## APPENDIX D

## VARIABLE CODES FOR THE

SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUESTIONNAIRES

Variable Codes for the Socio-economic Questionnaires

| Variable Name |  | Variable Codes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v | 1 Day | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Monday } \\ & 2=\text { Tuesday } \\ & 3=\text { Wednesday } \\ & 4=\text { Thursday } \end{aligned}$ |
| v | 2 Fee | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Fee } \\ & 2=\text { No Fee } \end{aligned}$ |
| V | 3 Sex | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Male } \\ & 2=\text { Female } \end{aligned}$ |
| V | 4 Age | $\begin{aligned} 1 & =18-22 \text { years } \\ 2 & =23-27 \text { years } \\ 3 & =28-32 \text { years } \\ 4 & =33-37 \text { years } \\ 5 & =38-42 \text { years } \\ 6 & =43-47 \text { years } \\ 7 & =48-52 \text { years } \\ 8 & =53-57 \text { years } \\ 9 & =58-62 \text { years } \\ 10 & =63-67 \text { years } \\ 11 & =68-72 \text { years } \\ 12 & =73-77 \text { years } \\ 13 & =78-82 \text { years } \\ 14 & =83-87 \text { years } \\ 15 & =\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| v | 5 Country of Birth | $\begin{aligned} 1= & \text { Canada } \\ 2= & \text { U.S.A. } \\ 3= & \text { Other English Speaking } \\ 4= & \text { France, Belgium } \\ 5= & \text { Spain, Portugal } \\ 6= & \text { Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia } \\ 7= & \text { Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, } \\ & \text { Germany, Austria, Holland, } \\ & \text { Switzerland } \\ 8= & \text { Poland } \\ 9= & \text { Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, } \\ & \text { Bulgaria } \\ 10= & \text { North Africa and Middle East } \\ 11= & \text { Pakistan, India, Ceylon, } \\ & \text { Bangladesh } \\ 12= & \text { Far East } \\ 13= & \text { Latin America } \\ 14= & \text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |



| Variable Name |  | Variable Codes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V 9 | Marital Status | $\begin{aligned} 1 & =\text { Never Married } \\ 2 & =\text { Separated/Divorced } \\ 3 & =\text { Widowed } \\ 4 & =\text { Married } 0-4 \text { years } \\ 5 & =\text { Married } 5-9 \text { years } \\ 6 & =\text { Married } 10-14 \text { years } \\ 7 & =\text { Married } 15-19 \text { years } \\ 8 & =\text { Married } 20 \text { or more years } \\ 9 & =\text { Common-1aw } \\ 10 & =\text { Engaged } \\ 11 & =\text { Other } \\ 12 & =\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 10 | Years of <br> Elementary and <br> Secondary Schooling | $\begin{aligned} 4 & =4 \text { or less } \\ 5 & =5 \\ 6 & =6 \\ 7 & =7 \\ 8 & =8 \\ 9 & =9 \\ 10 & =10 \\ 11 & =11 \\ 12 & =12 \\ 13 & =13 \\ 14 & =\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 11 | Years of Post-Seco | $\begin{aligned} & 0=0 \\ & 1=1 \\ & 2=2 \\ & 3=3 \\ & 4=4 \\ & 5=5 \\ & 6=6 \\ & 7=7 \\ & 8=8 \text { or more } \\ & 9=\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 12 | Present Work Status | ```l = Full-Time Housework 2 = Part-Time & Housework 3 = Full-Time 4 = Unemployed 5 = Temporarily Laid-off 6 = Self-Employed 7 = Retired 8 = Retired & Part-Time 9 = Full-Time Student 10 = Student & Part-Time 11 = Part-Time 12 = No Response``` |


|  | Variable Name | Variable Codes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V 13 | Personal Income | $\begin{aligned} & 00=\$ 0-500 \\ & 01=\$ 501-1000 \\ & 02=\$ 1001-2000 \\ & 04=\$ 2001-4000 \\ & 06=\$ 4001-6000 \\ & 08=\$ 6001-8000 \\ & 10=\$ 8001-10,000 \\ & 12=\$ 10,001-12,000 \\ & 14=\$ 12,001-14,000 \\ & 16=\$ 14,001-16,000 \\ & 18=\$ 16,001-18,000 \\ & 20=\$ 18,001-20,000 \\ & 22=\$ 20,001 \text { and over } \\ & 23=\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 14 | Number of Persons Employed in. Household | $\begin{aligned} 0 & =0 \\ 1 & =1 \\ 2 & =2 \\ 3 & =3 \\ 4 & =4 \\ 5 & =5 \\ 6 & =6 \\ 7 & =7 \\ 8 & =8 \\ 9 & =9 \\ 10 & =\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 15 | Family Income | $\begin{aligned} 2 & =\text { Less than } \$ 2000 \\ 4 & =\$ 2001-4000 \\ 6 & =\$ 4001-6000 \\ 8 & =\$ 6001-8000 \\ 10 & =\$ 8001-10,000 \\ 12 & =\$ 10,001-12,000 \\ 14 & =\$ 12,001-14,000 \\ 16 & =\$ 14,001-16,000 \\ 18 & =\$ 16,001-18,000 \\ 20 & =\$ 18,001-20,000 \\ 22 & =\$ 20,001-22,000 \\ 24 & =\$ 22,001-24,000 \\ 26 & =\$ 24,001-26,000 \\ 28 & =\$ 26,001-28,000 \\ 30 & =0 v e r \text { \$28,001} \\ 31 & =\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |


| Variable Name |  | Variable Codes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V 16 | Number of Chilaren <br> Supported <br> Financially | $\begin{aligned} & 0=0 \\ & 1=1 \\ & 2=2 \\ & 3=3 \\ & 4=4 \\ & 5=5 \\ & 6=6 \\ & 7=7 \text { or more } \\ & 8=\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 17 | Type of Accommodation | $\begin{aligned} & 1=\text { Mobile Home } \\ & 2=\text { Apartment/Condominium } \\ & 3=\text { Townhouse } \\ & 4=\text { Duplex/Triplex } \\ & 5=\text { Single Family Home } \\ & 6=\text { Acreage } \\ & 7=\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 18 | Type of Payment: <br> Rent or Mortgage | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\text { None } \\ & 1=\text { Rent } \\ & 2=\text { Mortgage } \\ & 3=\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 19 | Amount of Monthly <br> Housing Payment | $\begin{aligned} & 0=\$ 0 \\ & 1=\$ 1-100 \\ & 2=\$ 101-200 \\ & 3=\$ 201-300 \\ & 4=\$ 301-400 \\ & 5=\$ 401-500 \\ & 6=\$ 501-600 \\ & 7=\$ 601 \text { or more } \\ & 8=\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |
| V 20 | Number of Cars <br> Owned by Family | $\begin{aligned} 0 & =0 \\ 1 & =1 \\ 2 & =2 \\ 3 & =3 \\ 4 & =4 \\ 5 & =5 \\ 6 & =6 \\ 7 & =7 \\ 8 & =8 \\ 9 & =9 \\ 10 & =\text { No Response } \end{aligned}$ |



|  | Variable Name | Variable Codes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V 24 | Job Advancement | $1=-3.1$ to -9.9 |
| V 25 | Social Contact | $2=-2.6$ to -3.0 |
| V 26 | External Expectations | $3=-2.1$ $4=-1.6$ to -2.5 |
| V 27 | Escape Stimulation | $5=-1.1$ to -1.5 |
|  | Escape Stimulation | $6=-.6$ to -1.0 |
| V 28 | Cognitive Interest | $7=-.1$ to - . 5 |
|  |  | $8=0$ |
|  |  | $9=.1$ to . 5 |
| NOTE: | V $24-28$ all have the | $10=.6$ to 1.0 |
|  | SAME CODE. | $11=1.1$ to 1.5 |
|  |  | $12=1.6$ to 2.0 |
|  |  | $13=2.1$ to 2.5 |
|  |  | $14=2.6$ to 3.0 |
|  |  | $15=3.1$ to 9.9 |
|  |  | $16=$ No Response |
| V 29 | Attendance | $0=0$ |
|  |  | $1=1$ |
|  |  | $2=2$ |
|  |  | $3=3$ |
|  |  | $4=4$ |
|  |  | $5=5$ |
|  |  | 9 = No Response |

## APPENDIX E

## TABLES OF RESULTS FOR <br> SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF

FEE AND NON-FEE PAYERS

TABLE 1

Distribution of Participants by Age Group

| Age Group | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18-22 yrs. | 83 | 11.51 |
| 23-27 yrs. | 156 | 21.64 |
| 28-32 yrs. | 121 | 16.78 |
| 33-37 yrs. | 66 | 9.15 |
| 38-42 yrs. | 60 | 8.32 |
| 43-47 yrs. | 67 | 9.29 |
| 48-52 yrs. | 63 | 8.74 |
| 53-57 yrs. | 31 | 4.30 |
| 58-62 yrs. | 20 | 2.77 |
| 63-67 yrs. | 17 | 2.36 |
| 68-72 yrs. | 10 | 1.39 |
| 73-77 yrs. | 3 | . 42 |
| 78-82 yrs. | 2 | . 28 |
| 83-87 yrs. | 7 | . 97 |
| No Response | 15 | 2.08 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 2
Distribution of Participants by Country of Birth

| Country | n | Per cent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Canada | 548 | 76.01 |
| U. S. A. | 17 | 2.36 |
| Other English Speaking | 80 | 11.10 |
| Spain, Portugal | 1 | .14 |
| Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia | 3 | .42 |
| Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, | 45 | 6.24 |
| Germany, Austria, Holland | 4 | .55 |
| Poland | 1 | .14 |
| Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria | 1 | .14 |
| North Africa and Middle East | 4 | .55 |
| Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Bangladesh | 6 | .83 |
| Far East | 3 | .42 |
| Latin America | 8 | 1.11 |
| No Response | 721 | 100.00 |

table 3
Distribution of Participants by Years of Residence in Neighbourhood

| Years Residence | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 305 | 42.30 |
| $6-10$ | 113 | 15.67 |
| $11-15$ | 67 | 9.29 |
| $16-20$ | 98 | 13.59 |
| $21-25$ | 52 | 7.21 |
| $26-30$ | 33 | 4.58 |
| $31-35$ | 10 | 1.39 |
| $36-40$ | 4 | .55 |
| $41-45$ | 8 | 1.11 |
| $46-50$ | 4 | .55 |
| $51-55$ | 1 | .69 |
| $56-60$ | 21 | .14 |
| No Response | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 4

Distribution of Participants by Neighbourhood of Residence

| Neighbourhood | $n$ | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guildford, Riverside, Bridgeview | 130 | 18.03 |
| Newton, Sullivan, Fleetwood | 133 | 18.45 |
| Whalley | 132 | 18.31 |
| Sunnyside, White Rock, Douglas | 112 | 15.53 |
| Cloverdale, Port Kells | 119 | 16.50 |
| Langley, Ft. Langley, Aldergrove | 29 | 4.02 |
| Delta, Richmond | 17 | 2.36 |
| New Westminster | 3 | . 42 |
| Burnaby, Vancouver | 12 | 1.66 |
| Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, Port Moody, Maple Ridge | 4 | . 55 |
| Kennedy, Cedar Hills | 6 | . 83 |
| Clayton Hill | 3 | . 42 |
| Outside Surrey | 4 | . 55 |
| Surrey General | 14 | 1.94 |
| No Response | 3 | . 42 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 5
Distribution of Participants by Marital Status

| Status | n | Per cent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Not Married | 114 | 15.81 |
| Separated or Divorced | 44 | 6.10 |
| Widowed | 26 | 3.61 |
| Married 1-4 yrs. | 105 | 14.56 |
| Married 5-9 yrs. | 131 | 18.17 |
| Married 10 - 14 yrs. | 74 | 10.26 |
| Married 15 - 19 yrs. | 56 | 7.77 |
| Married 20 or more years | 145 | 20.11 |
| Common-1aw | 7 | .97 |
| Engaged | 3 | .42 |
| Other | 3 | 13 |
| No Response | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 6
Distribution of Participants
by Years of Elementary and Secondary Schooling

| Years | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 years or less | 12 | 1.66 |
| 5 years | 3 | .42 |
| 6 years | 9 | 1.25 |
| 7 years | 5 | .69 |
| 8 years | 34 | 4.72 |
| 10 years | 38 | 12.76 |
| 11 years | 92 | 12.48 |
| 12 years | 939 | 47.02 |
| 13 years | 85 | 11.79 |
| No Response | 14 | 1.94 |

TABLE 7

Distribution of Participants by Years of Post-Secondary Schooling

| Years | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 309 | 42.86 |
| 1 | 147 | 20.39 |
| 2 | 77 | 10.68 |
| 3 | 44 | 6.10 |
| 4 | 52 | 7.21 |
| 5 | 34 | 4.72 |
| 6 | 15 | 2.08 |
| 7 | 8 | 1.11 |
| 8 or more | 16 | 2.22 |
| No Response | 19 | 2.64 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 8
Distribution of Participants by Their Present Work Status

| Status | n | Per cent |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Full-Time Housework | 239 | 33.15 |
| Housework and Part-Time Employment | 78 | 10.82 |
| Full-Time Employment | 261 | 36.20 |
| Unemployed | 32 | 4.44 |
| Temporarily Laid-Off | 7 | .97 |
| Self-Employed | 27 | 3.74 |
| Retired | 38 | 5.27 |
| Part-Time Employment, but Retired | 4 | .55 |
| Full-Time Student | 5 | .69 |
| Part-Time Employment | 2 | .28 |
| Student with Part-Time Employment | 20 | 2.77 |
| No Response | 8 | 1.11 |

TABLE 9
Distribution of Participants by Personal Income

| Income Group in Dollars | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 0 - 500 | 162 | 22.47 |
| \$ 501-1,000 | 41 | 5.69 |
| \$ 1,001-2,000 | 54 | 7.49 |
| \$ 2,001-4,000 | 85 | 11.79 |
| \$ 4,001-6,000 | 50 | 6.93 |
| \$ 6,001 - 8,000 | 66 | 9.15 |
| \$ 8,001-10,000 | 49 | 6.80 |
| \$10,001-12,000 | 44 | 6.10 |
| \$12,001-14,000 | 32 | 4.44 |
| \$14,001-16,000 | 19 | 2.64 |
| \$16,001-18,000 | 24 | 3.33 |
| \$18,001-20,000 | 10 | 1.39 |
| \$20,001 or more | 1 | . 14 |
| No Response | 84 | 11.65 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 10
Distribution of Participants by the Number of Persons Employed in Household

| Number Employed | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 34 | 4.72 |
| 1 | 280 | 38.83 |
| 2 | 240 | 33.29 |
| 3 | 71 | 9.85 |
| 4 | 27 | 3.74 |
| 5 | 6 | .83 |
| 6 | 2 | .28 |
| No Response | 2 | .28 |

## TABLE 11

Distribution of Participants by Family Income

| Income Group in Dollars | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ 0-2,000 | 7 | . 97 |
| \$2,001-4,000 | 34 | 4.72 |
| \$ 4,001-6,000 | 34 | 4.72 |
| \$ 6,001-8,000 | 38 | 5.27 |
| \$ 8,001-10,000 | 39 | 5.41 |
| \$10,001-12,000 | 64 | 8.88 |
| \$12,001-14,000 | 90 | 12.48 |
| \$14,001-16,000 | 66 | 9.15 |
| \$16,001-18,000 | 66 | 9.15 |
| \$18,001-20,000 | 53 | 7.35 |
| \$20,001 - 22,000 | 31 | 4.30 |
| - \$22,001-24,000 | 27 | 3.74 |
| \$24,001-26,000 | 23 | 3.19 |
| \$26,001-28,000 | 18 | 2.50 |
| \$28,001 or more | 30 | - 4.16 |
| No Response | 101 | 14.01 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

TABLE 12
Distribution of Participants by Number of Previous Courses Attended

| Number of Courses | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 350 | 48.54 |
| 1 | 137 | 19.00 |
| 2 | 105 | 14.56 |
| 3 | 38 | 5.27 |
| 4 | 23 | 3.19 |
| 5 | 13 | 1.80 |
| 6 | 8 | 1.11 |
| 7 | 3 | . 42 |
| 8 | 1 | . 14 |
| 9 | 1 | . 14 |
| 10 | 1 | . 14 |
| 11 | 1 | . 14 |
| 12 | 1 | . 14 |
| 16 | 1 | . 14 |
| 20 | 1 | . 14 |
| No Response | 37 | 5.13 |
|  | 721 | 100.00 |

## TABLE 13

## Distribution of Participants by Travel Time <br> To and From Course

| Time in Minutes | n | Per cent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 110 | 15.26 |
| $6-10$ | 153 | 21.22 |
| $11-15$ | 166 | 23.02 |
| $16-20$ | 156 | 21.64 |
| $21-30$ | 28 | 3.88 |
| $30-99$ | 94 | 13.04 |
| No Response | 14 | 1.94 |

