

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ACADEMIC  
ADMINISTRATORS OF PUBLIC TWO- AND  
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER  
EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA TOWARD  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

By

RICKY NEAL BASER

Bachelor of Arts  
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma  
Chickasha, Oklahoma  
1979

Master of Arts  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1981

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
July, 1992

Thesis  
1992D  
B299s

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ACADEMIC  
ADMINISTRATORS OF PUBLIC TWO- AND  
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER  
EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA TOWARD  
COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

Thesis Approved:

*Stephen Gregory Katsinas*

Thesis Adviser

*Dante Murphy*

*Jimmy R. Hughes*

*Arnold L. Bras*

*Thomas Korman*

*Thomas C. Collins*

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the constant help and encouragement of several people. While I cannot begin to acknowledge all of those to whom this educational accomplishment is owed, several individuals require special thanks.

First, my sincere appreciation to my mentors and friends who served as my initial chairman and advisor, Dr. John Gardiner and to those who carried the baton following his departure, Drs. Steve Katsinas and Thomas Karman. Dr. Steve Katsinas has gone beyond the call of duty to assist me in the completion of this study. To Dr. David Murphy, who led me by the hand through the rewriting of the methodology chapter and the analysis of the survey data, goes my heartfelt gratitude. In addition, Dr. Jerry Bass and Dr. Jim Hughey added to the professional nature of this committee through their support and critical review of this study. To Dr. William Warde, who gave of his time and statistical expertise to crunch the data over and over again, goes my appreciation.

Second, my appreciation is extended to Drs. Tim McElroy, Jerry Williamson, Herb Swender, and Mert Martens for talking me into beginning the doctoral program and motivating me to persevere.

In addition, I owe much to Dr. and Mrs. Robert B. Kamm for their moral support and the honor bestowed me through the financial generosity of the Robert B. Kamm Distinguished Graduate Fellowship.

I am grateful to Mr. Larry Kruse for his mentoring support and understanding during the final phases of the doctoral program. I would also like to thank Linda Hunter for her prayers and friendship and the other High School and College

Relations staff who filled in for me during my physical, and sometimes mental, absence the last few months.

I would like to thank my parents, Rev. Gerald L. and Bettie L. Baser, who have always supported my educational endeavors through their finances and continual prayers. In addition, my other parents, Charles, Bettye McHam, and Elizabeth McHam deserve much of the credit for understanding the time and energy required of the doctoral program and for hosting Kari and Deric on numerous occasions. To my brother Jerry, just a word of thanks for always reminding me that I could do it.

Finally, I will never be able to thank my wife, Kari, and my son, Deric enough for the family gatherings I missed or for the occasions when my mind was some place other than the family. This degree is as much Kari's as it is mine. From her unending patience to her ability to enter data, her support allowed me to complete the doctoral program. As for Deric, I owe him three years of attention and patience for the time lost from his father. It is for these reasons and more that this dissertation is dedicated to Kari and Deric.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION .....   | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem.....   | 7    |
| Purpose .....   | 8    |
| Scope of the Study .....  | 11   |
| Definitions of Terms .....  | 12   |
| Assumptions of the Study .....  | 13   |
| Significance of the Study .....   | 13   |
| II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE .....   | 16   |
| Introduction .....  | 16   |
| Articulation .....  | 17   |
| Community College Transfer .....  | 22   |
| Transfer/Articulation in Oklahoma .....   | 30   |
| Attitudes Toward the Education a Student<br>Receives at a Community College ..... | 35   |
| Recommendations for Improving<br>Articulation/Transfer .....                      | 38   |
| Summary .....   | 39   |
| III. METHODOLOGY .....  | 42   |
| Introduction .....  | 42   |
| Definition and Selection of Populations .....                                     | 43   |
| Research Instrument .....   | 43   |
| Data Collection Procedure .....   | 46   |
| Statistical Procedures .....  | 48   |
| IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA .....  | 50   |
| Introduction .....  | 50   |
| Populations .....   | 52   |
| Factor Analysis .....   | 57   |
| Presentation of Findings .....  | 61   |
| Research Hypotheses .....   | 76   |
| Summary .....   | 81   |

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....     | 82   |
| Introduction .....                                      | 82   |
| Findings .....  | 87   |
| Conclusions .....                                       | 94   |
| Recommendations .....                                   | 96   |
| Concluding Remarks .....                                | 97   |
| A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY .....                           | 103  |
| APPENDIX A - RESEARCH INSTRUMENT .....                  | 107  |
| APPENDIX B - CORRESPONDENCE .....                       | 115  |
| APPENDIX C - STATE ARTICULATION POLICY .....            | 119  |
| APPENDIX D - HISTORICAL STUDENT TRANSFER ACTIVITY ..... | 129  |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. Public Higher Education Institutions Included in Survey .....        | 53   |
| II. Respondent Demographics .....                                       | 55   |
| III. Factor Analysis Grouping of Statements .....                       | 58   |
| IV. Summary of Responses .....  | 62   |
| V. Summary of School T-Test .....                                       | 69   |
| VI. Summary of Analysis of Variance Procedure: Two-Year Schools .....   | 70   |
| VII. Summary of Analysis of Variance Procedure: Four-Year Schools ..... | 74   |



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Over the last three decades, the reliance on the two-year college as the main port of entry for the general population to gain access to postsecondary education has become more and more evident (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). While this egalitarian mission would seemingly take into account the overwhelming desire of the community college student to eventually transfer to a four-year college, less than 24 percent of community college students transfer to a four-year college within four years of their initial two-year college enrollment (Cohen, 1991). Astin (1982) asserted that merely by being enrolled at community colleges, students were significantly less likely to complete a baccalaureate degree than those students who began their postsecondary educations at a four-year institution. Astin's findings were consistent regardless of the academic preparation, race, and/or ethnicity of the college level student. There are several explanations for the reduction in transfer rates between community and senior colleges, but the underlying factor remains that much of the perceived barrier to increasing transfer rates through effective interinstitutional articulation is subjective (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985). The subjective nature of articulation barriers are a combined result of several factors including, but not limited to the historical "step-child" beginnings of the junior college as an institutional type, the inclusion of non-transfer oriented programs into the community college curriculum, and the use of the community college as the entry point for the non-traditional student (non-traditional in terms of age, socioeconomic status, and college preparedness). Because of the multiple missions the two-year college has been assigned and assumed, many four-year receiving institutions have questioned the quality of the transferring students,

programs, faculty, administrations, and facilities (James, 1969; Rice, 1976; Nazari-Robati, 1981; Cohen & Brawer, 1989). The question of quality can be linked to examples such as the rejection of "D" grades from transferring two-year college students, while counting "D" grades of native four-year college students toward graduation requirements (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Taken together, these attitudinal barriers result in a transfer bridge that is structurally unsound, and severely mitigate the promise of egalitarian postsecondary access beyond the community college. This lack of access to the four-year institution becomes even more profound when examining barriers to transfer from a social justice perspective. With nearly 40 percent of all higher education enrollments and nearly 50 percent of the minority population concentrated in the two-year college, the promise of egalitarian access to higher education becomes even more of a social issue (Gabert, 1991). Currently community colleges enroll 43 percent of all blacks, 55 percent of all Hispanics, 56 percent of all Native Americans, and 42 percent of all Asians in higher education (Gabert, 1991). Secondary barriers to four-year college access through which two-year college transfer students must pass should be open as well, if the egalitarian promise is to be fulfilled.

The original function of the community/junior college was to serve as a bridge from high school to the university. Yeilding (1987) traced the philosophical origins of the community college to suggestions made by University of Michigan President Henry P. Tappan in 1851 regarding the inappropriate placement of the first two years of college in the university environment. Yeilding then discussed the slow development of Tappan's suggestion into a working structural experiment by William Rainey Harper, President of the University of Chicago during the 1890's. President Harper divided the first and last two years of university study and labeled them "junior college" and "senior college", respectively. Cohen and Brawer (1989) agreed with Yeilding's assessment and asserted that the beginnings of the junior college came from a desire to better replicate the German gymnasium/university model. The authors posed answers to the question,

Why community colleges? A major reason is that several prominent nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century educators wanted the universities to abandon their freshman and sophomore classes and relegate the function of teaching adolescents to a new set of institutions, to be called junior colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, pp. 5-6).

According to Monroe (1972), from the time of their inception, the historical roots of the public community college and much of the current community college philosophy began in the image of the public school system. Central to Monroe's comparative historical analysis was the continued opportunity for the general public to access a free postsecondary education regardless of socioeconomic status, ethnic, racial, or religious affiliation.

The lack of agreement of what constituted proper functions and missions for the junior/community college can be traced back to the separation arguments made by Tappan and other prominent educators in the second half of the 1800s. Whether the freshman and sophomore years were an end to the secondary school system or a beginning to the university had conflicting postsecondary role implications. Birenbaum (1986) contended that the role the community colleges play on the stage for the reformation of education reflects the ambiguity of how they were originally cast. Birenbaum addressed the difference of whether the junior college function was an end to secondary education or a beginning to the university as being the major source of the role problem. The benefit of universal access is severely mitigated if the true function of the junior college is to end prior to university access. Karabel (1972) agreed with Birenbaum's contention that the egalitarian role had been assigned to the community college, but wrote that much more attention to the students' potential was necessary for the community college to fulfill its assigned mission. Karabel argued that the community college had not fulfilled its mission of egalitarian access until it provided a vehicle for students to be prepared for transfer to four-year programs. Bernstein (1986) contended that the community college must take the responsibility for offering an education which transcends the market, providing instead an education

sound in theory and consistent with the larger educational community in which it exists:

Given this democratic context, community colleges

must understand the importance of their mission as collegiate institutions and not view themselves simply as educational sites offering whatever formal courses of instruction individuals, local communities, or industries wish to support. Central to the community college's collegiate mission is its role in facilitating the transfer of students from one level of higher education to another, yet no function has been more misunderstood or recently neglected by community college administrators and faculty (Bernstein, 1986, pp. 34-35).

The centrality of the community college transfer function to egalitarian access was compounded by the rapid growth in the number of community colleges, the increased percentage of students they have enrolled, and the additional functions which have been added to their original transfer collegiate mission. Brubaker (1976), one of the most distinguished historians of American higher education, saw the importance of the transfer function as being vital to the very existence of the community college. He supported the philosophy that the community college was originally conceived as the beginning of the four-year degree and therefore reliant on the transferability of the two-year programs as a reason for existence.

The expansion of the community college mission to include functions other than transfer has created new problems for role definition and interinstitutional articulation. Yeilding (1982) examined the multifaceted nature of the community college of the 1970s and early 1980s. He asserted that the community college mission has expanded to include such functions as vocational-technical education, continuing education, remedial education, and community education in addition to academic transfer education. Not only has the curricular nature changed in the community college, but the growth explosion of the institutional type has also complicated the narrowing of the two-year college curricular mission focus. In 1980, there were 1,231 public and private two-year colleges in the United States, a tremendous growth from Tappan's 1851 [junior college] reference (Yeilding, 1982). Other community college historians have agreed with Yeilding's description of the community college boom and marveled at such wide-spread growth by pointing to two significant statistics: first, that

community colleges are now operating in every state; and second, that over half of all college students begin their postsecondary educations at a community college (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). While community colleges experienced tremendous growth in the past 100 years, prospects for future expansion in the overall number of community colleges in the 1990's might be limited as the growth approaches a national saturation point. The community college saturation assumption by Cohen and Brawer (1989) was based on the location and number of community colleges in a state, the state's population density, and its area.

Several authors have seen better articulation between the community college and the four-year institution as having gained in importance as the general population has increased their use of the two-year college as the entry into higher education:

Transfer is seen as a critical issue because of the large number of students who begin their undergraduate education in two-year colleges. About 5.3 million people, or 43% of today's undergraduates, are enrolled in community-college credit programs. Observers say that number, which has increased by 14% since 1985, will continue to grow (Watkins, 1990, p. A38).

Americans have long assumed that they possess, at least within the public sector of higher education, an egalitarian higher education system. An egalitarian system implies open access and easy transfer from and between institutions within the structure of public higher education. The claim of providing access to all who want or need higher education lies at the heart of the community college movement and has long been articulated in community college course catalogs and mission statements. This claim of egalitarian access is mitigated by the fact that the overwhelming majority of two- year college students intend to continue their educations at a four-year institution and fail to transfer. While indeed the general population may be able to gain entrance to higher education through the open doors of the community college, relatively few students make the transition to the four-year college:

Evidence indicating a decline of the community college transfer function continues to appear in the education literature and in the press. For at least a decade, the movement of community college students to baccalaureate degree-granting institutions has been slowing down. While large numbers of high school graduates entering community colleges intend to complete the

bachelor's degree, comparatively few matriculate in senior institutions (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985, p. 1).

Cohen and Brawer (1989) confirmed these earlier findings regarding the decline of the emphasis being placed on the transfer function by two-year colleges. Segner (1974) also saw the decline in the transfer function and the number of community college students actually matriculating to the senior college:

Less than fifty percent of our 'college transfer' students ever matriculate. This is reason enough to stop thinking that the major purpose of a community college academic program is for transfer. However, for the sake of the minority who will eventually matriculate, the programs obviously must be transferable (Segner, 1974, p. 6).

If the community college has indeed become the access point for a majority of the American public, the transferability of community college programs to receiving four-year institutions must be perceived as a priority issue. Cohen and Brawer (1989) viewed the egalitarian feature of the American higher education system as being totally reliant on the community college: "For most students in two-year institutions, the choice is not between the community college and a senior residential institution; it is between the community college and nothing" (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 47).

The problem of poor interinstitutional articulation further compounds the transfer problem, impeding meaningful egalitarian access to upper division public higher education institutions:

The transferability of credits from junior to senior colleges is one of the most urgent problems of articulation. Senior institutions confront community colleges with a bewildering variety of policy differences on credit acceptance. Courses accepted in transfer still might not count toward a degree. The clearest and least defensible example is the practice of some colleges to reject D grades in transfer, although D grades earned there apply toward graduation (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 11).

The importance of interinstitutional articulation agreements was attested by other leading commentators:

Articulation is a major requirement of effective and efficient education in which relationships and meaning are significant. It is not a goal in itself, except as its attainment enables institutions and individuals to function more successfully. If the several levels and many experiences in education are to fit

properly and operate in concert, articulation must receive the attention it deserves as a continuing challenge to higher education (Romine, 1975, p. 159).

In addition, Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) pointed to the connection between the success of interinstitutional articulation agreements and the attitudes which exist toward junior college education:

Articulation must be recognized as a series of processes, transfer being one of them. The total activity—the relationship—is also an attitude. No matter how beautiful the paper model, success of the responsibility to serve transfer students is strongly dependent on the support and understanding of faculty and staff of both sending and receiving institutions. The problem is largely people-oriented (p. 43).

#### Statement of the Problem

The importance of the community college in providing a meaningful egalitarian system of access to higher education strongly suggests the need for better understanding of the attitudinal barriers to articulation between institutional types. Lacking an objective application of a standard transfer policy by academic administrators, the two-year college student is forced to accept the receiving institution's assessment of his/her education credit if he/she wishes to complete a baccalaureate degree. The realization that a possible problem might exist with the transfer of two-year college credits to a four-year college, seldom occurs until the student's transcript is evaluated by the receiving institution (Bernstein, 1986). For the five million students of community, junior and technical colleges in this country, the attitudes of individuals involved in the transfer process is critical if a supposedly egalitarian system is to provide social mobility (Cohen & Brawer, 1989).

The overwhelming importance of articulation agreements to the successful operation of the entire system of post-secondary education was stressed by Romine (1975): "The position of higher institutions in the educational pyramid places heavy responsibility upon them to articulate their efforts with those of earlier schooling and with out of school learning" (p. 157).

There were several factors which suggested the need to further examine the attitudinal barriers to effective interinstitutional articulation. The very magnitude of literature pointing to attitudinal barriers existing between institutional types which have resulted in seemingly inherent inconsistencies in current interinstitutional degree and/or course articulation agreements between community colleges and senior institutions called for further analysis. In addition, the mitigating effect these attitudinal barriers have on the credit acceptance and matriculation of the transferring student (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985; Zwerling, 1976), and the link between attitudes and action related behaviors (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965; Triandis, 1971), suggests that this educational problem was relevant and significant. There have been two studies documenting the attitudinal barriers between the traditional two-year and four-year institutional types, one conducted by Rice in 1976 and a second by Nazari-Robati in 1981, there was little information available in the literature concerning the attitudes of chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads who have the responsibility for developing articulation policy and the assessment of individual community and junior college student transcripts for transferability. For this reason, a study of the attitudes toward community and junior college education might be of value to administrators and statewide planning agents in the development of coordinated interinstitutional articulation agreements. In addition, this information could be used as a reference by regents and trustees, college administrators, and admissions offices in designing interinstitutional articulation agreements which acknowledge attitudinal barriers to successful transfer articulation.

### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess and compare the attitudes of community and senior college academic administrators, deans, and department heads in Oklahoma toward community college education through the use and analysis of *The Junior College Attitude Survey* (James, 1969) as a means of improving interinstitutional articulation through a better understanding of one of the inherent barriers. The two-



year college was examined through the five areas which were representative of the essence of two-year college education, and suggested in earlier studies which utilized the survey instrument: faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities (James, 1969; Rice, 1976; Nazari-Robati, 1981).

In addition to the assessment of attitudes toward two-year college education through the administration of the survey instrument, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education data related to transfer and articulation between two- and four-year college education will be analyzed. Through this data analysis, the ability of the higher education system in Oklahoma to fulfill its promise of egalitarian access through its transfer/articulation policies to the general public can be assessed. The data might be used in comparison to this study's survey analysis in assessing the roots of the perceived attitudinal differences between these two segments of the higher education system.

The main objectives of this study were to identify and assess the attitudes affecting the articulation of transfer programs between publicly controlled two- and four-year institutions in Oklahoma.

In regards to the above problem and purpose statements, three major hypotheses and their sub-related hypotheses were tested. The first grouping of hypotheses is related to assessing the attitudinal differences of academic administrators representing the two-year college population and the four-year college population toward community college education and the five descriptive facets:

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college education.

- 1a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college faculty.

- 1b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college students.
- 1c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college transfer degree programs.
- 1d. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college administration.
- 1e. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college facilities.

The second grouping of hypotheses is related to assessing the attitudinal differences of the three selected levels of academic administration representing the two-year college population toward community college education.

- 2. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the three sub-groups of two-year college academic administrators toward community college education.
  - 2a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and division heads regarding community college education.
  - 2b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and department heads regarding community college education.
  - 2c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college department heads and division heads regarding community college education.

The third grouping of hypotheses is related to assessing the attitudinal differences of the three selected levels of academic administration representing the four-year college population toward community college education.

3. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the three sub-groups of academic administrators at four-year colleges toward community college education.

3a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of chief academic administrators and college deans at four-year colleges regarding community college education.

3b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of chief academic administrators and department heads at four-year colleges regarding community college education.

3c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of department heads and college deans at four-year colleges regarding community college education.

### Scope of the Study

The scope of the study was limited to the 27 public two- and four-year colleges and universities in the State of Oklahoma, as recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the state's coordinating board for higher education. Included in the two populations were the two associate degree granting technical branches of Oklahoma State University located in Okmulgee and Oklahoma City. Tulsa Junior College, Oklahoma's only multicampus community college was treated as three separate entities because of the administrative structure of each of the three campuses.

Oklahoma's system of university centers was not included in the study. Also, the study only dealt with the administrators of undergraduate degree programs which accepted transfer credit. The three levels of academic administration utilized in this study included chief academic administrators, college deans or division heads, and department heads. The main thrust of the analysis of the requested data was limited to five facets of the community college: faculty, students, administration, facilities, and programs in a broad rather than specific sense.

## Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study and to assure common understanding, the significant terms were defined.

Community College—In a Carnegie Foundation technical report entitled *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (1987), two-year community, junior, and technical colleges were defined: "These institutions offer certificate or degree programs through the Associates of Arts level and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees" (p. 7). The terms "junior college," "two-year college," "technical college," and "community college" were used interchangeably in this study.

Four-Year College—refers to institutions authorized to award the bachelor degree or higher degree. The terms "senior college," "university," and "four-year college" were used interchangeably: "Articulation—is the generic term referring to the entire range of processes and relationships involved in the systematic movement of students inter-institutionally and intersegmentally throughout postsecondary education" (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985, p. iii).

Transfer Function—refers to the collegiate function of the community college in offering the freshman and sophomore coursework designed for transfer to a baccalaureate degree granting institution and specifically "... the mechanics of credit, course, and curriculum exchange" (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985, p. iii).

Attitude— "... an idea charged with emotion which predisposes a class of actions to a particular class of social situations" (Triandis, 1972, p. 2).

Chief Academic Administrator—refers to the college or university administrator who has direct responsibility for the academic affairs of the institution. The chief academic administrator may hold the title of vice president for academic affairs, dean of academic affairs, dean of faculty, or provost.

College Dean—refers to the college administrator who has direct responsibility for the academic affairs of an individual college or academic division. In a university

setting, this would include dean of the college of education, dean of the college of engineering, dean of the college of arts and sciences, and other recognized university colleges. Since most Oklahoma community/junior colleges are structurally divided in manners other than those typically utilized in four-year colleges, division heads at those institutions will be included in this category.

Department Head—refers to the faculty/administrator who has direct responsibility for the academic affairs of an individual college department. In this study, only those administrators of departments offering undergraduate programs were considered.

### Assumptions of the Study

1. It was assumed that the measuring instrument utilized was adequate for the purpose of this study.
2. It was assumed that the minor modifications made to the questionnaire did not significantly impact the overall validity and reliability of the instrument.
3. It was assumed that the responses to the questionnaire reflected actual attitudes of the respondents toward the various facets of the community college.
4. It was assumed that the three categories of academic administrators included in this study do have a significant impact on the interinstitutional articulation process, and their attitudes do play a role in the decisions concerning articulation and two-year college transfer processes.

### Significance of the Study

A great deal of the literature pointed to attitudinal barriers existing between institutional types which have resulted in seemingly inherent inconsistencies in current interinstitutional degree and/or course articulation agreements between community colleges and four-year institutions (Ernst, 1978). Because of the mitigating affect these attitudinal barriers had on the credit acceptance and matriculation of the

transferring student (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985), and the link between attitudes and behavioral action (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965; Triandis, 1971), suggest the significance of this study. As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, Rice (1976) and Nazari-Robati (1981) utilized a revised version of The Junior College Attitude Survey (James, 1969) in analyzing the attitudinal predispositions of community and four-year college personnel. Rice's 1976 study surveyed the attitudes of faculty at Oklahoma's six regional colleges toward community college education. Nazari-Robati (1981) examined the attitudinal differences between community and four-year college chief academic administrators in a stratified national sample based on the state's articulation type (e.g., formal agreement; informal agreement; state agency; etc.) (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985). Nazari-Robati's main thrust was to evaluate the articulation types as to their personnel exhibiting more or less favorable attitudes toward community college education.

While faculty do play a role in the articulation process and attitudinal barrier development, it is the assumption of this study that the major players in the development and application of articulation policy are the chief academic administrators, undergraduate college deans or division heads, and undergraduate department heads. It is through the articulation policies and/or application of those policies developed and practiced by the aforementioned administrators that have the greatest impact on the ultimate value and/or respect (number of hours accepted from the community college toward a four-year degree) of community college education and its transfer function. A study of the attitudes toward the education students receive at community colleges might add to the knowledge base and be of value to administrators and state-wide planning agents in the development of coordinated interinstitutional articulation agreements. In addition, this information could be used as a reference by regents and trustees, college administrators, and admissions offices in designing interinstitutional articulation agreements which acknowledge attitudinal barriers to transfer articulation.

The following chapters will review the literature pertaining to the historical development of community college education as it relates to the transfer function and interinstitutional articulation agreements, describe *The Junior College Attitude Survey* (James, 1969) to be utilized in the collection of data on administrative attitudes toward community college education, report the findings of the survey, analyze the findings, develop conclusions and make recommendations for further study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

During the background research, several related areas emerged as relevant to the study of the attitudes toward the education received at community colleges. The review of the literature for this chapter was thus divided into ten sections: (1) Introduction, (2) Articulation, (3) Systems of Articulation, (4) Community College Transfer, (5) Decline of the Transfer Function, (6) Defining Transfer, (7) Transfer/Articulation in Oklahoma, (8) Attitudes Toward Education Received by Students at Community Colleges, (9) Recommendations for Improving Articulation/Transfer, and (10) Summary.

#### Introduction

The overall importance of the two-year college to the American democratic ideal through the providing of access to postsecondary education to the general population has been the normal consensus in the literature. This importance has been debated in light of the perceived shift in two-year college curricular orientation from collegiate/transfer to vocational/terminal. Most of the literature pertaining to the two-year college has been related to the historical development, changing roles, curricular responsiveness to perceived needs, and the general features of the two-year institution. Because of the huge increase in the use of the two-year college by the general population for access to higher education during the last thirty years, a growing literature pertaining to articulation and transfer has emerged. Much of the articulation



and transfer literature contained references to perceived attitudinal barriers to effective interinstitutional relationships between two- and four-year colleges. While references to attitudinal barriers existed in the relevant transfer and articulation literature, subsequent followup research studies on the attitudes toward junior college education were largely missing. The body of articulation research dealing with attitudinal barriers, with the exception of two studies all centered on the attitudes of high school counselors toward the education students receive at community colleges (James, 1969). Both Rice (1976) and Nazari-Robati (1981) studied attitudinal barriers to effective two- and four-year college articulation.

## Articulation

### A Workable Definition

In examining interinstitutional articulation as it relates to the two year college, one must first analyze the meaning of the term articulation. Much of the literature referred to the problems associated with the disparity between definitions and application. Ernst (1978) referred to the centrality of the articulation issue to the effective functioning of the postsecondary institution and the problems of establishing a good usable definition. Edwards and others (1989) linked the diversity of views and/or definitions of articulation as a result of individual application and desired purpose. They also pointed out that while there has been much discussion of articulation issues, a consistent knowledgeable group of educational practitioners had yet to materialize:

A review of the literature reveals that in some instances administrators and teachers may lack a basic understanding of the meaning of articulation, even though the concept of articulation has been discussed in the educational community for many years (p. 33).

This lack of understanding on the part of faculty and administrators regarding articulation, further complicates the ability of a definition and/or articulation policy to

be placed into practice. Menacker (1975) viewed the difficulty of developing a unified definition for articulation with the multifaceted nature of the articulation process. Menacker examined the perceived view points of articulation, each with its own specific needs as including "... educational specialties, administrative articulation, subject or curricular articulation and guidance centered articulation" (p. 4).

Following a comprehensive review of the literature by Edwards, Leonard, and Southerland (1989) dealing with the problems associated with a single definition for the term "articulation," commonalties were found linking the seemingly diverse definitions: "Each definition emphasized communication, coordination, cooperation, and mutual planning" (p. 33). Ernst (1978) offered a workable definition for articulation:

Articulation is systematic coordination between an educational institution and other educational institutions and agencies designed to ensure the efficient and effective movement of students among those institutions and agencies, while guaranteeing the students' continuous advancement in learning. This coordination requires the institution to provide each incoming and transferring student an effective transition from one institution to another with consideration for: (1) The student's prior and subsequent courses of study. (2) The student's need for information concerning procedures practices of the new environment. (3) The student's financial needs (p. 32).

Romine (1975) looked at the articulation issue not as the ending purpose, but as a necessary ingredient to have a successful institutional, as well as a system of higher education. Romine examined the higher education structure involving both the two- and four-year college and concluded that articulation within the system was what made it a system.

The importance of a workable definition for articulation seemed to hinge on the cooperation and communication between institutional types (Edwards et al., 1989). Ernst (1978) asserted that regardless of the quality of the articulation definition, attitude was the element which would ultimately deem its practical success or failure: "Perhaps the most important factor in implementing such a definition of articulation is

that of attitude. This includes the attitude of all institutions and agencies involved in the articulation process" (p. 33).

As an ingredient in the formula for individual institutional and the higher education system success, articulation was revealed to be extremely important. Without the articulation ingredient, there was no "system" of higher education (Romine, 1975). In addition, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges as the umbrella organization for two-year colleges has never defined articulation in its 71-year history. The need for a workable definition for articulation which transcends the diverse viewpoints, remains unmet. There were ideological threads throughout the articulation definitions which had three commonalties including: (1) communication, (2) cooperation, and (3) mutual planning (Edwards et al., 1989). Finally, for an articulation definition to be fully implemented, one must take into account the role that attitudes play in the application process (Ernst, 1978).

### Systems of Articulation

Many of the attitudinal problems associated with interinstitutional articulation can be linked to the basic historical development of the American system of higher education. Menacker (1975) stated,

Knowledge of the background of American education helps to explain the extent to which inarticulation exists in the American educational system today. France, Germany, Japan, the Soviet Union, and most other nations have no such problems, since curricula are planned at the national level. Procedures for transferring from one educational level to another are also worked out centrally and applied uniformly throughout the land. In contrast, the United States developed a pattern in which there are communities that have separate school districts and policy-making governing boards for public elementary schools, high school, junior colleges, four-year colleges, and universities (p. 7).

Much importance has been given to the coordination aspect of educational articulation. Many educators viewed articulation as a panacea to solve many of the problems facing higher education today (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985; Edwards et al.,

1989; Bender, 1990). The relationships fostered by the need to find solutions to the problems of higher education were addressed by other researchers, such as Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985):

... articulation/transfer relationships have existed from the beginning of the two-year college movement. Appearing first as informal arrangements in the Midwest and soon in the West as junior colleges were opened in California, formal agreements were gradually negotiated in areas where the number of transfer applicants demanded that attention or where a degree of cordiality had developed between universities and junior colleges (p. 21).

Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) asserted that the involvement of state agencies (such as the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education) in the articulation/transfer process did not occur until 1971, when the Florida State Department of Education placed into action the Florida Formal Agreement Plan. In addition, Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) identified three types of state-wide articulation and/or transfer agreements: "(1) formally and legally-based policies; (2) state system policies; and (3) voluntary agreements between individual institutions or systems" (p. 21).

In an attempt to define the "formal & legally-based" articulation systems, Kintzer (1973) stated,

The distinguishing characteristics of the formal and legally-based patterns are the (1) breadth of general education requirements offered by both two- and four-year institutions, (2) timing stipulations regulating when each level can legitimately offer required courses, and (3) policies pertaining to articulation services that facilitate the movement of students through the system (p. 35).

The second recognized articulation agreement was referred to by Kintzer (1973) as the state plan:

State plans typically tend to emphasize the details of transfer. State bodies responsible for two-year college education are more controlling than coordinating. Heavy responsibility for policy development and implementation is held by the state, often through an agency of government such as the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (p. 52).

In the third type of agreement, individual institutions within the state acted upon the need to articulate, and reached mutually acceptable voluntary agreements rather than depend on system mandate. Cooperative "liaison committees" made up of

representatives from each institution provided the close communication needed to stimulate workable articulation agreements (Kintzer, 1973).

Bernstein (1986) felt that "system" involvement was necessary for collaboration and continued support of an agreement, but was probably not a panacea for continued application:

Interinstitutional factors regarding the breakdown in articulation among segments of higher education indicate that responsibility for the transfer function cannot be placed solely on the doorstep of the community college. Better and more programmatic articulation between and within systems can have a positive effect on transfer. It must be added, however, that there is no evidence that simple agreements between institutions result in higher transfer rates. When the time comes to evaluate credits, students may find that much of their previous work will not be accepted for credit toward the major or distribution requirements. In other words, the articulation agreements may not be worth the paper on which they are written (p. 39).

In his 1981 study, Nazari-Robati discovered a significant difference between the attitudes of chief academic administrators at two-year, as compared to four-year institutions, when analyzed on the basis of the type of articulation agreement. It was revealed that chief academic administrators from all four articulation types exhibited positive attitudes toward the education students receive at community colleges, but that significant differences existed between the two more positive articulation plans (formal and voluntary) and the two less positive plans (state agency and legal).

The differences in the outcomes of articulation policy tell me that the ultimate success of an articulation agreement may hinge on the attitudinal predisposition of the higher education articulation structure. Some research exists supporting some articulation plans over others (Nazari-Robati, 1981; Bender, 1990). The bottom line remained that articulation agreements were only as good as their subjective attitudinal interpretation.

## Community College Transfer

### The Egalitarian Role

In the early development of the community college the curriculum was primarily collegiate and transfer oriented. Although most of the students attending a two-year college did so with transfer in mind, by the late 1920s most students failed to matriculate to the senior institutions. According to Brubaker and Rudy (1976),

In its early years the junior college conceived its curriculum as the first two years of a regular four-year college. Preeminent, therefore, was its "transfer" function, that is to pass its graduates on to some institution with the junior and senior years of college. It early began to appear, however, especially during the depression, that as many as two-thirds to three-fourths did not transfer, went no further (p. 259).

The growth of the two-year college since 1901 has been just short of unbelievable. A 1989 report found that in 1983 over 1,200 two-year colleges enrolled over 4 million students which equated to 53 percent of the first-time entering freshmen in 1983 (Brint & Karabel, 1989). With the majority of the college-bound students opting for the two-year institution as their entry-point to higher education, the two-year college had truly become the gateway for a majority of the American populace (Brint & Karabel, 1989). Cohen and Brawer (1989) also saw the community college as an access point, when examining its multi-purpose mission:

The academic transfer, or collegiate studies were meant to fulfill several institutional purposes: a popularizing function, a democratizing pursuit, and a function of conducting the lower division for the universities. The popularizing activity was to have the effect of advertising higher education, showing what it could do for the individual, encouraging people to attend. The democratizing function was realized as the community colleges became the point of first access for people entering higher education; by the late 1970s, 40 percent of all first-time-in-college, full-time freshmen and around two-thirds of all ethnic minority students were in the two-year institutions (p. 17).

The multi-purpose two-year college orientation was also supported by Banks (1990a):

Since their beginnings, community colleges have accommodated many audiences and educational needs. The transfer function is only one of several missions of the community college, but it is an essential function for the large number of two-year college students who lack the financial support or academic preparation to pursue any other route to a baccalaureate degree (p. 53).

The egalitarian role of the community college was fueled by the drive for "open admissions" in the 1960 s. This open access provided a door-way to higher education for a new type of student. The "comprehensive junior colleges" provided an expanded curriculum to this broadened audience which included transfer, as well as non-transfer oriented educational programs (Brubaker & Rudy, 1976). According to Brint and Karabel (1989), most of the general public viewed the two-year college as a less expensive and more convenient means of receiving the first two years of a baccalaureate degree. Certainly this was the view among policymakers at the state level. In addition, higher education was generally viewed as the best vehicle for upward mobility in American society (Brint & Karabel, 1989). Much of the community college literature referred to democracy's promise of the "American Dream" ideal (the ability of a person to reach his/her fullest potential), which was carried on the shoulders of education and how that almost always the two-year institution was assigned the fostering of "democratic ideals" and to serve as the vehicle for achieving "the American Dream" (Roueche & Baker, 1987). The general public has continued to view the community college largely as a gateway to the baccalaureate degree and in turn, upward mobility (Brint & Karabel, 1989). When the heavy use of the community college as an access route to higher education by the general public was compounded with the poor transfer rate and propensity for terminal degree programs, the American dream was significantly mitigated (Karabel, 1972; Zwerling, 1976; Brint & Karabel, 1989). In addition, with the community college being the major access route for low socioeconomic and/or minority collegiate entry, the tracking of these students into

terminal fields of study only further stratified the social system and mitigated their access to mobility (Banks, 1990b).

### Decline of the Transfer Function

There have been several explanations for the decline of the transfer function in the two-year college. Brint and Karabel (1989) examined the community college vocationalization phenomenon and its transfer-to-terminal emphasis shift as having its philosophical beginnings in the 1920s under the leadership of such men as Leonard Koos and Walter Crosby Eells, who had advocated semiprofessional training (Brint & Karabel, 1989). This lessening of the collegiate transfer emphasis was a slow process observed by several of the community college commentators. Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) reported that "throughout the early decades of the junior college movement, actually until the 1960s, transfer education carried about two-thirds of the total enrollments" (p. 3). One of the odd features of the transfer issue revolves around the phenomena that a very small percentage of the students enrolled in transfer-oriented programs ever transfer to a four-year institution. While historically the vast majority of people who have enrolled in the two-year institution have done so with the intention of completing a baccalaureate degree, statistically less than 15 percent actually transfer and complete the four-year degree (Brint & Karabel, 1989). According to the Center for the Study of Community Colleges Transfer Assembly, between 1984 and 1986 the transfer rate from two-year to four-year colleges was about 23.5 percent (Cohen, 1991). This transfer percentage was derived by defining transfer rate as:

... all students entering a two-year college in a given year who have no prior college experience and who complete at least 12 college credit units, divided into the number of that group who take one or more classes at a university within four years (Cohen, 1991, p. 3).

Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) acknowledged the constant growth in the occupational function throughout the development of the community college:



Transfer students remained in the majority until the beginning of the 1970's. By 1973, the percentage had slipped from about two-thirds of the total enrollment to less than 43%. Throughout that decade, the number of associates degrees awarded nationwide continued to drop, while total enrollments grew rapidly, again reflecting the slowdown of the transfer function (p. 2).

According to Cohen and Brawer (1982), the proportion of terminal associates degrees increased from just over a third of the curricular offerings to almost two-thirds during the 1970s.

No longer is the major function of the associate degree-granting institution one of collegiate transfer. Bartkovich (1981) discovered that during the decade between 1960 and 1970, the majority of community colleges shifted their curricular emphasis from general education and/or transfer to one of vocational-technical education. Yeilding (1982) noted the inclusion of many non-transfer oriented programs such as vocational/technical, community, and adult education programs which have replaced the transfer emphasis at the vast majority of community colleges. Considering the increased use of the community college by the general population as a higher education access point and the reduction in the transfer emphasis, there is a significant discrepancy between the number of community college students who begin their postsecondary education with the intent to complete a four-year degree but fail to do so (Segner, 1974; Eaton, 1989).

Brint and Karabel (1989) viewed the evolution of the community college to function as a terminal rather than as a transfer institution as being traditionally credited to two models of thought. The first was from an "individual" or consumer-choice perspective. This perspective justifies the shift in community college curricular emphasis from transfer to vocational as being driven by student preference: "The consumer-choice model views students as highly rational economic maximizers. They wish to obtain the highest possible rates of return for the lowest cost in time, effort, and expense" (p. 13). This model advocated that as the rate of return on the liberal arts

degree diminished, the interest of students and the community colleges' emphasis on terminal vocational programs increased (Brint and Karabel, 1989).

The second perspective describing the vocational transformation of the community college curriculum was the "business-domination" model: "... the curricular offerings of the community colleges are seen as reflecting the interests of powerful business interests, which prefer programs which provide them with technically trained workers" (Brint & Karabel, 1989, p. 13).

Neither of these models accounted for the vast majority of students entering the community college with the desire and intention to complete a four-year degree, according to the authors. Until the last two decades, the majority of students were enrolled in the transfer programs even though they might not complete the baccalaureate degree (Brint & Karabel, 1989).

Brint and Karabel (1989) offered a third possible explanation for the transfer-to-vocational community college shift. They contended that an institutional model based on the overall structure of the higher education system accounted for the change in curricular emphasis. They asserted that the previous models failed to consider the beliefs and activities of the administrators and/or other two-year college professionals, "who typically have the power to define what is in the 'interest' of the organizations over which they preside." In addition, because of the two-year colleges late entry into the higher education structural hierarchy, much of the best training markets for top business careers "were effectively monopolized by the rival institutions." The authors' structural explanation takes into account the need of the early junior colleges to associate with the older and more accepted university to enhance their credibility and justify their reason for existence. The two-year college administrators soon realized the dependent position within the higher education hierarchy with which the junior college had been saddled, according to Brint and Karabel. They felt they had little control over their future, and thus took the opportunity to expand into the terminal

vocational/technical markets to mitigate their structural dependence on the senior institutions. Thus, the early junior college administrators saw the need to advance into the terminal degree market slowly (still offering the transfer curriculum) for fear of losing the credibility the association with the university afforded them (Brint & Karabel, 1989).

Each of the three models posed by Brint and Karabel (1989) provided insight into the vocational transformation of the two-year college. In addition, each had merit and were supported by a wide range of commentators within the literature, but all lacked a consistent definition for what constituted transfer. This lack of definitional consistency mitigated the significance of the statistical support for the decline of the junior college collegiate transfer function.

### Defining Transfer

Parker (1975) stated that

Few facets of American postsecondary education reveal such sharp reflections of current emphasis in academic pursuits beyond high school with a sparser statistical background than enrollments in career and transfer-oriented programs in American two-year colleges (p. 4).

This lack of research on the transfer function significantly hampered the ability to ascertain the status and true impact of the phenomenon on the institutional type and the students it serves. In a 1986 review of the literature on the transfer issue for the ERIC Clearing house for Junior Colleges, Palmer concurred with Parker, and revealed several barriers to obtaining a status report of the collegiate transfer function of the community college. Palmer (1986) found a "lack of consistent measuring devices, lack of dependable research, and little cooperation between institutional types" (pp. 101-102). Other authors such as Bernstein (1986) were in concurrence with Palmer's analysis of the state of community college research:

Given the small number of states collecting transfer statistics and the lack of uniformity regarding the definition of a transfer student, we do not have solid national longitudinal data regarding the flow of students from two- to four- year colleges (p. 33).

There was an obvious need and call for two-year institutions to cooperate and develop an acceptable definition for the transfer function and universal measuring devices for the analysis of the status of transfer to be attempted.

In 1990, the Ford Foundation sponsored an institutional conference to lay the foundation for the generation of consistent data through a common methodology and definition of transfer rate. The consensus of those present at the first Transfer Assembly was that an acceptable definition for transfer must be developed prior to any statistical research being done (Watkins, 1990). Watkins (1990) reported that Arthur M. Cohen, the President of the Center for the Study of Community Colleges at the University of California at Los Angeles, and several of his colleagues hosted a conference (The Transfer Assembly Project) in Beverly Hills, California, which was supported by the Ford Foundation to discuss the problems associated with obtaining better information on transfer rates so as to respond to critics who charge that too few students make the transition from two-year to four-year institutions. The impact of the diverse use and application of the term "transfer" on the institutional research and analysis is significant. Cohen asserted,

... to obtain the needed information, two-year institutions must agree on a definition of a transfer student and collect data every year to support that definition. Today the transfer rate is anything you want it to be. Colleges can pick a number from 1 to 100 and develop a description which gives them that rate. What we need is a national, interstate, interinstitutional, reliable, consistent definition of the transfer student (quoted in Watkins, 1990, p. A38).

Kintzer and Wattenbarger (1985) contended that two-year vocationally-oriented colleges are beginning to expand the transfer definition to better "fit" their institution's career-oriented priority: "The non-traditional student or transfer student is now in the process of being redefined to include transfer relationships with business and industry,

proprietary schools, and the military" (p. 61). The wide variety of transfer rate application further complicates the development of a definition to be used in the reporting and analysis of transfers.

The Transfer Assembly participants developed a definition which served as a basis for transfer research: "... a transfer student is one who enrolls at a community college with no previous college education, earns a minimum of twelve credit hours there, and enrolls at a four-year institution within five years" (quoted in Watkins, 1990, p. A38).

According to Watkins (1990), there was much argument among the Transfer Assembly participants as to the incentive for two-year colleges for accepting such a definition if transfer was not the institution's primary mission. While the Transfer Assembly did develop a transfer definition for institutional research purposes, no mechanism and/or incentive has been developed for its universal usage. In subsequent meetings of the Transfer Assembly, the definition for transfer rate was further refined:

...all students entering the two-year college in a given year who have no prior college experience and who complete at least 12 college credit units, divided into the number of that group who take one or more classes at a university within four years (Cohen, 1991, p. 3).

Utilizing this definition for transfer rate, Cohen and the Transfer Assembly requested transfer data from 240 four-year colleges and about a fifth of the two-year colleges with at least a 20 percent minority enrollment (Cohen, 1991). Each of the 48 participating institutions was asked to provide the Transfer Assembly with the following set of related data:

(1) the number of their students, desegregated by ethnicity, who had entered the college in 1984 with no prior college experience; (2) of those, the number who had stayed at the institution long enough to attain at least 12 college credit units; and (3) the number of that group who, within four years of initial enrollment, had entered a senior institution (Cohen, 1991, p. 4)

In 1990, the 240 colleges were again asked to supply the Transfer Assembly with the requested transfer data. From this request, 114 colleges representing 27 states participated in the 1990 transfer study. The resulting transfer rate which was derived from the participating institutions was 23.6 percent (Cohen, 1991).

It would be an obvious understatement to say that the transfer issue could easily be "fixed" by some single definition. The issues of public perception and usage of the two-year college transfer function as a vehicle to the achievement of the American Dream, the perceived decline of the two-year college's emphasis on the transfer function, and the lack of universally applied definitions and/or statistical reporting devices all complicated the discovery of the true status of the transfer process. The lack of cooperation and mission definition and/or agreement within the ranks of the two-year college has created the climate for negative attitudes among other sectors of the higher education community regarding the quality of community college education.

#### Transfer/ Articulation in Oklahoma

For many states, Oklahoma included, "open access" to higher education is defined as the two-year college. Oklahoma's articulation typology has been categorized as being a state-system policy (Kintzer, 1973). With the responsibility for interinstitutional articulation in higher education for Oklahoma falling to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, their often cited policy statements and data collection procedures seem to outweigh the results of transfer articulation.

According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education—*Policy Statement On The Articulation Of Students Among Institutions In The Oklahoma State System Of Higher Education*:

One of the primary goals of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is to provide access at some public institution for all Oklahoma citizens

whose interests and abilities qualify them for admission. Given the large number of individuals who annually seek admission to the State System, it is recognized that no single institution can physically accommodate the total student body, nor can any institutional type meet the diverse needs and demands of all the students for various kinds of educational programs. Therefore each institution and each institutional type has been assigned a specialized role within the total State System, in order that all qualified individuals may be accommodated at some institution, although not necessarily at the institution of first choice (OSRHE, 1992a, p. 3-J).

The development of public two-year college education in Oklahoma began in 1901 with the founding of University Preparatory School at Tonkawa which was to eventually become Northern Oklahoma College. Seven institutions were founded in 1908, one in 1909, and one in 1919 which were destined to become junior colleges. The University Preparatory School was the first to be accredited as a junior college in 1920:

The first state supported junior colleges were dependent on funds from the state, usually served a fairly well-defined region, and were designed for special types of schooling. The early municipal junior colleges were financed and operated by public school districts, usually in shared high school facilities. The University Preparatory School at Tonkawa, created in 1901 by legislative action, is the oldest state supported institution which was to become a junior college, and Muskogee Junior College, founded in 1920, is the oldest municipal junior college in the state (Nutter, 1974, p. 14-15).

The development of the two-year college in Oklahoma had many of the same driving forces which had driven the first junior college at Joliet Junior College in 1901 (Nutter, 1974). Junior colleges in Oklahoma, as was the case elsewhere, were developed as an additional two years of high school (Gabert, 1991). They were created to augment an inferior public school college preparatory program (Nutter, 1974). While the two-year college in Oklahoma may have been created as a possible solution to inadequate public education, legislative directives noted that the seven original junior colleges were established "as preparatory toward two years of traditional college work" (Nutter, 1974, p. 26). The collegiate function of the two-year college in Oklahoma was established early in its development.

According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, *Student Data Report: Oklahoma Higher Education 1988-89*, "The majority of first-time entering

freshmen, 61 percent, continue to enter two-year institutions. Four-year institutions receive 22 percent and comprehensive universities receive the remaining 17 percent" (p. 3). In light of the majority of first-time freshmen beginning their postsecondary education at the two-year college level, comprehensive articulation policies should allow for the easy transfer of credits within the system of higher education. As is the case of higher education in general, Oklahoma has a large percentage of minority population attending two-year institutions. In an effort to mitigate discrimination of any group's access to higher education, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education adopted an operational policy on social justice:

To make possible the participation of all able persons at the highest attainable level of academic life regardless of their race, ethnic background, sex, age, religion, handicap, income level, or geographic location; and to provide for social justice in the form of equitable and fair treatment and for systematic adjustments in the form of positive action until equity is attained (OSRHE, 1990b, p. 7).

This commitment to social justice relies on the system of Oklahoma higher education being integrated. In a 1990 Oklahoma State Regents publication entitled, *Oklahoma Higher Education . . . An Overview*, the building of a quality "system" of Oklahoma higher education is referred to several times. This system includes twelve senior baccalaureate degree-granting institutions and fifteen two-year associates degree-granting public institutions (OSRHE, 1990c).

The Oklahoma state articulation policy has been cited by several noted authorities as one of the better statewide transfer articulation policies on record (e.g., Kintzer, 1973; Bender, 1990). While the Oklahoma articulation policy sounds very comprehensive, the underlying focus remains on institutional autonomy and not on student progression (Appendix C). The articulation policy in Oklahoma focuses on the 37 semester-credit-hour general education requirement and allows for the individual institutional interpretation of additional credit hour application toward a receiving institution's baccalaureate degree program. This almost total freedom on the part of



the receiving institution and/or academic department to evaluate subjects the minimal twenty-three hours additional credit required for an associate degree to a level of attitudinal subjectivity. While the State Regents' articulation policy makes it clear that no guarantee of choice is implied in the policy statement, there is also no guarantee that credits obtained at a two-year institution beyond the general education requirements will be accepted as anything more than an elective.

According to Bender (1990),

A reading of state policies reveals an attitudinal posture worthy of note as well. Legislative resolutions dealing with transfer and articulation will, almost without exception, reflect a concern for the students' interest, sometimes to the detriment of traditions or values cherished by colleges and universities. In sharp contrast, the interest of institutions can often be found in policies developed by state coordinating agencies or voluntary institutional organizations (p. ix).

The underview of this line of reasoning is, "What is the function of the 'system' of higher education?" or "Who does the system serve?" Based on the review of literature and on the results of this attitudinal study, if the function of the system was to create a "class system" and serve the traditions of the "privileged," then the fraternal order has been preserved. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Articulation Policy is not a bad start; but it just that, a start. Without the dedication to student articulation on the part of each individual higher education institution (two- and four-year), "...the articulation agreements may not be worth the paper on which they were written" (Bernstein, 1986, p. 39).

According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education 1988-89 *Student Data Report*,

In the fall of 1988, 48.5 percent of the transfer students went to four-year institutions and 51.5 percent went to two-year institutions. In the fall of 1987, the distribution was 49 and 51 percent, respectively. There was also not much change in the percentage of transfer students who moved from two-year to four-year institutions in the fall of 1988, 29.2 percent. In 1987, 31 percent transferred from two-year to four-year institutions (1990a, p. 97).

Following the review of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education transfer data, very little can be gained as to the percentage of two-year college student transfers, and how transfer is defined. Transfer, although not specifically addressed, seems to be defined as any student (part-time or full-time) who moves from one Oklahoma institution to another regardless of institutional type. This lack of usable data reiterates the need for developing a definition for transfer rates. Lumping all transfers together and then giving percentages of that total does little to gauge the effectiveness of the articulation system of higher education in egalitarian access. It is interesting to note in the review of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education publications including the *1988-89 Student Data Report*, *Social Justice In Oklahoma Higher Education*, *Degrees Conferred in Oklahoma Higher Education 1988-89*, *Oklahoma Higher Education: An Overview*, *Oklahoma Demographics: Myths and Realities*, the original and revised *Policy Statement on the Articulation of Students Among Institutions in the Oklahoma State System Of Higher Education* and the *Admission Policy Impact Study* no reference to an official definition of transfer rate was mentioned and no annual transfer percentages were given for two-year colleges relating to transfer and articulation with four-year institutions. In a conversation with one Oklahoma two-year college president, he mentioned he had seen a transfer rate of 29.2 percent for his institution. He had a single page photocopy of a document that he had received from the Oklahoma State Regents. This president was unsure of the methodology utilized in obtaining the transfer rate percentage and if it had come from a published document or an in-house (state system) source. At this time, no publication containing such two-year to four-year college transfer rates has been discovered. With virtually no practically usable Oklahoma transfer documentation to rely on, national figures which have been covered in the review of literature will be the basis of further analysis. The lack of a common transfer definition holds true with the majority of the transfer-

related data collection in the United States and is cause for concern in grasping the success or failure of egalitarian access to higher education in Oklahoma.

### Attitudes Toward the Education a Student

#### Receives at a Community College

The community college has seen significant growth, as measured by sheer institutional numbers as well as services it offered because of its unique response to needs not provided by any other segment of higher education (Nolan and Paradise, 1979). Watkins (1990) saw the importance of the community college as having a direct link to the general population's use and perception of the two-year college as a means of obtaining upward mobility: "About 5.3 million people, or 43% of today's undergraduates, are enrolled in the community college credit programs. Observers say that number, which has increased by 14% since 1985, will continue to grow" (p. A38).

While a major factor in the two-year college development process has been the involvement of four-year college and university personnel (Fields, 1962), arguments continued regarding the mission, faculty, students, and curricular emphasis expected of two-year colleges (Gleazer, 1968).

There has been much criticism directed at the issue of junior college educational expectations (Nazari-Robati, 1981). Few research studies have been conducted to ascertain the breadth and impact of these negative attitudes. Three studies relating to the attitudes toward junior colleges were found during the literature review. The first was that of a doctoral study completed at the University of Illinois by James (1969). The major goal of the study was the development of an instrument designed for the measurement of attitudes toward the junior college. This 1969 study assessed the attitudes of high school counselors in the Illinois public school system toward community college education. Although the instrument was initially intended for

application to determine the attitudes of high school counselors toward junior colleges, the instrument was so designed to be applicable to several different educational groups. The instrument which resulted from the 1969 James study was *The Junior College Attitude Survey* which was a Likert-type attitudinal survey used by Rice in his 1976 study that measured the attitudes of the full-time faculty of six Oklahoma regional colleges toward the junior college. The results of the study reported by Rice (1976) revealed that, "the full-time faculty of Oklahoma's six regional colleges have had such information and/or experiences that would cause them, as a group, to be generally favorable toward junior college education" (p. 106).

The final relevant attitudinal study was performed by Nazari-Robati in 1981. This study analyzed academic administrator attitudes toward the junior college as they related to the type of state institutional articulation plan (as determined by Wattenbarger's four articulation plan categories) from which the administrator originated and the comparison of junior college administrator attitudes with senior college attitudes. The conclusions of the study included the finding of significant differences in the attitudes of both junior college and senior college administrators toward junior college and between those administrators representing different state articulation plans (Nazari-Robati, 1981). As a recommendation, Nazari-Robati (1981) called for additional attitudinal studies in states not included in the study and for institutions within a given state.

According to Triandis (1971), "An attitude is an idea charged with emotion which predisposes a class of actions to a particular class of social situations" (p. 2). Supporting the premise that attitudes and behaviors are interrelated, Sherif, Sherif and Nebergal (1965) asserted:

To summarize, attitudes can be inferred only from behavior; specifically, they are inferred from characteristic and selective patterning of behavior toward their referents. This characteristic and selective patterning of behavior reflects an evaluation, either favorable or unfavorable (p. 8).

The prevailing trend in the reviewed literature provided a dichotomy of attitudes for and against the facets which constitute the community college.

Although most of the arguments regarding attitudes for and against community college education were covered in previous chapters and/or sections of this review, Nazari-Robati (1981) provided a comprehensive listing of the more traditional arguments for and against community college education and/or its components. Those factors resulting in positive attitudes included the junior college's role in the egalitarian access of the general population to higher education, the diversity of programs in response to perceived educational needs (collegiate transfer function, vocational/technical training, general education, remedial programs, and community services), and their unique ability to quickly respond to changing needs. Those arguments listed by Nazari-Robati (1981) as being against the junior college and/or its components included perceptions held by individuals in other sectors of higher education that junior college staffs were inferior in quality, junior college programs were not of college level and/or quality, the low emphasis on transfer function mitigated the potential of low socioeconomic students and minorities, the quality of the junior college administration, the open access allows students of below-college-level ability to enroll, junior colleges fail to develop their transfer programs in regards to senior college programs and requirements, and junior college fail to cooperate in the development of interinstitutional articulation plans. Much of the literature supported the argument that these negative attitudes have had the propensity and strength to mitigate collaboration and possibilities for interinstitutional cooperation between the community college and senior college (Ernst, 1978).

### Recommendations for Improving Articulation/Transfer

In establishing the criteria for a good system of articulation, Zwerling, author of the important work *Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College*, contended:

... a more equitable system would be designed to assist individuals to progress. Rather than offering a hierarchy made up of relatively impervious layers, an equitable system would present a continuous, seamless configuration of offerings in which success at one level would mean direct access to the next (1986, p. 57).

Koltai (1982), former Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, the largest network of urban community colleges in the United States, saw the success of articulation/transfer agreements contingent upon the mutual benefits offered as incentive to both sides of the transfer issue. If relevant information can be shared between sending and receiving institutions regarding the transferring student's academic profile and how the transfer student compares to the receiving institution's native students, then analysis of transfer oriented programs and transfer student support programs could be provided. Koltai agrees that with a declining pool of traditional aged 18-22 year old college attending applicants, institutions must look to new means of attracting and retaining students now beginning their postsecondary education at the community college level.

Donovan and others (1987) offered seven recommendations to improve interinstitutional articulation:

1. Key administrators and faculty from two- and four-year colleges should meet periodically to discuss curriculum, teaching strategies, and outcomes.
2. As part of a continuing process, articulation agreements should be developed by both faculty and administrators at participating institutions and should be communicated to all faculty, students, and counselors.
3. Two- and four-year colleges should encourage state and local coordinating and governing boards to adopt policies that guarantee places in four-year colleges for two-year graduates. About twenty years ago the [Florida] state legislature enacted an articulation agreement that was designed to ease the transfer of students from two-year to four-year public colleges. According to

this policy, no public university in the state can question or not accept the thirty-six general education credits provided by the community colleges if the student has the associate arts degree. In turn, the community colleges provide their students with proper advisement regarding the sequence of courses they should take beyond general education for transfer into the upper division program of their choice.

4. Community colleges should communicate relevant data to four-year receiver colleges so that they may identify and recruit students, particularly minorities, eligible for transfer.

5. Community college catalogs should identify transfer courses.

6. Two- and four-year colleges should exchange faculty and staff, particularly in transfer-related courses.

7. Students should be encouraged to take lower division courses at four-year colleges while enrolled at a two-year college (pp. 11-12).

Eaton (1992) proposed similar recommendations and requirements for institutional inclusion in the National Transfer Center's Partnership Grants:

The Academic Model requires: primary focus on curriculum and performance expectations; faculty leadership; two-year/four-year faculty collaboration; administrative leadership and support for faculty-led collaborative efforts; and systematic tracking of the transfer student population to determine transfer effectiveness (p. 2).

### Summary

According to the 1991 *Digest of Education Statistics* and several noted community college commentators, it has become the trend in higher education in the United States that over half of all college students begin their postsecondary educations at the community college (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Cohen & Brawer, 1989; NCES, 1991). This increased egalitarian usage, however, has not resulted in an equal increase in transfer rates (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985). Several explanations have been offered in response to the low rates of transfer including, but not limited to: poorly understood and/or ineffective articulation plans (Ernst, 1978), lack of a universal transfer definition (Menacker, 1975; Bernstein, 1986; Watkins, 1990; Cohen, 1991), replacement

of the collegiate "transfer" function with one which is terminal-vocational (Zwerling, 1976; Cohen & Brawer, 1982) and that negative attitudes existed between two-and four-year colleges which created barriers to the successful transfer and articulation of students and programs (Nazari-Robati, 1981).

The importance of the transfer/articulation issue was a paramount factor in the literature associated with system viability. A significant portion of the literature related to the problems associated with the development and acceptance of operational definitions for articulation and transfer. The one element which bridged the various definitions for articulation, which all of the commentators cited as important was the element of mutual cooperation and constant communication (Edwards, Leonard, & Southerland, 1989). Each institution should consider themselves as part of an interdependent system of higher education and not as competing sectors (Bernstein, 1986). This type of collaborative articulation effort has several requirements to be deemed successful. The proper attitude and shared respect for the various institutional program offerings, students and personnel called for by Ernst (1978) was representative of the literature:

... proper attitude accepts the fact that legitimate and creditable education can be attained at institutions other than one's own. It recognized the universality of educational experiences and the professional competence of colleagues. Further, this attitude recognized that agencies and enterprises other than educational institutions can provide valuable and responsible learning experiences. Such an attitude also suggests that an institution knows how to add to and complement a diversity of educational experiences (p. 33).

The argument that the attitudes toward community college education and their resulting behaviors can determine the overall success or failure of articulation plans was promoted in both the articulation definitions (Ernst, 1978) and structural systems sections of the review (Berstein, 1986).

A need exists for the enhancement of the knowledge base relating to the attitudes which act as barriers to higher education performing as a system. This study was



designed to add to the knowledge base by assessing the attitudes which exist between the two- and four-year college academic administrators in the State of Oklahoma. Argued here is the view that an enhanced understanding of the current attitudinal context which has led to the present state of articulation will aid in the development of future articulation agreements and ultimately improve the cooperation within the state system of higher education in Oklahoma.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The general purpose of this study was to assess and analyze the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college education through their survey responses regarding five facets of the two-year college: faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities. The perceptions and attitudes were quantified in terms of the participant's scores on *The Junior College Attitude Survey* initially developed by James in 1969. In addition to the use of the mail survey to assess whether attitudinal differences exist between the two selected populations, it was deemed appropriate to analyze the related two- and four-year college data as documented by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education to ascertain any justification for attitudinal differences which may exist between the two populations toward the two-year college education.

This chapter includes the components of the design of research through which the purpose of the study was accomplished and the research hypotheses were tested. This chapter is divided into the following sections: introduction, definition and selection of populations, a description of the research instrument and the procedures used in data collection, and the statistical methods used in manipulating the collected data.

### Definition and Selection of Populations

Due to the focused scope of this study, the total universe of the two populations of undergraduate administrators at Oklahoma's public two- and four-year higher education institutions were included. The universe as defined in the study was comprised of 491 individuals representing the two groups of operationally defined academic administrators (e.g., chief academic administrators, undergraduate college deans/division chairpersons, and department heads) in the 27 public institutions of higher education in Oklahoma:

(1) 351 individuals were identified by their institution's academic affairs office as meeting the criteria for one of the three categories operationally defined as an undergraduate academic administrator (a) chief academic administrators, (b) college deans, and (c) undergraduate department heads in public four-year colleges in Oklahoma as recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

(2) 140 individuals were identified by their institution's academic affairs office as meeting the criteria for one of the categories operationally defined as an academic administrator (a) chief academic administrators, (b) division head, and/or (c) department heads in public two-year colleges in Oklahoma, as recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

In a 1980 study, Hammons, Thomas, and Ward noted the pivotal role collegiate administrators play in the development and implementation of change:

The key role of administrators in initiating, implementing, and facilitating change has been quite clear throughout the history of the community college. Without vigorous administrative leadership, especially from the chief instructional officers, there is little hope that inertia and faculty resistance can be overcome (p. 27).

### Research Instrument

*The Junior College Attitude Survey* (James, 1969) was selected as the instrument to be used in assessing the attitudes of the two populations of undergraduate academic administrators toward two-year college education. The questionnaire was originally designed as a mail survey to assess the attitudes of high school counselors toward

community college education, but had applicability to two- and four-year higher education administrative personnel as well. *The Junior College Attitude Survey*, first administered by James in 1969, was slightly revised in subsequent studies by Rice in 1976 and Nazari-Robati in 1981, to be administered to college administrators in regard to their attitudes toward two-year college education. Following a comprehensive review, which included communications with Dr. Arthur M. Cohen, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, *Tests in Print*, and *Dissertation Abstracts*, *The Junior College Attitude Survey* was found to be most applicable survey instrument to accomplish the objectives of this study.

The plan was to utilize the 1981 Nazari-Robati version of the survey instrument in analyzing the attitudes of academic administrators toward community college education in Oklahoma. The five point Likert-type questionnaire was intended to measure the general attitude toward community college education by measuring the attitudes of individuals toward five facets (e.g., faculty, students, community college programs, community college administration, and facilities) which were deemed as most important in determining the overall attitude toward two-year college education (Rice, 1976).

The development of *The Junior College Attitude Survey* by James (1969) involved the discrimination of an expansive list of items found in the related literature and derived from opinions, attitudes, and beliefs regarding community college education. James also included personal items from his many years of academic experience as a two-year college educator. In addition, James had extensive interviews with counselors, faculty, and administrators to further enhance and complete the list of items needed to administer the survey as a pilot study. This complete set of questions was administered to those high school and two-year college counselors who were in attendance at the National Defense Education Act Institutes for Guidance and Counseling at the University of Hawaii and Los Angeles State College. James reported

that an analysis was made regarding the clarity and reliability of the survey items for the purpose of establishing the items' favorableness or unfavorableness toward the two-year college. Following these first two pilot studies, a panel of experts edited the attitudinal statements included in the prior studies and submitted a second version of the instrument to be utilized in a third pilot study. In the third pilot study the revised 92-item, five-scale ("strongly agree;" "agree;" "undecided;" "disagree;" and "strongly disagree") Likert-type questionnaire was administered to a group of 132 two-year college students attending a public two-year college in Illinois. The data obtained from this pilot study were analyzed to determine the most discriminating items, in terms of their favorableness or unfavorableness toward two-year college education. The items were then rank-ordered according to their "t" values. These "t" statistical values represented the extent to which the item on the questionnaire was differentiated between the favorable and unfavorable groupings. James then selected a "t" value of 2.74 relating to the one percent level of significance for differences between means with 31 degrees of freedom (Rice, 1976). This 2.74 "t" value was the minimum individual item score for inclusion in the final 39 item attitudinal survey.

According to James,

To further validate the discriminating ability of the thirty-nine items, an item analysis method was used to correlate the total score and item scores over all the people. The previously chosen 39 items did show a substantial correlation with the total score, indicating they did illicit different responses for those who score high and those who score low on the total test. The high "t" statistics and the substantial correlation coefficients indicate that the questionnaire is "internally consistent," or that every item is related to the same general attitude" (1969, pp. 62-63).

To obtain the reliability data, Rice (1976) points to his utilization of a split-half questionnaire technique employing the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of the correlation formula. For the entire questionnaire, a correlation coefficient of .788 was obtained from that of the split-half questionnaire. The Spearman-Brown formula was then used to obtain a .881 estimate of the total test reliability. *The Junior College Attitude*

*Survey* was chosen because of its high reliability in assessing attitudes toward community college education and its applicability to the population and purpose of the study (Rice, 1976; Nazari-Robati, 1981).

For the purpose of this study, the questionnaire was in a format similar to those used by Rice and Nazari-Robati. The only changes to the survey instrument came in the enhancement of the demographic section. The Likert-type items relating to the two-year college's faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities were kept in total and used as they had been originally written by James (1969). Due to two of the facets being represented in the questionnaire by only two items each, Nazari-Robati (1981) added two additional items to the administration facet and two items to facilities to allow a minimum of four items for each of the five two-year college facets. These four additional survey items were assessed by a panel of experts prior to their inclusion in the revised survey. Even though some of the items did not describe the five facets involved in this study, they were left in place to maintain as much of the instrument integrity as possible. In addition to the 43 items relating to the five facets representing two-year college education, six additional demographic questions were utilized by Nazari-Robati (1981) and twelve by Rice (1976). For the purposes of this study, all of the demographic questions included by Nazari-Robati plus three additional questions from Rice were used in the construction of the demographic section of the survey.

#### Data Collection Procedure

Due to the relatively small number of subjects in each of the two designated populations, no advantage was found for surveying a random sample over the utilization of the two populations selected for this study. Because of the decision to use the two populations in their entirety and the 27 institution geographic dispersion of subjects, it was decided that the mail survey was the most appropriate procedure for

this study. According to Kerlinger (1986), "Survey research is probably best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes. Survey research has the advantage of wide scope: a great deal of information can be obtained from a large population" (pp. 386-387). While the validity of a descriptive study which utilizes a mail survey can be threatened by a low rate of returned surveys, this study hoped to mitigate this possibility by establishing credibility for the study through departmental endorsement on the cover letter, timely follow-up for non-returned surveys, postage-paid return envelopes, and through the promise of participant confidentiality. Because of the importance of a high rate of return, Dillman's (1978) Total Design Method strategies for mail surveys were utilized. Dillman (1978) recommends post card reminders as well as a third mailing including a second instrument and cover letter sent to non-respondents .

The questionnaire was mailed on March 2, 1992, under the letterhead of the Department of Education Administration and Higher Education Department in the College of Education at Oklahoma State University, with the cover letter explaining the study's educational significance and the importance of their participation. In addition, a self-addressed stamped envelope was included for ease of response. The confidentiality of their responses was assured in the cover letter as well as on the questionnaire. Each questionnaire was registered with a code designating the subject's population (two- or four-year), administrative level (1, 2, or 3), and subject number so as to aid in the logging and analysis of returned questionnaires. Each letter was personally signed in ink.

After allowing two weeks for the return of the questionnaire, on March 16, 1992, a post card addressing the first mailing was sent to those in the populations yet to respond. As was recommended by Dillman (1978), a second cover letter and questionnaire were mailed on March 30, 1992, to those failing to respond to the first mailing and follow-up post card. It was decided that having received a return in

excess of 60 percent from both of the targeted populations prior to the third mailing, an April 10, 1992, deadline for the receipt of completed questionnaires would be established.

### Statistical Procedures

Since this study involved surveying the two administrative populations in their entirety, the resulting data were described in terms of population or subgroup mean(s) (M) and standard deviation (SD) as derived from the cumulative scores given by the respondents on the survey instrument in each of the five two-year college education research facets. The mean attitude scale scores considered for analysis in this study were derived from the 43 items on the questionnaire. It was determined that because of the difference in the populations selected for this study and the lack of factor analysis of the survey items in the previous utilization of the instrument by Rice (1976) and Nazari-Robati (1981), an examination of the loading of the survey items to the research factors was needed. A factor analysis with varimax rotation was applied to the survey data to determine the grouping of survey items in relation to the factors describing community college education. According to Gay (1987), "Factorial analysis is the appropriate statistical analysis if a study is based on a factorial design and investigates two or more independent variables and the interactions between them" (p. 544). The five survey items as utilized in the previous studies by Rice and Nazari-Robati describing faculty included items 3, 10, 19, 35, and 41. In addition, the items relating to facilities were items 6, 9, 11, 14, and 37. There were seven items for each of the two facets of programs (1, 25, 27, 28, 31, 39, and 42) and students items (4, 13, 15, 18, 36, 38, and 43). For the four items relating to the administrator facet items 2, 8, 23, and 33 were designated. In addition to the already mentioned facets, 15 survey items which were included for instrument integrity reasons were analyzed as "other."



Following the factor analysis of survey items and analysis of descriptive statistics, a t-test was applied to the population mean scores as determined by the rotated values to compare for significant differences. The t-test for independent samples was deemed the appropriate statistical method for determining the statistical difference between population means (Gay, 1987). The Duncan's Multiple Range test was applied to the mean scores of the three levels of administrators within each of the two academic populations to ascertain where significant attitudinal differences exist between levels as to the predetermined community college factors. While the t-test can show that a significant difference between means exists, an analysis of variance technique is necessary to ascertain where the significant difference lies. The Duncan's Multiple Range test was suggested as the statistical methodology suited to assessing the significance of the differences in attitudes between population administrative levels in this nested design.

Following the April 10, 1992, deadline for the return of completed questionnaires from each of the respondents, the data were initially entered into an IBM-compatible microcomputer using Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet software. The entered data were then loaded onto a SAS statistical software package for manipulation of the data. The results produced by the central tendencies and standard deviations were analyzed, tabulated, and factor analyzed using a varimax rotation, and then compared by population and/or subgroup affiliation. These results are presented and interpreted in the following chapter, to which attention is now directed.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes of academic administrators in Oklahoma's public two- and four-year institutions of higher education toward community college education. The organization of this chapter will begin with the hypotheses posed for testing, the reporting of the higher education institutions involved in the study, the demographics of the populations and their subgroups, the results of the factor analysis of the survey items in relation to the universe under study, a descriptive summary of the responses to the survey by institutional type and administrative level, results of a t-test by institutional type, and the reporting of the results of a Duncan's Multiple Range analysis of variance to compare the subgroup means by community college facet.

In order to analyze the attitudes of academic administrators toward community college education, three major hypotheses and their subrelated hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college education.
  - 1a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college faculty.
  - 1b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college students.

- 1c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college degree programs.
- 1d. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college administration.
- 1e. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college facilities.
2. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the three sub-groups of two-year college academic administrators toward community college education.
  - 2a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and division heads regarding community college education.
  - 2b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and department heads regarding community college education.
  - 2c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college department heads and division heads regarding community college education.
3. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the three sub-groups of four-year college academic administrators toward community college education.
  - 3a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of four-year college chief academic administrators and college deans regarding community college education.
  - 3b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of four-year college chief academic administrators and department heads regarding community college education.

- 3c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of four-year college department heads and college deans regarding community college education.

In order to address the research hypotheses the attitudes of the two populations of academic administrators were assessed by means of a survey questionnaire. The *Junior College Attitude Survey* (James, 1969) was mailed to the accessible population of academic administrators as was operationally defined and divided by institutional type.

### Populations

The 27 public two-and four-year institutions of higher education recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education were included in this study. Included in these 27 institutions were 12 four-year and 15 two-year colleges, as shown in Table I, "Public Higher Education Institutions Included in Survey," below. In addition to the 27 individual higher education institutions, Tulsa Junior College was considered as three separate entities in the collection of data because of the administrative structure of each of the three campuses. The addition of three Tulsa Junior College campuses brought the total of institutions included in this study to 29.

The populations as defined in the study were comprised of 491 individuals representing the two populations of operationally defined academic administrators (e.g., chief academic administrators, undergraduate college deans/division chairpersons, and department heads) in the 29 publicly controlled institutions of higher education in Oklahoma:

Population One: 351 individuals were identified by their institutions' academic affairs office as meeting the criteria for one of the three categories operationally defined as an undergraduate academic administrator (a) chief academic administrators ( $n = 12$ ), (b) college deans ( $n = 67$ ), and (c) undergraduate department heads ( $n = 272$ ) in public four-year colleges in Oklahoma as recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

TABLE I  
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS INCLUDED IN SURVEY

| Institution                                  | 2/4-Year      | Location      |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Cameron University                        | 4             | Lawton        |
| 2. Carl Albert State College                 | 2             | Poteau        |
| 3. Conners State College                     | 2             | Warner        |
| 4. East Central University                   | 2 <i>4 yr</i> | Ada           |
| 5. Eastern Oklahoma State College            | 2             | Wilburton     |
| 6. Langston University                       | 4             | Langston      |
| 7. Murray State College                      | 2             | Tishomingo    |
| 8. Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College       | 2             | Miami         |
| 9. Northeastern State University             | 4             | Tahlequah     |
| 10. Northern Oklahoma College                | 2             | Tonkawa       |
| 11. Northwestern Oklahoma State University   | 4             | Alva          |
| 12. Oklahoma City Community College          | 2             | Oklahoma City |
| 13. Oklahoma Panhandle State University      | 4             | Goodwell      |
| 14. Oklahoma State University                | 4             | Stillwater    |
| 15. Oklahoma State University-Oklahoma City  | 2             | Oklahoma City |
| 16. Oklahoma State University-Okmulgee       | 2             | Okmulgee      |
| 17. Redlands College                         | 2             | El Reno       |
| 18. Rogers State College                     | 2             | Claremore     |
| 19. Rose State College                       | 2             | Midwest City  |
| 20. Seminole Junior College                  | 2             | Seminole      |
| 21. Southeastern Oklahoma State University   | 4             | Durant        |
| 22. Southwestern Oklahoma State University   | 4             | Weatherford   |
| Tulsa Junior College *                       | 2             | Tulsa         |
| 23. Metro Campus                             |               |               |
| 24. Northeast Campus                         |               |               |
| 25. Southeast Campus                         |               |               |
| 26. University of Central Oklahoma           | 4             | Edmond        |
| 27. University of Oklahoma                   | 4             | Norman        |
| 28. University of Science & Arts of Oklahoma | 4             | Chickasha     |
| 29. Western Oklahoma State College           | 2             | Altus         |

Note. Each of the three Tulsa Junior College campuses were considered as separate institutions because of their size, proximity and individual academic administrative structures.

Population Two: 140 individuals were identified by their institutions' academic affairs office as meeting the criteria for one of the categories operationally defined as an academic administrator (a) chief academic administrators (n = 17), (b) division head (n = 88), and (c) department heads (n = 35) in public two-year colleges in Oklahoma, as recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Table II, "Respondent Demographics," presents the population demographics of the two groups included in this research study. Population One recorded a return of 281 of the 351 or 80.06 percent of the four-year college administrators included in the study had responded by April 10, 1992. This return rate included the responses by 83.33 percent (10 of 12) of the chief academic administrators, 82.09 percent (55 of 67) of the undergraduate college deans, and 79.41 percent (216 of 272) of the department heads. Of the 10 four-year college chief academic administrative respondents, all were male with an average age of 52.4, they had an average of 15.7 years of higher education administrative experience with an average of 2.85 years in their current administrative position, and 100 percent reported having completed a doctoral degree. Of the 55 four-year college undergraduate college deans responding to the survey, 85.45 percent were male and 14.55 percent were female, their mean age was 52.38, they had an average of 14.7 years of higher education administrative experience with an average of 9.86 years in their current administrative position, and all but one reported having completed a doctoral degree. Of the 281 four-year college undergraduate department heads responding to the survey, 79.63 percent were male and 20.37 percent were female, their mean age was 51.1, they had an average of 11.61 years of higher education administrative experience with an average of 9.96 years in their current administrative position, and reported their level of education attainment as slightly below that of the doctorate (Table II).

TABLE II  
RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

| Administrative Level                   | Population One<br>4-Year College | Population Two<br>2-Year College |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <u>Academic Vice President</u>         | n = 10 (83.3%)                   | n = 17 (100%)                    |
| Sex                                    | M = 100%<br>F = 0                | M = 88.24%<br>F = 11.76%         |
| No. years admin. experience            | 15.7                             | 17.91                            |
| No. years in current position          | 2.85                             | 6.29                             |
| Educational attainment                 | 4.0                              | 3.94                             |
| <u>College Dean/<br/>Division Head</u> | n = 55 (82.09%)                  | n = 72 (81.82%)                  |
| Sex                                    | M = 85.45%<br>F = 14.55%         | M = 61.11%<br>F = 38.89%         |
| No. years admin. experience            | 14.7                             | 8.52                             |
| No. years in current position          | 9.86                             | 10.05                            |
| Educational attainment                 | 3.96                             | 3.36                             |
| <u>Department Head</u>                 | n = 216 (79.41%)                 | n = 29 (82.86%)                  |
| Sex                                    | M = 79.63%<br>F = 20.37%         | M = 79.31%<br>F = 20.69%         |
| No. years admin. experience            | 9.96                             | 7.67                             |
| No. years in current position          | 11.61                            | 9.08                             |
| Educational attainment                 | 3.85                             | 2.96                             |

Population two recorded a return of 84.29 percent (118 of 140) of the two-year college administrators included in the study. This return rate included the response of 100 percent or all 17 chief academic administrators, 81.82 percent (72 of 88) of the undergraduate division heads, and 82.86 percent (29 of 35) of the department heads. Of the 17 two-year college chief academic administrative respondents 88.24 percent were male and 11.76 percent were female, their average age was 50.94, they reported an average of 17.91 years of higher education administrative experience with an average of 6.29 years in their current administrative position, and reported the level of education attainment as slightly below the doctorate. Of the 72 two-year college division heads responding to the survey, 61.11 percent were male and 38.89 percent were female, their mean age was 49.55, had an average of 10.05 years of higher education administrative experience with an average of 8.52 years in their current administrative position, and reported their level of education attainment as above the masters degree level. Of the 29 two-year college undergraduate department heads responding to the survey, 79.31 percent were male and 20.69 percent were female, their mean age was 44.83, they had an average of 9.08 years of higher education administrative experience with an average of 7.67 years in their current administrative position, and reported their level of education attainment as slightly below the masters degree level (Table II).

In addition to the recorded surveys, two surveys were returned with the identification code removed or made illegible rendering them unusable. Five surveys were returned incomplete citing a lack of knowledge regarding two-year college education and a preference not to be included in the study. Fifteen additional surveys were returned after the April 10, 1992, deadline and were not included in the results. The 15 late returns were a representative cross section of the two populations and their three sublevels and would not have changed the resulting means or standard deviations.



### Factor Analysis

In the previous studies utilizing the survey instrument by James (1969), Rice (1976), and Nazari-Robati (1981), the population samples had included high school and two-year college counselors, regional college faculty, and chief academic administrators by articulation type, respectively. In these previous studies, the 43-item Likert-type *The Junior College Attitude Survey* (James, 1969) was factored into five variables representing two-year college education. The five variables included faculty, facilities, students, programs and administration. The five items describing community college faculty were 3, 10, 19, 35, and 41. In addition, the items relating to facilities were 6, 9, 11, 14, and 37; there were seven items for each of the two facets of programs (items 1, 25, 27, 28, 31, 39, and 42) and students (items 4, 13, 15, 18, 36, 38, and 43). The four items relating to the administrator facet were 2, 8, 23, and 33. In addition to the already mentioned facets, there were 15 items included for instrument integrity reasons and analyzed as "other" (Appendix A).

Upon recommendation by committee members and because of the application of the survey instrument to a different universe than had been previously attempted, a factor analysis with varimax rotation was utilized to analyze the grouping of survey items by community college factors. The 43 Likert-type items on each of the 399 returned surveys were factor analyzed resulting in an eight factor grouping plus the "other" category (Table III). Only the survey items related to faculty (items 3, 10, 19, 35, and 41) and administration (items 2, 8, 23, and 33) were factored in the same manner as were utilized in the studies by Rice (1976) and Nazari-Robati (1981). The factor grouping of the items representing facilities, programs, students and other all changed and three additional factors emerged. The newly factored survey items representing the seven variables other than faculty and administration included facilities: 6, 11, and 14; programs: 1, 25, 27, 28, 39, and 42; students: 4, 13, and 16; institution: 18 and 40; comprehensive nature: 5, 9, 15, 31, 37, and 38; second class: 36 and 43; and other: 7, 12,

TABLE III  
FACTOR ANALYSIS GROUPING OF STATEMENTS

| Variable   | Statements  |
|------------|---|
| Faculty    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Junior college teachers are not as interested in their professional development as teachers in other colleges and universities.</li> <li>10. Teachers in the junior college "spoon feed" their students with easy work and easy grading.</li> <li>19. Vocational teachers in the junior college are well prepared for their task.</li> <li>35. Junior college teachers have more personal interest in students than teachers in most colleges and universities.</li> <li>41. Faculty members in the junior college are better qualified for academic advising than are the counselors.</li> </ul>   |
| Facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The facilities of the junior college compare unfavorably with those of four year colleges.</li> <li>11. Vocational programs in the junior college have sufficient equipment to prepare students for occupations.</li> <li>14. The junior college facilities are adequate for student development and progress.</li> </ul>   |
| Programs   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students get a lower quality of education in a junior college than they get in a four-year college or university.</li> <li>25. Course work in the junior college adequately prepares the student for transfer to a four-year college.</li> <li>27. Junior colleges give mostly "lip service" to their guidance and counseling function.</li> <li>28. Vocational courses in the junior colleges should be recommended to persons seeking vocational skills.</li> <li>39. Junior college programs provide little about which students could get excited.</li> <li>42. Courses which do not lead to a degree weaken the image of the junior college as a college.</li> </ul> |
| Students   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The junior college serves chiefly the inept and unable student.</li> <li>13. Junior college transfers should perform as well in a four-year college as they did in the junior college.</li> <li>16. Some of the most important aspects of attending college are missed on the junior college campus.</li> </ul>   |

Table III (Continued)

| Variable             | Statements  |
|----------------------|---|
| Administration       | <p>2. Administrators of junior colleges are usually bright, dynamic, and highly competent leaders.</p> <p>8. The administrative behavior of public school administration has become the pattern of community college administration.</p> <p>23. Administrators of community colleges generally exclude faculty and students in the selection of staff and are therefore not in harmony with senior institutions.</p> <p>33. Junior college presidents and deans are well prepared for their positions.</p>  |
| Institution          | <p>18. Students from all levels of ability can be served well by the junior college.</p> <p>40. Junior colleges provide better opportunities for student-teacher interaction than do four-year colleges and universities.</p>   |
| Comprehensive Nature | <p>5. Junior colleges are for the dumb rich and the bright poor.</p> <p>9. Opportunities for participation in extracurricular activities are very limited at the junior college.</p> <p>15. The lack of juniors and seniors leaves the junior college without competent student leaders.</p> <p>31. Advising and counseling functions in the junior colleges should be emphasized more highly than in the four year colleges.</p> <p>37. The extensive use of community college educational and sports facilities by the community people may leave students with limited resources.</p> <p>38. Living at home is a handicap to the personal development of the junior college student.</p> |
| Second Class         | <p>36. The junior college student is considered a second-class citizen in the population of higher education.</p> <p>43. Accepting all students who apply gives the junior college a bad image.</p>   |
| Other                | <p>7. Junior colleges appear to have a good understanding of the needs of their students.</p> <p>12. It would be better to expand four year colleges and universities than to build junior colleges.</p> <p>17. In the coming years, junior colleges will enroll an increasingly larger proportion of higher education students.</p> <p>20. I would advise students against attending a junior college.</p>   |

Table III (Continued)

| Variable | Statements   |
|----------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="472 447 1382 516">21. The junior college has done a good job of communicating the goals of the junior college to the surrounding communities.</li><li data-bbox="472 520 1273 550">22. Junior colleges are the wastebaskets of higher education.</li><li data-bbox="472 554 1227 583">24. The junior college is in reality a glorified high school.</li><li data-bbox="472 588 1382 657">26. The bright student should consider attending a junior college only if there are financial difficulties.</li><li data-bbox="472 661 1365 690">29. The junior college is organized much the same as a high school.</li><li data-bbox="472 695 1382 806">30. The college-bound student should consider junior college only after being denied admission by four-year colleges and universities.</li><li data-bbox="472 810 1382 879">32. The junior college is more a liability than an asset to its community.</li><li data-bbox="472 884 1382 953">34. Junior colleges are more concerned about their relationships with high schools than with four-year colleges.</li></ul> |

17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 30, 32, and 34. The new facet termed as "institution" was defined as relating to the community college as a learning environment. The facet termed "comprehensive nature" was defined by the factored items as the total stereotypical collegiate experience involving the extracurricular activities typically associated with higher education. In addition, the facet termed as second class was defined as the community college being something less in quality and/or function than its four-year counterpart. The newly factored variables were then used as a basis for comparing population and subgroup means.

### Presentation of Findings

In this descriptive study, the attitudes of the two populations and their three administrative levels were assessed regarding community college education and results were reported in terms of (M) means and (SD) standard deviations. The five point Likert-type survey item were given numerical values as follows: (1) "strongly disagree," (2) "disagree," (3) "undecided," (4) "agree," and (5) "strongly agree." The survey statements were then coded as either positive or negative as defined by degree of agreement with the higher item values equating to the more favorable statements. A response of "strongly agree" to a survey statement which was coded as favorable would receive a positive attitude score of five. A response of "strongly agree" to a negative statement would also receive a positive score of five. Each of the nine factors were then examined descriptively in terms of any population or subgroup score in excess of three and multiplied by the number of grouped statements included in that variable was considered as a positive attitude toward that community college factor. With the exception of four-year college undergraduate department heads on the factors of faculty, administration, institution, and second class, both populations and their three subgroups exhibited positive attitudes toward the nine community college factors. In comparing population and subgroup mean scores by each of the nine factors as derived from the factor analysis, several trends emerged (Table IV).

TABLE IV  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

| Variable       | Two-Year    |             |             | Four-Year   |             |              |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
|                | 1<br>n = 17 | 2<br>n = 72 | 3<br>n = 29 | 1<br>n = 10 | 2<br>n = 55 | 3<br>n = 216 |
| Faculty        |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 21.64       | 20.11       | 19.56       | 17.50       | 15.43       | 14.57        |
| SD             | 1.37        | 2.10        | 2.23        | 2.64        | 2.67        | 2.90         |
| Facilities     |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 11.71       | 10.72       | 10.21       | 11.70       | 11.04       | 10.29        |
| SD             | 2.39        | 2.52        | 2.65        | 2.16        | 1.90        | 2.04         |
| Programs       |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 27.29       | 25.44       | 24.86       | 23.40       | 20.91       | 18.64        |
| SD             | 1.83        | 2.48        | 2.79        | 4.58        | 3.45        | 4.06         |
| Student        |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 13.59       | 13.00       | 12.31       | 12.20       | 11.01       | 10.47        |
| SD             | 1.23        | 1.27        | 1.91        | 1.93        | 2.08        | 2.17         |
| Administration |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 18.24       | 16.25       | 15.24       | 15.10       | 13.15       | 11.75        |
| SD             | 1.89        | 2.66        | 3.28        | 2.42        | 3.22        | 2.60         |
| Institution    |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 9.41        | 9.11        | 8.69        | 6.50        | 6.09        | 5.54         |
| SD             | 0.71        | 1.07        | 1.00        | 1.18        | 1.67        | 1.89         |
| Comprehensive  |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 24.24       | 22.90       | 21.72       | 22.70       | 20.25       | 19.38        |
| SD             | 2.66        | 3.44        | 3.95        | 4.57        | 3.73        | 3.60         |
| Second Class   |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 7.12        | 7.13        | 6.76        | 7.10        | 6.47        | 5.83         |
| SD             | 2.32        | 1.69        | 1.83        | 1.97        | 1.76        | 1.81         |
| Other          |             |             |             |             |             |              |
| M              | 56.94       | 54.88       | 53.14       | 49.30       | 44.02       | 39.48        |
| SD             | 1.71        | 3.70        | 4.48        | 7.47        | 7.54        | 7.83         |

The factor termed as "faculty" contained five survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding a fifteen was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward community college faculty. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) with a mean group score of 14.57 and a standard deviation of 2.90, exhibited a slightly less than positive attitude toward community college faculty. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 15.43 and a standard deviation of 2.67. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 17.50 and a standard deviation of 2.64. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 19.56 and a standard deviation of 2.23. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 20.11 and a standard deviation of 2.10. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 21.64 and a standard deviation of 1.37. The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that while only the four- year college department heads exhibited a less than positive attitude toward community college faculty, there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward community college faculty becomes more positive (Table IV).

The factor termed as "facilities" contained three survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding nine was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward community college facilities. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 10.29 and a standard deviation of 2.04. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 11.04 and a standard deviation of 1.90. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 11.70 and a standard deviation of 2.16. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 10.21 and a standard deviation of 2.65. The two- year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 10.72 and a standard deviation of 2.52. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 11.71 and a standard deviation of 2.39.

The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that all subgroups exhibited a positive attitude toward community college facilities, but there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward community college facilities becomes more positive (Table IV).

The factor termed "programs" contained six survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding 18 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward community college programs. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 18.64 and a standard deviation of 4.06. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 20.91 and a standard deviation of 3.45. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 23.40 and a standard deviation of 4.58. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 24.86 and a standard deviation of 2.79. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 25.44 and a standard deviation of 2.48. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 27.29 and a standard deviation of 1.83. The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that all subgroups exhibited a positive attitude toward community college programs, but there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward community college programs becomes more positive (Table IV).

The factor termed "student" contained three survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding 9 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward community college students. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 10.47 and a standard deviation of 2.17. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 11.01 and a standard deviation of 2.08. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 12.20 and a standard deviation of 1.93. The two-year undergraduate



department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 12.31 and a standard deviation of 1.91. The two- year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 13.00 and a standard deviation of 1.27. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 13.59 and a standard deviation of 1.23. The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that all subgroups exhibited a positive attitude toward community college students, but there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward community college students becomes more positive (Table IV).

The factor termed "administration" contained four survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding a 12 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward community college administration. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) with a mean group score of 11.75 and a standard deviation of 2.60, exhibited a slightly less than positive attitude toward community college administration. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 13.15 and a standard deviation of 3.22. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 15.10 and a standard deviation of 2.42. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 15.24 and a standard deviation of 3.28. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 16.25 and a standard deviation of 2.66. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 18.24 and a standard deviation of 1.89. The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that while only the four- year college department heads exhibited a less than positive attitude toward community college administration, there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward community college administration becomes more positive (Table IV).

The factor termed "institution" contained two survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding a 6 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward the community college as an institution of higher education. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) with a mean group score of 5.54 and a standard deviation of 1.89, exhibited a slightly less than positive attitude toward the community college as an institution of higher education. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 6.09 and a standard deviation of 1.67. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 6.50 and a standard deviation of 1.18. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 8.69 and a standard deviation of 1.00. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 9.11 and a standard deviation of 1.07. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 9.41 and a standard deviation of 0.71. The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that while only the four-year college department heads exhibited a less than positive attitude toward the community college as an institution of higher education, there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward the community college as a higher education institution becomes more positive (Table IV).

The factor termed "comprehensive" contained six survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding 18 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward the community college as a comprehensive collegiate experience. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 19.38 and a standard deviation of 3.60. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 20.25 and a standard deviation of 3.73. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 22.70 and a standard deviation of 4.57. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 21.72 and a standard deviation of 3.95. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 22.90 and a standard deviation of 3.44. The two-year

college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 24.24 and a standard deviation of 2.66.

The factor termed "second class" contained two survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding a 6 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward the community college as a sublevel or second class higher education institution. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) with a mean group score of 5.83 and a standard deviation of 1.81, exhibited a slightly less than positive attitude toward the community college as a second class higher education institution. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 6.47 and a standard deviation of 1.76. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 7.10 and a standard deviation of 1.97. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 6.76 and a standard deviation of 1.83. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 7.13 and a standard deviation of 1.69. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 7.12 and a standard deviation of 2.32.

The factor termed "other" contained twelve survey statements and thus a mean subgroup score exceeding 36 was considered as exhibiting a positive attitude toward the community college factor termed as other. The four-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 39.48 and a standard deviation of 7.83. The four-year college deans (level 2) had a group mean score of 44.02 and a standard deviation of 7.54. The four-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 49.30 and a standard deviation of 7.47. The two-year undergraduate department heads (level 3) had a mean group score of 53.14 and a standard deviation of 4.48. The two-year college division heads (level 2) had a group mean score of 54.88 and a standard deviation of 3.70. The two-year college chief academic administrators (level 1) had a group mean score of 56.94 and a standard deviation of 1.71. The results of the subgroup mean scores would suggest that all

subgroups exhibited a positive attitude toward the community college factor termed as other, but there was a large difference in the degree of positive attitude between subgroups and between populations. It was also apparent that as the academic administrator moves up the levels (levels 3 to 2 to 1), the attitude toward the community college termed as other becomes more positive (Table IV).

In examining the differences in the attitudes of the two populations utilized in this study, a t-test was administered to the means as ascertained from the survey data for each of the nine community college factors. With the one exception of attitudes toward the variable community college facilities, the differences between population means toward the other eight variables representing community college education were deemed significant at the 0.0001 level of probability (Table V). While the attitudes of the two populations toward the nine variables relating to community college education were generally positive, the differences between the mean positive attitudes of the two- year and four-year college administrators were significant.

For the analysis of the difference between two-year college subgroup mean scores, Duncan's Multiple Range Test was utilized. The variance of subgroup means were analyzed for each of the nine variables representing community college education (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "faculty" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 21.647$ ) and two ( $M = 20.111$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 19.552$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "facilities" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 11.706$ ) and three ( $M = 10.207$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 10.722$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

TABLE V  
SUMMARY OF SCHOOL T-TEST

| Variable                |    | School              |                      | t      | Probability |
|-------------------------|----|---------------------|----------------------|--------|-------------|
|                         |    | Two-Year<br>N = 118 | Four-Year<br>N = 281 |        |             |
| Faculty                 | M  | 20.1949             | 14.8470              | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 2.1334              | 2.9034               |        |             |
| Facilities              | M  | 10.7373             | 10.4875              | 0.3468 |             |
|                         | SD | 2.5535              | 2.0426               |        |             |
| Programs                | M  | 25.5678             | 19.2527              | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 2.5736              | 4.1348               |        |             |
| Students                | M  | 12.9153             | 10.6406              | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 1.4940              | 2.1669               |        |             |
| Administration          | M  | 16.2881             | 12.1459              | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 2.8588              | 2.8265               |        |             |
| Institution             | M  | 9.0508              | 5.6797               | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 1.0282              | 1.8450               |        |             |
| Comprehensive<br>Nature | M  | 22.8051             | 19.6690              | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 3.5331              | 3.7072               |        |             |
| Second Class            | M  | 7.0339              | 6.0000               | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 1.8160              | 1.8303               |        |             |
| Other                   | M  | 54.7458             | 40.7153              | 0.0001 | **          |
|                         | SD | 3.8524              | 8.1107               |        |             |

TABLE VI  
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PROCEDURE:  
TWO-YEAR SCHOOLS

| Variable       | Admin.<br>Level | N  | Mean   | Duncan<br>Grouping |
|----------------|-----------------|----|--------|--------------------|
| Faculty        | 1               | 17 | 21.647 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 72 | 20.111 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 29 | 19.552 | B                  |
| Facilities     | 1               | 17 | 11.706 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 72 | 10.722 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 29 | 10.207 | B                  |
| Programs       | 1               | 17 | 27.294 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 72 | 25.444 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 29 | 24.862 | B                  |
| Student        | 1               | 17 | 13.588 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 72 | 13.000 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 29 | 12.310 | B                  |
| Administration | 1               | 17 | 18.235 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 72 | 16.250 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 29 | 15.241 | B                  |
| Institution    | 1               | 17 | 21.647 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 72 | 20.111 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 29 | 19.552 | B                  |

TABLE VI (Continued)

| Variable                | Admin.<br>Level | N  | Mean   | Duncan<br>Grouping |
|-------------------------|-----------------|----|--------|--------------------|
| Comprehensive<br>Nature | 1               | 17 | 21.647 | A                  |
|                         |                 |    |        | A                  |
|                         | 2               | 72 | 20.111 | B A                |
|                         |                 |    |        | B                  |
|                         | 3               | 29 | 19.552 | B                  |
| Second Class            | 1               | 17 | 7.125  | A                  |
|                         |                 |    |        | A                  |
|                         | 2               | 72 | 7.118  | A                  |
|                         |                 |    |        | A                  |
|                         | 3               | 29 | 6.759  | A                  |
| Other                   | 1               | 17 | 56.941 | A                  |
|                         |                 |    |        |                    |
|                         | 2               | 72 | 54.875 | B                  |
|                         |                 |    |        | B                  |
|                         | 3               | 29 | 53.138 | B                  |

Alpha = 0.05; df = 115.

Means with the same letter grouping are not significantly different.

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "programs" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 27.294$ ) and two ( $M = 25.444$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 24.862$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "student" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 13.588$ ) and three ( $M = 12.310$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 13.000$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "administration" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 18.235$ ) and two ( $M = 16.250$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 15.241$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "institution" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 21.647$ ) and three ( $M = 19.552$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 20.111$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "comprehensive nature" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 21.647$ ) and three ( $M = 19.552$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 20.111$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "second class" revealed no significant difference between the attitude scores for administrative levels one ( $M = 7.125$ ), two ( $M = 7.118$ ) and three ( $M = 6.759$ ) at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "other" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 56.941$ ) and two ( $M = 54.875$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 53.138$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VI).



As was utilized for the analysis of the difference between two-year college subgroup mean scores, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test was also employed to analyze the four-year college subgroup scores. The variance of subgroup means were analyzed for each of the nine variables representing community college education (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "faculty" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 17.500$ ) and two ( $M = 15.436$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 14.574$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "facilities" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 11.700$ ) and three ( $M = 10.292$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 11.036$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "programs" showed a significant difference between all administrative levels one ( $M = 23.400$ ) and two ( $M = 20.909$ ), levels one and three ( $M = 18.639$ ), and between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "students" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 12.200$ ) and three ( $M = 10.472$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 11.018$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "administration" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 15.100$ ) and two ( $M = 13.145$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 11.755$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "institution" revealed no significant difference between the attitude scores for administrative levels one ( $M = 6.500$ ), two ( $M = 6.091$ ) and three ( $M = 5.537$ ) at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

TABLE VII  
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE PROCEDURE:  
FOUR-YEAR SCHOOLS

| Variable       | Admin.<br>Level | N   | Mean   | Duncan<br>Grouping |
|----------------|-----------------|-----|--------|--------------------|
| Faculty        | 1               | 10  | 17.500 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 55  | 15.436 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 216 | 14.574 | B                  |
| Facilities     | 1               | 10  | 11.700 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 55  | 11.036 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 216 | 10.292 | B                  |
| Programs       | 1               | 10  | 23.400 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 55  | 20.909 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 216 | 18.639 | C                  |
| Student        | 1               | 10  | 12.200 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 55  | 11.018 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 216 | 10.472 | B                  |
| Administration | 1               | 10  | 15.100 | A                  |
|                | 2               | 55  | 13.145 | B                  |
|                | 3               | 216 | 11.755 | B                  |
| Institution    | 1               | 10  | 6.500  | A                  |
|                | 2               | 55  | 6.091  | A                  |
|                | 3               | 216 | 5.537  | A                  |

TABLE VII (Continued)

| Variable                | Admin.<br>Level | N   | Mean   | Duncan<br>Grouping |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------|--------------------|
| Comprehensive<br>Nature | 1               | 10  | 22.700 | A                  |
|                         | 2               | 55  | 20.255 | B<br>B             |
|                         | 3               | 216 | 19.380 | B                  |
| Second Class            | 1               | 10  | 7.100  | A<br>A             |
|                         | 2               | 55  | 6.473  | B<br>B             |
|                         | 3               | 216 | 5.829  | B                  |
| Other                   | 1               | 10  | 49.300 | A                  |
|                         | 2               | 55  | 44.018 | B                  |
|                         | 3               | 216 | 39.477 | C                  |

Alpha = 0.05; df = 278.

Means with the same letter grouping are not significantly different.

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "comprehensive nature" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 22.700$ ) and two ( $M = 20.255$ ) and between levels one and three ( $M = 19.380$ ), but not between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "second class" showed a significant difference between administrative levels one ( $M = 7.100$ ) and three ( $M = 5.829$ ), but not between levels one and two ( $M = 6.473$ ) and levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

The mean survey scores for the variable labeled "other" showed a significant difference between all administrative levels one ( $M = 49.300$ ) and two ( $M = 44.018$ ), levels one and three ( $M = 39.477$ ), and between levels two and three at the 0.05 alpha level (Table VII).

### Research Hypothesis

In order to analyze the attitudes of academic administrators toward community college education, three major hypotheses and their subrelated hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college education.

As was shown in Table V, the mean scores of the two- and four-year administrative populations on eight of the nine variables representing community college education were deemed significant with a  $t$  probability of 0.0001. Hypothesis 1 was rejected. While both population mean scores showed a favorable disposition toward community college education, the difference in the degree of favorability was statistically significant.

- 1a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college faculty.

Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four- year ( $M = 14.8470$   $SD = 2.9034$ ) and two-year ( $M = 20.1949$   $SD = 2.1334$ ) college administrators toward community college faculty with a t probability of 0.0001. Hypothesis 1a was rejected. While both population mean scores showed a favorable disposition toward community college faculty, the difference in the degree of favorability was statistically significant.

- 1b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college students.

Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 10.6406$   $SD = 2.1669$ ) and two-year ( $M = 12.9153$   $SD = 1.4940$ ) college administrators toward community college students with a t probability of 0.0001. Hypothesis 1b was rejected. While both population mean scores showed a favorable disposition toward community college students, the difference in the degree of favorability was statistically significant.

- 1c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college degree programs.

Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 19.2527$   $SD = 4.1348$ ) and two-year ( $M = 25.5678$   $SD = 2.5736$ ) college administrators toward community college degree programs with a t probability of 0.0001. Hypothesis 1c was rejected. While both population mean scores showed a favorable disposition toward community college programs, the difference in the degree of favorability was statistically significant.

- 1d. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college administration.

Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 12.1459$   $SD = 2.8265$ ) and two-year ( $M = 16.2881$   $SD = 2.8588$ ) college administrators toward community college administration with a t probability of 0.0001. Hypothesis 1d was rejected. While both population mean scores showed a favorable disposition toward community college administration, the difference in the degree of favorability was statistically significant.

- 1e. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year college chief academic administrators, deans, and department heads toward community college facilities.

Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, no significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 10.4875$   $SD = 2.0426$ ) and two-year ( $M = 10.7373$   $SD = 2.5535$ ) college administrators toward community college facilities with a t probability of 0.0001. Based on the results of the t-test, this study fails to reject Hypothesis 1e. While both population mean scores showed a favorable disposition toward community college facilities, the difference in the degree of favorability was not statistically significant.

2. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the three sub-groups of two-year college academic administrators toward community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the three levels of administration for two-year colleges. Of the nine factored variables, significant differences between the administrative levels were noted in eight of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Only the variable termed as "second class" were there found no significant attitudinal mean score differences. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VI), hypothesis 2 was rejected.

- 2a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and division heads regarding community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the two-year college chief academic administrator and division heads regarding community college education. Of the nine factored variables, significant differences between the administrative levels were noted in four of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. The variables termed as "faculty," "programs," "administration," and "other" showed significant attitudinal mean score differences. The variables termed as "facilities," "students," "institution," "comprehensive nature," and "second class" showed no significant attitudinal mean score differences. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VI), hypothesis 2a was rejected.

- 2b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and department heads regarding community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the two-year college chief academic administrator and department heads regarding community college education. Of the nine factored variables, significant differences between the administrative levels were noted in eight of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Only in the variable termed as "second class" were there found no significant attitudinal mean score differences. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VI), hypothesis 2b was rejected.

- 2c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two-year college department heads and division heads regarding community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, no significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the two-year college division heads and department heads. Of the nine factored variables, no significant differences between the administrative levels two and three were noted in any of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Based on

the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VI), this study fails to reject hypothesis 2c.

3. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of the three subgroups of four-year college academic administrators toward community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the three levels of administration for four-year colleges. Of the nine factored variables, significant differences between the administrative levels were noted in eight of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Only the variable termed as "institution" was there found no significant attitudinal mean score differences. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VII), hypothesis 3 was rejected.

3a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of four-year college chief academic administrators and college deans regarding community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VII, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the four-year college chief academic administrator and division heads regarding community college education. Of the nine factored variables, significant differences between the administrative levels were noted in five of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. The variables termed as "faculty," "programs," "administration," "comprehensive nature," and "other" showed significant attitudinal mean score differences. The variables termed as "facilities," "students," "institution," and "second class" showed no significant attitudinal mean score differences. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VII), hypothesis 3a was rejected.

3b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of four-year college chief academic administrators and department heads regarding community college education.



Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VII, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the four-year college chief academic administrator and department heads regarding community college education. Of the nine factored variables, significant differences between the administrative levels were noted in eight of the nine variables at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. Only in the variable termed as "institution" was there found no significant attitudinal mean score difference. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VII), hypothesis 3b was rejected.

3c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of four-year college department heads and college deans regarding community college education.

Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test results reported in Table VII, significant differences in attitude toward community college education exists between the four-year college division heads and department heads regarding community college education. Of the nine factored variables, two showed significant differences between the administrative levels at the 0.05 alpha level of significance. The factored variables termed "programs" and "other" showed significant differences in attitude toward community college education. Based on the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table VII), hypothesis 3c was rejected.

### Summary

The three research hypotheses and their related hypotheses proposed for study in the first chapter, were addressed in Chapter IV. The analysis of the attitudinal data generated by the two populations assessed for this study was presented. Based on the analysis of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education articulation policy and the analysis of the state-wide survey results, the following chapter will concentrate on presenting the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this study.

## CHAPTER V

### FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess and compare attitudes of community and senior college chief academic administrators, deans/division heads, and department heads toward community college education through the use and analysis of the Junior College Attitude Survey (James, 1969) as a means of improving interinstitutional articulation. This research instrument was selected for use in the study because of its applicability to the chosen populations and its high level of reliability in previous studies. Of the two academic administration populations representing Oklahoma's 27 public institutions, over 80 percent responded to the mail survey. The two-year college population consisted of 140 individuals who were identified by their institution's academic affairs office as meeting one of the three academic administrative levels (e.g., chief academic administrators, division heads, and/or department heads). The four-year college population consisted of 351 individuals who were identified by their institutions' academic affairs office as meeting one of the three academic administrative levels (e.g., chief academic administrators, undergraduate college deans/division heads, and/or department heads).

The analysis of the data generated by the research instrument yielded the following results. It was found that while both academic populations had a favorable attitude toward community college education, significant differences exist between the degree of favorability. In addition, significant differences exist between the administrative levels of each population suggesting that the further an administrator is

removed from the faculty and/or students, the more positive is his or her attitude toward community college education.

It is hoped that an awareness of the difference in the level of attitudinal disposition toward community college education will lead state governing boards and higher education academic administrators to develop transfer policies and application processes which will be empathetic to the needs of the transferring students, cognizant of the difference in attitudes present in the policy makers, and aware of the multiple missions for which the community college has become responsible.

The two-year college has played an integral role in the egalitarian mission of American higher education by the general public. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, American higher education was viewed as a privilege and only the privileged class was allowed to benefit. The idea of privilege and the autonomous instructional rights of the higher education institution was accepted by the general society as appropriate. Since the 1960s, societal attitudes have dramatically changed (Bender, 1990). No longer is higher education a matter of privilege, but rather an integral part of the promise of the American Dream. The idea that anyone can be or do anything they desire if they work hard normally implies if not assumes, a level of higher educational attainment. As has been cited in Chapters I and II, the majority of the general population has gained entrance to higher education through the open doors of the community college. For many states, Oklahoma included, "open access" to higher education is defined as the two-year college. According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Policy Statement on *The Articulation Of Students Among Institutions In The Oklahoma State System Of Higher Education*,

One of the primary goals of the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is to provide access at some public institution for all Oklahoma citizens whose interests and abilities qualify them for admission. Given the large number of individuals who annually seek admission to the State System, it is recognized that no single institution can physically accommodate the total student body, nor can any institutional type meet the diverse needs and demands of all the students for various kinds of educational programs. Therefore, each institution and each institutional type has been assigned a specialized role within the total State System, in order that all qualified individuals may be accommodated at some institution, although not necessarily at the institution of first choice (OSRHE, 1992a, p. 3-J).

According to Nutter (1974), the development of public two-year college education in Oklahoma began in 1901 with the founding of University Preparatory School at Tonkawa which was to eventually become Northern Oklahoma College. Seven institutions were founded in 1908, one in 1909, and one in 1919 which were destined to become junior colleges. The University Preparatory School was the first to be accredited as a junior college in 1920:

The first state supported junior colleges were dependent on funds from the state, usually served a fairly well-defined region, and were designed for special types of schooling. The early municipal junior colleges were financed and operated by public school districts, usually in shared high school facilities. The University Preparatory School at Tonkawa, created in 1901 by legislative action, is the oldest state supported institution which was to become a junior college, and Muskogee Junior College, founded in 1920, is the oldest municipal junior college in the state (Nutter, pp. 14-15).

The development of the two-year college in Oklahoma had many of the same driving forces which had driven the first two-year college at Joliet Junior College in 1901 (Nutter, 1974). Junior colleges in Oklahoma, as was the case elsewhere, were developed as an additional two years of high school (Gabert, 1991). They were created to augment an inferior public school college preparatory program (Nutter, 1974). While the two-year college in Oklahoma may have been created as a possible solution to inadequate public education, legislative directives noted that the seven original junior colleges were established "as preparatory toward two years of traditional college work" (Nutter, 1974, p. 26). The collegiate function of the two-year college in Oklahoma was thus established early in its development.

According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education *Student Data Report: Oklahoma Higher Education 1988-89* (1990a), "The majority of first-time entering freshmen, 61 percent, continue to enter two-year institutions. Four-year institutions receive 22 percent and comprehensive universities receive the remaining 17 percent" (p. 3). In light of the large proportion of first-time freshmen beginning their post-secondary education at the two-year college level, comprehensive articulation policies should allow for the easy transfer of credits within the system of higher education. In a 1990 Oklahoma State Regents' publication entitled, *Oklahoma Higher Education . . . An*

*Overview*, the building of a quality "system" of Oklahoma higher education is referred to several times. This "system" includes 12 senior baccalaureate degree-granting institutions and 15 two-year associates degree-granting public institutions.

The Oklahoma state articulation policy has been cited by several noted authorities as one of the better statewide transfer articulation policies on record (Kintzer, 1973; Bender, 1990). While the Oklahoma articulation policy sounds very comprehensive, the underlying focus remains on institutional autonomy and not on student progression (see Appendix C). The articulation policy in Oklahoma focuses on the thirty-seven semester-credit-hour general education requirement and allows for the individual institutional interpretation of additional credit hour application toward a receiving institution's baccalaureate degree program. This almost total freedom on the part of the receiving institution and/or academic department to evaluate the minimal 23 hours additional credit required for an associate degree to a level of attitudinal subjectivity. While the State Regents' articulation policy makes it clear that no guarantee of choice is implied in the policy statement, there is also no guarantee that credits obtained at a two-year institution beyond the general education requirements will be accepted for anything more than an elective credit.

According to Louis Bender, a former state community college system director and noted scholar on the community college,

A reading of state policies reveals an attitudinal posture worthy of note as well. Legislative resolutions dealing with transfer and articulation will, almost without exception, reflect a concern for the students' interest, sometimes to the detriment of traditions or values cherished by colleges and universities. In sharp contrast, the interest of institutions can often be found in policies developed by state coordinating agencies or voluntary institutional organizations (1990, p. ix).

The underview of this line of reasoning is, "what is the function of the 'system' of higher education?" or "who does the system serve?" Based on the review of literature and on the results of this attitudinal study, if the function of the system was to create a "class system" and serve the traditions of the "privileged," then a fraternal order has been preserved. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Articulation Policy

is not a bad start, but it just that, a start. Without the dedication to student articulation on the part of each individual higher education institution (two- and four-year), "... the articulation agreements may not be worth the paper on which they were written" (Bernstein, 1986, p. 39).

According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education *1988-89 Student Data Report*,

In the fall 1988, 48.5 percent of the transfer students went to four-year institutions and 51.5 percent went to two-year institutions. In the fall of 1987, the distribution was 49 and 51 percent, respectively. There was also not much change in the percentage of transfer students who moved from two-year to four-year institutions in the fall of 1988, 29.2 percent. In 1987, 31 percent transferred from two-year to four-year institutions (1990a, p. 97).

Following the review of Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education transfer data, very little can be gained as to the percentage of two- to four-year college student transfers and how transfer is defined. Transfer in Oklahoma appears to be defined as any student (part-time or full-time) who moves from one Oklahoma institution to another regardless of institutional type and regardless of how many credit hours were earned (1, 2, 20, or 60 hours). What minimal data does exist does not give cause for comfort: according to the Oklahoma State Regents' *Admission Policy Impact Study*, enrollment within the state system of higher education and the two-year college tier increased by 5.8 and 13.4 percent, respectively, from fall 1986 to fall 1991 (1992b, Appendix B). During this same period while transfers from two-year colleges (using the Regents' definition) to four-year public colleges and universities increased by 16.7 percent, transfers to the state's two comprehensive universities—Oklahoma State University and University of Oklahoma—actually declined by 8.9 percent (OSRHE, 1992b). While the Oklahoma State Regents compile a large amount of institutional data, practical usage of these data is hampered because of the inability to compare such data to regional and/or national criterion-based norms.

This lack of usable data reiterates the need for developing a definition for transfer students. Lumping all transfers together and then giving percentages of that total does little to gauge the effectiveness of the articulation system of higher education in

egalitarian access. According to Dr. Arthur M. Cohen and The Transfer Assembly, to obtain comparable data, transfer rate should be defined as

... all students entering the two-year college in a given year who have no prior college experience and who complete at least 12 college credit units, divided into the number of that group who take one or more classes at a university within four years (Cohen, 1991, p. 3).

The rationale for which community college students should be included in the calculation of the transfer rate was offered by Cohen:

What should the definition include? The denominator should include only those students who complete some minimum number of college credit units at the two-year college and have been enrolled long enough for the college staff to have had a chance to work with them. It should allow at least a four-year span between community college entrance and transfer in order to accommodate the educational careers of part-time students. And it should be based on data that can be feasibly compiled at the college because if the transfer rate is to have any meaning for the college staff, they must be able to combine their own student records with the information they obtain from receiving institutions (Cohen, 1991, p. 3).

With virtually no practically usable Oklahoma transfer documentation to rely on, national figures which have been covered in the review of literature will be the basis of this chapter.

While no short-cut panacea will be offered in the text of this chapter, the following findings were discovered, and the following conclusions and recommendations are offered. Due to the focused scope of this study, no attempt should be made to generalize the findings of this descriptive study to a broader population of other states, private institutions, or college personnel other than those operationally defined as academic administrators at the 27 public two- and four-year colleges as recognized by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

### Findings

Based on the results of the attitude survey, in general there was a favorable attitude toward community college education by both the two-year college academic administrators and the four-year college academic administrators involved in the

study (Table IV). The degree to which the favorability was exhibited, by the mean scale scores as well as the t-test, showed a significant difference between the two groups. The results of the factor analysis of the survey items further quantified the uniqueness of these populations as compared to those assessed in previous studies. The two populations' attitude survey scores on the nine factored variables of community college education (faculty, facilities, programs, students, administration, institution, comprehensive nature, second class, and other), all showed a significant difference in degree of favorability (Table IV). The two-year college academic administrators, as demonstrated by their mean group scores, showed a much more favorable attitude toward the individual facets describing community college education than did their senior college counterparts.

The following findings relate to the three research hypotheses presented in Chapter I:

1. There is a significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college education. As was reported in Table V, the mean attitude scores of the public two-year and four-year college academic administrators in Oklahoma were deemed significantly different at the 0.0001 probability level. In general, these differences in attitude account for at least part of the barriers to effective interinstitutional articulation:

Articulation must be recognized as a series of processes, transfer being one of them. The total activity—the relationship—is also an attitude. No matter how beautiful the paper model, success of the responsibility to serve transfer students is strongly dependent on the support and understanding of faculty and staff of both sending and receiving institutions. The problem is largely people-oriented (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985, p. 43).

2. There is a significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college faculty. Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 14.8470$ ,  $SD = 2.9034$ ) and two-year ( $M = 20.1949$ ,  $SD = 2.1334$ ) college administrators toward community college faculty at the 0.0001 level of probability. These findings are consistent with the reviewed literature and previous studies



relating to negative stereotyped attitudes on the part of four-year college staff toward community college faculty (James, 1969; Zwerling, 1976; Rice, 1976; Nazari-Robati, 1981). The negative attitudes toward community college faculty were based on the perception that two-year college faculty were less qualified to teach transfer-oriented programs than their four-year faculty counterparts (Nazari-Robati, 1976). Of the nearly 275,000 faculty members currently teaching in two-year colleges in the United States, over 60 percent teach part-time and are considered adjunct (Gabert, 1991). This reliance on adjunct faculty has likely added to the perception that two-year college faculty are less qualified than their four-year college counterparts.

3. There is a significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college students. Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 10.6406$ ,  $SD = 2.1669$ ) and two-year ( $M = 12.9153$ ,  $SD = 1.4940$ ) college administrators toward community college students at the 0.0001 level of probability. This significant difference in attitude, at least in part, contributes to the "open access" mission which has been given to the two-year college (Cohen & Brawer, 1989; OSRHE, 1992c). The inability of the two-year college to select its students on the basis of an accepted discriminating criterion has fostered many of the negative attitudes toward the two-year college student. Regardless of the vast diversity and individuality of the two-year college student, because of a mission requiring open access and a thirty-year move emphasizing vocationalization, the negative, substandard composite depiction of the student remains apparent (Astin, 1983; Brint & Karabel, 1989). With the academic preparation and potential of the two-year college student being so diverse, the fact remains that the percentage of low-ability students as determined by standardized test scores and high school grade point averages, remains higher at two-year colleges than at four-year colleges (Gabert, 1991).

4. There is a significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college degree programs. Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists

between four-year ( $M = 19.2527$ ,  $SD = 4.1348$ ) and two-year ( $M = 25.5678$ ,  $SD = 2.5736$ ) college administrators toward community college degree programs at the 0.0001 level of probability. This was exemplified in the literature review with the illustration that the majority of receiving institutions commonly reject "D" grades from sending institutions while granting credit for "D" grades earned by their native students (Cohen & Brawer, 1989).

5. There is a significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college administration. Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, a significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 12.1459$ ,  $SD = 2.8265$ ) and two-year ( $M = 16.2881$ ,  $SD = 2.8588$ ) college administrators toward community college administration at the 0.0001 level of probability. Many of the negative attitudes toward community college administration originated in the initial development of the two-year college. According to Monroe (1972), from their earliest beginnings, the curricular and administrative philosophies of the two-year college found their roots in the public school system. This strong association with the public school system has likely provided further impetus to the alienation of the two-year college from the mainstream of higher education, and has served to reinforce their hierarchical position and perceived second class status.

6. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college facilities. Based on the findings of the t-test reported in Table V, no significant difference in attitude exists between four-year ( $M = 10.4875$ ,  $SD = 2.0426$ ) and two-year ( $M = 10.7373$ ,  $SD = 2.5535$ ) college administrators toward community college facilities at the 0.0001 level of probability. Possibly because of the current age and general condition of the physical plants in all of the tiers of Oklahoma higher education and the pending higher education facilities bond issue, no significant differences in attitudes were ascertained from the survey results.

7. There are significant differences in the attitudes of two-year college administrators toward community college education. Based on the findings of the

Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude exists between the three levels of administration for two-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level. It was apparent that as the administrator moved up the administrative ladder (e.g., department head to division head to chief academic administrator), the attitudes toward community college education and its related factors became more positive.

8. There are significant differences in the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and division heads toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude exists between the two cited levels of administration for two-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level.

9. There are significant differences in the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and department heads toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, significant differences in attitude exists between the two cited levels of administration for two-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level.

10. There are no significant differences in the attitudes of two-year college division heads and department heads toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VI, no significant differences in attitude exists between the two cited levels of administration for two-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level. This lack of significant difference of attitude between these two administrative levels might be attributed to the small number of individuals within the two-year colleges designated as department heads. The most common administrative structure utilized in the two-year college merged the responsibilities of the department head and the college dean into one administrative level. This merger of duties may account for the similarity of attitudes toward community college education between these two administrative levels.

11. There are significant differences in the attitudes of four-year college administrators toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VII, significant differences in attitude

exist between the three levels of administration for four-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level. It was apparent that as the administrator moved up the administrative ladder (e.g., department head to college dean/division head to chief academic administrator), the attitudes toward community college education and its related factors became more positive.

12. There are significant differences in the attitudes of two-year college chief academic administrators and college deans toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VII, significant differences in attitude exist between the two cited levels of administration for four-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level.

13. There are significant differences in the attitudes of four-year college chief academic administrators and department heads toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VII, significant differences in attitude exist between the two cited levels of administration for four-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level.

14. There are no significant differences in the attitudes of four-year college deans and department heads toward community college education. Based on the findings of the Duncan's Multiple Range test reported in Table VII, no significant differences in attitude exist between the two cited levels of administration for four-year colleges at the 0.05 alpha level. The results of the demographic section of the survey indicated that only slight differences existed between the two levels of academic administration in regard to level of educational attainment and years in current administrative position. This similarity in demographics between the department heads and college deans could partially explain the lack of significance in regard to their attitudes toward community college education between the two administrative levels.

There were several other related findings which emerged during the course of the study, which, while not specifically directed by the three research hypotheses, are worthy of note:

1. Of the four-year college respondents, 31 made comments concerning the difficulty they had in developing a composite community college student, institution, facility, program, and/or administrator from which to base their responses to the survey items. Many of the comments concerned the diversity among and between two-year college students, faculties, programs, facilities, and administrations. Considering both well prepared and poorly prepared students, full-time and adjunct faculty, two-year college "A" transfer program to two-year college "B" transfer program, facilities, and administrators, the respondents' ability to create a single composite of any of the factors was extremely compromised.

2. Several four-year college respondents commented that they had no idea as to which students were native and which were transfer students. Most of these comments related to a faculty's lack of accessible demographic information on their students. Most of the respondents who made such comments went on to mention the value of such relevant information.

3. From one two-year college, two division heads made conflicting commentary regarding their view of their institution's transfer function. One stated that they would complete the survey, but that "transfer" was not a part of their two-year college's mission. From the same institution, another administrator spoke of the "great strides" their institution had made in developing interinstitutional articulation relationships.

4. Ten two-year college respondents commented on the difference in per capita expenditures between two- and four-year colleges as relating to the differences in quality. These comments related to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education statistics showing over 40 percent of the public higher education credit hour production coming from the two-year colleges and over 60 percent of the first-time entering freshman starting at the two-year institution (OSRHE, 1990a). The argument from the two-year college administrators regarded the discrepancy between the two-year colleges' share of the Oklahoma higher education budget and their share of the responsibility to educate the majority of first-time students.

5. Seventeen two-year and five four-year college respondents addressed the lack of emphasis placed on teaching at all higher education institutions. Many of these noted the heavy use of graduate teaching assistants at the four-year college level and the "over reliance" of two-year colleges on adjunct faculty. The argument rested in the perceived loss of priority for teaching in Oklahoma's public higher education institutions. These respondents believed that at the four-year college, quality teaching takes a second place to research; at the two-year college, quality teaching takes a second place to quantity teaching through the use of adjuncts.

6. It was discovered in both two- and four-year populations that as the administrator moved from department head to division head/dean, and then to chief academic administrator, the attitudes toward the community college became more positive. This finding could be the result of a distancing from the community college factor and/or greater association with institutional administrative counterparts. This finding could also be the result of an enhanced understanding that senior-level administrators may have within each population regarding the concept that different institutions can possess vastly different missions and functions which are equally valid.

### Conclusions

On the basis of the previous findings, the following conclusions can be reached:

1. There are obvious differences in the degree of favorability depicted in the attitudes of two- and four-year academic administrators toward community college education. These differences may be a major factor in the negative evaluation of transfer credit between two- and four-year institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 1989) and at least a portion of the lessening of the effectiveness of the Oklahoma State Regents' for Higher Education Articulation policy. Other mitigating factors should be considered within the context of low transfer rates. The decline of the community college transfer function since the introduction of the two-year college could also be viewed as an issue in assessing the attitudes toward community colleges and the small percentage of two-

year college students who eventually transfer to four-year colleges. The role of the differences in attitudes toward the education students receive at community colleges on the part of academic administrators could determine the eventual success or failure of statewide and/or interinstitutional transfer articulation plans (Ernst, 1978).

2. Attitudinal barriers to transfer/articulation, as displayed in the significant differences in the degree of favorability on the part of the academic administrators involved in the evaluation of transfer credit, may limit the accessibility of a baccalaureate education to those students accessing higher education at the two-year college level. According to Cohen and Brawer (1989), "For most students in two-year institutions, the choice is not between the community college and a senior residential institution; it is between the community college and nothing" (p. 47).

3. Because of the vast differences discovered between the intra-level administrative attitudes at two-year as well as at four-year institutions, an apparent lack of communication between administrative levels as to priority of two-year college transfer mission, the tracking of two-year college students following transfer, and a lack of institutional commitment to intra-institutional transfer mission appears to be occurring. The apparent enhanced understanding that senior-level administrators may have within each population regarding the concept that different institutions can possess vastly different missions and functions which are equally valid must be communicated to all administrative levels as well as throughout the higher education system. From a national perspective, institutions with successful transfer programs promote transfer as a high priority. In a study of academic partnerships between two- and four-year colleges participating in the ACE/Ford Foundation/NCAAT sponsored grant program, four common transfer related concerns were noted:

Transfer data collection and analysis campus needs to be strengthened. Effectiveness measures to determine the success of transfer efforts need to be established. Institutional data collection should not be hampered by state or other external system demands. The institution needs to realize that Academic Model efforts are intended as long-term, systemic changes in institutional functioning (Eaton, 1992, p. 5).

As Berman et al. (1990) note, attitudes do matter: "At colleges with high transfer effectiveness, administrators, faculty, and support staff shared the belief that transfer is a high priority mission" (p. 36). It will be the challenge of Oklahoma's system of 27 publicly controlled two- and four-year colleges and universities to effectuate policies and programs that make accessible higher education meaningful in fact and reality and not just on paper.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings and conclusions of the study:

1. Additional research is needed to assess attitudes of academic support personnel toward the community college transfer student. At many institutions, subordinates, often secretaries and unit administrators/administrative assistants who may not themselves possess the associate and/or baccalaureate degree, are the institutional representatives who make the initial contact with the prospective transfer student. These subordinates may include the staff who evaluate transcripts for admissions and transfer, admissions staff, recruiters, and telephone receptionists. Transfer and articulation is a fragile plan from which the student may view the initial contact with support personnel as exhibiting the attitude of the entire institution.

2. In addition, research is needed to ascertain the attitudinal disposition of academic administrators at private institutions toward community college education. While the public institutional study takes into account the majority of the transferring students in Oklahoma, several private two- and four-year colleges contribute to the overall transfer articulation picture.

3. An intra-institutional study to assess the attitudes of faculty toward community college transfer by college and academic department. Based on several comments made by four-year college respondents on the survey instrument, assessing attitudes toward community college education by college and/or department would be of benefit to developing better degree program articulation agreements. One



respondent's comments related to the ability of a two-year college student to transfer liberal arts courses without any future ramifications, but questioned the quality and subsequent transfer of two-year college science and math curriculums as building blocks for tougher four-year college programs. For this reason such a study would be useful.

4. A study to compare the attitudes of four-year college native students to transfer students regarding community college education could also be of use in determining the inherent nature, or origins, of the vast difference in attitudes toward junior college education present in the study. Regardless of the ability to extrapolate implications of attitudes toward community college education from literature reviews or research studies, first-hand knowledge of the transfer process and/or articulation plans would be helpful in validating indirect research studies.

5. Because of the limited nature of the Oklahoma populations used in this attitudinal study, a national sample of chief academic administrators, division heads/college deans, and department heads should be assessed as to their attitudes toward community college education in order to broaden the generalizability of the results.

6. A study should be made of the inter-institutional agreements which have been made between two- and four-year colleges in order to compile and catalog relevant plans for an accessible transfer resource center. This would allow higher education practitioners to access possible solutions to barriers restricting effective articulation and transfer, while avoiding further duplication of unsuccessful articulation and transfer agreement plans.

### Concluding Remarks

While researching the literature to support this study, several structural barriers to mitigating the negative effects of attitudes emerged. One of those barriers was related to the political nature of higher education funding in Oklahoma. The long-term turf battles (for dollars, students, etc.) have placed barriers to the fostering of collaborative

interinstitutional articulation. According to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, all of the institutions of higher education make up the state system. Beyond a centralized coordinating board, very little actually takes place which would lend itself to a "family" system rather than to a mere collection of colleges. Romine (1975) found that without the ingredient of articulation, there was no system of higher education. More typically, Oklahoma institutions seem to regard each other as required partners rather than team members.

Following the analysis of several transfer related Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education reports and policy statements, a more balanced emphasis is needed which focuses on the transferring student as well as the autonomy of the institutions. With over 60 percent of the first-time entering freshmen beginning at a two-year college (OSRHE, 1990a) and less than 25 percent of two-year college students actually transferring (Bender, 1990), what level of opportunity or choice have we actually given to the majority of the Oklahoma two-year college students? Public policymakers in Oklahoma should be concerned about any data that would indicate an increasingly hierarchical, less accessible system. That the rate of first-time entering freshman in public colleges and universities in Oklahoma the fall following high school graduation declined from 42.07 to 39.58 percent, or numerically expressed from 14,495 to 13,242 students from fall 1986 to fall 1991, respectively, should not be a cause of comfort for faculty, administrators, trustee/regents, and state legislators. Further, that the rate of transfer from the state's two-year tier (employing the state regents own unique definition of transfer) to its two research universities, Oklahoma State University and the University of Oklahoma, declined by 8.79 percent from fall 1986 to fall 1990. These figures would appear to indicate a move towards a more hierarchical system with standardized tests being utilized to accomplish the student sorting (OSRHE, 1992b, p. 6 ; Appendix F). It is highly arguable that Oklahoma will be able to meet the economic, social, and cultural challenges of a new century with a diminishing percentage of well educated citizens as determined by the level of educational attainment.

This study strongly recommends that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education undertake, for the first time in their fifty-year history, a comprehensive study of transfer and articulation based on nationally recognized transfer rate definitions. Such studies should involve experts/scholars in the field of community college education. The current definition used by the Oklahoma State Regents, which recognizes students who take any number of hours at a community college as transfers should they later enroll at a four year institution, is not recognized by any of the national studies (Cohen, 1991; Palmer, 1991; Eaton 1992) and is of little practical use at the institutional level for transfer management. Such a study could be modeled after the excellent comprehensive studies that have been performed since the early 1980s by the Illinois Community College Board.

The review of the literature clearly demonstrated that no nationally accepted transfer rate definition is currently being utilized to enable the Oklahoma State Regents or the 27 institutions to gauge their transfer effectiveness. Practitioners at two-year colleges in Oklahoma find the most useful data related to transfer to be studies and reports furnished from time to time by the receiving institutions. These reports can be systematized employing a commonly accepted transfer rate definition that could be developed by a coordinating transfer board made up of representatives from both two- and four-year institutions (Bernstein, 1986). Each institution would then be responsible for generating information on the demographics of the transferring student and four-year institutions would be responsible for providing their two-year counterparts with needed data as to how their students performed after transfer. According to Cohen, "... to obtain the needed information, two-year institutions must agree on a definition of a transfer student and collect data every year to support that definition" (quoted in Watkins, 1990, p. A38).

Beyond the need for a transfer rate definition, transfer/articulation success stories and their plans should be collected to coordinate the system approach to higher education and possibly limit the collaborative problems typically associated with a hierarchical higher education structure.

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education should also develop a clearing-house for the dissemination of two- and four-year college articulation agreements which can be made readily available to two-year college students at the time of initial enrollment. In defining articulation, Ernst (1978) noted,

This coordination requires the institution to provide each incoming and transferring student an effective transition from one institution to another with consideration for: (1) the student's prior and subsequent courses of study; (2) the student's need for information concerning procedures and practices of the new environment; and (3) the student's financial needs (p. 32).

One of the most comprehensive programs to ensure ease of transfer and efficient dissemination of pertinent information to transfer students has been developed at Miami-Dade Community College in Florida. Their utilization of a computerized transcript evaluation system allows a student to instantly discover course equivalents at any of Florida's public institutions upon initial enrollment at the community college (Gabert, 1991). According to this scheme, which is described in great detail in the book *Access With Excellence* (Rouche & Baker, 1987), students enrolling at the community college first determine which specific degree at a public or private four-year institution they would like to receive. A computer-generated course of study is instantaneously generated which lists each and every required course needed at both institutions in order to achieve the baccalaureate degree. Students are able to take responsibility for their own learning because they have full access to the specific kind of information needed to make a successful transfer. Additionally, the state of Florida saves money by avoiding unnecessary duplication and repeating of courses.

Both two- and four-year colleges should make a high priority commitment to transfer. This will require two-year colleges to emphasize the collegiate missions of their institutions and the four-year colleges to develop collaborative relationships with two-year colleges. Ernst (1978) notes that "... proper attitude accepts the fact that legitimate and creditable education can be attained at institutions other than one's own. It recognized the universality of educational experiences and the professional competence of colleagues" (p. 33). These new transfer priorities must be matched with monetary and hard-dollar full-time staffing commitments. For these priorities to

become realities, the vision must be shared beginning with board-approved mission statements, to presidential directives, and finally to goal-oriented transfer committees comprised of faculty and staff:

A review of the literature reveals that in some instances administrators and teachers may lack a basic understanding of the meaning of articulation, even though the concept of articulation has been discussed in the educational community for many years (Edwards et al., 1989, p.33).

Because negative attitudes have contributed to a more limited transferability of credits, incentive-laden collaboration should be fostered by both the two- and four-year college (Koltai, 1982). This collaborative effort should not begin and end with the administrative levels. Departmental connections should be established to ensure disciplinary program compatibility. Specific departmental transfer goals should be established and direct responsibility for the achievement of those goals assigned.

The final remark is related to an apparent lack of priority emphasis on the part of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education toward inter-institutional articulation and the transfer of students between higher education tiers. This lack of priority may be evident in the lack of presence of a senior level Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education administrator with the responsibility for facilitating inter-institutional articulation and other collaborative efforts. The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education should demonstrate its leadership in promoting transfer and social justice by creating a position at the level of vice chancellor to monitor and facilitate inter-institutional articulation activities. A call for assuming responsibility for such an egalitarian cause was noted by Zwerling (1986) when he addressed the need for effective articulation plans:

... a more equitable system would be designed to assist individuals to progress. Rather than offering a hierarchy made up of relatively imperious layers, an equitable system would present a continuous, seamless configuration of offerings in which success at one level would mean direct access to the next (p. 57).

This study attempted to assess the attitudes of two- and four-year college academic administrators in the 27 public Oklahoma institutions of higher education. While the case has been made for the pivotal role administrators play in the

development and application of transfer articulation agreements and the role that attitudes play in the success or failure of articulation policies, other factors such as the overall decline of the transfer mission must also be considered when developing policies.

It is hoped that an awareness of the difference in the level of attitudinal disposition toward community college education will lead state governing boards and higher education academic administrators to develop transfer policies and application processes which will be empathetic to the needs of the transferring students. These policies and processes should be cognizant of the difference in observable attitudes present among practitioners who make transfer decisions, and should properly account for the multiple, equally valid missions for which the two-year college has become responsible.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, A. W. (1982). *Minorities in American education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1983). Strengthening transfer programs. *Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era*, 122-138.
- Banks, D. (1990). Why a consistent definition of transfer? An ERIC Review. *Community College Review*, 18 (2), 47-53.
- Banks, D. (1990). Why the concern about transfer performance and how should it be assessed? Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education*, Portland, OR, 1-18.
- Bender, L. W. (Ed.) (1990). *Spotlight on the transfer function: A national study of state policies and practices*. AACJC.
- Berman, P., Curry, J., Nelson, B., & Weiler, D. (Eds.) (1990). *Enhancing transfer effectiveness: A model for the 1990's*. AACJC.
- Bernstein, A. (1986). The devaluation of transfer: Current explanations and possible causes. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 14 (2), 31-40.
- Birenbaum, W. M. (1986). From mass to class in higher education. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 14 (2), 3-12.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brubaker, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transaction: A history of American colleges and Universities, 1636-1968*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cohen, A. M. (1989). What next for the community colleges? An ERIC review. *Community College Review*, 17 (2), 53-58.
- Cohen, A. M. (1991). Deriving a valid transfer rate. *A model for deriving the transfer rate: Report of the transfer assembly project (Monograph)*. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1-15.

- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1982). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: Wiley.
- Donovan, R. A., Schaier-Peleg, B., & Forer, B. (Eds.) (1987). Closing the gap: Productive collaboration between two- and four-year colleges. *Transfer: Making It Work—A Community College Report*, AACJC, 7-12.
- Eaton, J. S. (1988). *Colleges of choice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eaton, J. S. (1992). *Faculty and transfer: Academic partnerships at work*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Edwards, G., Leonard, R., & Southerland, A. R. (1989). Measuring articulation. *Community/Junior College Quarterly of Research and Practice*, 13 (1), 33-43.
- Ernst, R. J. (1978). Articulation: A working definition. *Community College Review*, 5 (4), 32-34.
- Fields, R. R. (1962). *The community college movement*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gabert, G. (1991). *Community colleges in the 1990's*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Gay, L. R. (1987). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (1968). *This is the community college*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hammons, J., Thomas, W., & Ward, S. (1980). General education in the community college. *Community College Frontiers*, 8 (3), 22-28.
- Hobbs, Dan S. (1986). *Oklahoma Demographics: Myths and realities*. Unpublished report, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.
- Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds Jr., W. G. (1974). *Reading statistics and research*. New York: Harper and Row.
- James, G. A. (1969). *The assessment of attitudes of Illinois public high school counselors toward the junior college*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Karabel, J. (1972). Community colleges and social stratification: Submerged class conflict in American higher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 42 (4), 521-561.



- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioral research* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kintzer, F. C., & Wattenbarger, J. L. (1985). *The articulation/transfer phenomenon: Patterns and directions*. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.
- Kintzer, F. C. (1973). *Middleman in higher education: Improving articulation among high school, community college and senior institutions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Koltai, L. (1982). General education and the transfer function. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 10 (4), 99-107.
- Menacker, J. (1975). *From school to college: Articulation and transfer*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Monroe, C. R. (1972). *Profile of the community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Center for Education Statistics (1991). *Digest of education statistics: 1991*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Nazari-Robati, A. (1981). *A study of academic administrators of junior and senior institutions of higher education toward junior college education, for the purpose of improving articulation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Nolan, E. J., & Paradise, L. V. (1979). An overview of community college counseling. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 20, 398-402.
- Nutter, L. W. (1974). *A history of junior colleges in Oklahoma*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1992a). *April 24, 1992, Agenda*.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1992b). *Admission policy impact study*.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1992c). *May 29, 1992, Agenda*.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1992d). *June 29, 1992, Agenda*.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1990a). *Student data report: Oklahoma higher education 1989-90*.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1990b). *Social justice in Oklahoma higher education*.

- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (1990c). *Oklahoma higher education. . . . An Overview.*
- Palmer, J. (1986). Source and information: The social role of the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 14 (2), 101-113.
- Palmer, J., & Reish, J. (1991). The process: Gathering data for transfer. *A model for deriving the transfer rate: Report of the transfer assembly project (Monograph)*. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 17-25.
- Parker, G. G. (1975). Career education and transfer program enrollments in two-year colleges, 1974-75. *The American College Testing Program.*
- Rice, O. W. (1976). *An analysis of attitudes of full-time teaching faculty in six Oklahoma state universities toward junior college education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
- Richardson, R. C., Jr., Fisk, E. C., & Okun, M. A. (1983). *Literacy in the open-access college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Romine, S. (1975). Articulation: The continuing challenge. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 23 (3), 157-159.
- Roueche, J. E., & Baker, III, G. A. (1987). *Access and excellence.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Sherif, C. W., Sherif, M., & Nebergall, R. E. (1965). *Attitude and attitude change.* Philadelphia: W. B. Sanders Co.
- Segner, K. B. (1974). Students resist occupational segmentation. *Community College Review*, 1 (3), 4-28.
- Triandis, H. C. (1971). *Attitude and attitude change.* New York: Wiley.
- Watkins, B. T. (1990). Consistent information on transfer rates sought for community colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36 (28), A38.
- Yeilding, D. (1987). General education requirement for community colleges accredited by the southern association. *Community College Review*, 15 (2), 45-49.
- Zwerling, S. L. (1986). Lifelong learning: A new form of tracking. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 14 (2), 53-60.
- Zwerling, S. L. (1976). *Second best: The crisis of the community college.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

**APPENDIX A**

**RESEARCH INSTRUMENT**

## JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY

### Instructions for Marking Responses

The following questionnaire is designed to provide a measure of your attitudes and beliefs concerning a number of aspects of junior and community colleges.

Please read each item carefully and place an X under the letter which most nearly indicates your true feelings. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any particular item. When your attitude falls between choices, try to select the closer one. Please answer every item and erase completely the answers you have changed.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| EXAMPLE: Socially immature college-age students should attend junior colleges. | SD    D    U    A    SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
|--|--|

SD = Strongly Disagree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

A = Agree

SA = Strongly Agree

If you strongly disagree with an item, place an X under the letters SD.

If you disagree with an item, place an X under the letters D.

Place an X under the letter U if you feel undecided about the item.

Place an X under the letter A if you agree with an item.

Place an X under the letter SA if you strongly agree with an item.

Please attach an extra sheet at the end of the questionnaire for any comments you care to make regarding junior colleges or this questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this very important study.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Students get a lower quality of education in a junior college than they get in a four-year college or university. | SD    D    U    A    SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 2. The administrators of junior colleges are usually bright, dynamic, and highly competent leaders.                  | SD    D    U    A    SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 3. Junior college teachers are not as interested in their professional development as teachers in other colleges and universities. | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 4. The junior college serves chiefly the inept and unable student.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 5. Junior colleges are for the dumb rich and the bright poor.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 6. The facilities of the junior college compare unfavorably with those of four-year colleges.                                      | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 7. Junior colleges appear to have a good understanding of the needs of their students.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 8. The administrative behavior of public school administration has become the pattern of community college administration.         | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 9. The opportunities for participation in extra-curricular activities are very limited at the junior college.                      | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 10. Teachers in the junior college "spoon feed" their students with easy work and easy grading.                                    | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 11. Vocational programs in the junior college have sufficient equipment to prepare students for occupations.                       | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 12. It would be better to expand four-year colleges and universities than to build junior colleges.                                | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 13. Junior college transfers should perform as well in a four-year college as they did in the junior college.                      | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 14. The junior college facilities are adequate for student development and progress.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 15. The lack of juniors and seniors leaves the junior college without competent student leaders.                                   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 16. Some of the most important aspects of attending college are missed on the junior college campus.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 17. In the coming years, junior colleges will enroll an increasingly larger proportion of higher education students.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 18. Students from all levels of ability can be served well by the junior college.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 19. Vocational teachers in the junior college are well prepared for their task.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 20. I would advise students against attending a junior college.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 21. The junior college has done a good job of communicating the goals of the junior college to surrounding communities.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 22. Junior colleges are the wastebaskets of higher education.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 23. The administrators of community colleges generally exclude faculty and students in the selection of staff and are therefore not in harmony with senior institutions. | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 24. The junior college is in reality a glorified high school.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 25. Course work in the junior college adequately prepares the student for transfer to a four-year college.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 26. The bright student should consider attending a junior college only if there are financial difficulties.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 27. Junior colleges give mostly "lip service" to their guidance and counseling function.   | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |
| 28. Vocational courses in the junior colleges should be recommended to persons seeking vocational skills.  | SD   D   U   A   SA<br>/ _ / _ / _ / _ / _ / |

29. The junior college is organized much the same as a high school. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
30. The college-bound student should consider junior college only after being denied admission by four-year colleges and universities. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
31. The advising and counseling functions in the junior colleges should be emphasized more highly than in the four-year colleges. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
32. The junior college is more a liability than an asset to its community. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
33. Junior college presidents and deans are well prepared for their positions. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
34. Junior colleges are more concerned with their relationships with high schools than with four-year colleges. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
35. Junior college teachers have more personal interest in the students than teachers in most colleges and universities. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
36. The junior college student is considered a second-class citizen in the population of higher education. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
37. The extensive use of community college educational and sports facilities by the community people may leave students with limited resources. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
38. Living at home is a handicap to the personal development of the junior college student. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
39. Junior college programs provide little about which students could get excited. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /
40. Junior colleges provide better opportunities for student-teacher interaction than do four-year colleges and universities. SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /

41. Faculty members in the junior college are better qualified for academic advising than are the counselors.

SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /

42. Courses which do not lead to a degree weaken the image of the junior college as a college.

SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /

43. Accepting all students who apply gives the junior college a bad image.

SD D U A SA  
/ \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ / \_ /



## DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

44. Your sex. (Circle number of your answer.)
1. Female
  2. Male
45. Your present age. \_\_\_\_\_ years
46. Which is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Circle number.)
1. Bachelor's
  2. Master's
  3. Doctorate
  4. Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
47. Have you ever been a student at a junior college? (Circle number.)
1. Yes
  2. No
48. In your educational training, have you had a course(s) pertaining primarily to two-year college education? (Circle number.)
1. Yes
  2. No
49. Is your present position (circle number):
1. Full-time administrator
  2. Part-time administrator
  3. Full-time faculty
  4. Part-time faculty
  5. Part-time administrator and part-time faculty
50. Years in your current position: \_\_\_\_\_
51. Years of higher education administrative experience: \_\_\_\_\_
- (Question Nos. 52 and 53—Senior college respondents only)
52. Percentage of students who transfer into your academic area from two-year institutions (circle number):
1.  $\leq 10\%$
  2. 11-20%
  3. 21-30%
  4. 31-40%
  5. 41-50%
  6.  $> 50\%$

53. Have you ever been employed by a two-year college as a faculty or administrator? (Circle number.)

1. Yes
2. No

(Question Nos. 54 and 55—Two-year college respondents only)

54. Percentage of students who transfer from your academic area to four-year institutions (circle number):

1.  $\leq 10\%$
2. 11-20%
3. 21-30%
4. 31-40%
5. 41-50%
6.  $> 50\%$

55. Have you ever been employed by a four-year college as a faculty or administrator? (Circle number.)

1. Yes
2. No

56. Do you wish to receive a summary of the results of this study?

1. Yes
2. No

**APPENDIX B**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

# Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078  
309 GUNDERSEN HALL  
405-744-7244

Survey ID No. Code:

March 2, 1992

Name, Title  
Academic Area  
Address  
Institution  
City, State zip

Dear

Sixty-one percent of first-time entering freshmen in Oklahoma enter post-secondary education via the two-year college (OSRHE, 1990). Regardless of reason, this trend in access makes it vital that the relationship between two- and four-year institutions be studied to learn the extent to which the overall system of higher education in Oklahoma is integrated.

This statewide study assesses the attitudes of key academic administrators like yourself regarding critical issues related to two-year college education. The initial step in this area of research is to collect the perceptions of academic administrators who develop and/or interpret transfer/articulation policies at both two- and four-year institutions.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. This questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will *never* be placed on the questionnaire. As a research faculty, we would greatly appreciate it if you would please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience.

If you believe a summary of the initial results would be useful to you and your institution, please mark the appropriate box at the end of the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in making this study truly representative of Oklahoma higher education. If you have any questions or comments, do not hesitate to contact me at Oklahoma State University, telephone 405/744-9346.

Sincerely,

Ric N. Baser  
Research Associate

March 16, 1992

On March 2, a questionnaire seeking your views on two-year college education (The Junior College Survey) was mailed to you. If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere *thanks*. If not, please do so today. Your views and opinions are extremely valuable in making this statewide survey of academic administrators truly representative.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire or it got misplaced, please call me right now at 405/744-9346 and I will get another one in the mail today.

Sincerely,

Ric N. Baser  
Research Associate  
Oklahoma State University

# Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION  
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078  
309 GUNDERSEN HALL  
405-744-7244

Survey ID No. Code:

March 29, 1992

Name, Title  
Academic Area  
Address  
Institution  
City, State zip

Dear

About four weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your opinion on important issues related to two-year college education. As of today, we have not received your completed questionnaire.

Our research unit has undertaken this study because of the belief that academic administrators' opinions should be taken into account in the formation of transfer articulation policies.

I am writing to you again because of the significance of each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of all higher education academic administrators, it is essential that each person return his or her questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Ric N. Baser  
Research Associate

P.S. A number of respondents have asked when the results will be available. We hope to have them out sometime next month.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **STATE ARTICULATION POLICY**

## POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ARTICULATION OF STUDENTS AMONG INSTITUTIONS IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of Oklahoma provides that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education shall constitute a coordinating board of control for all State System institutions with certain specific powers including (a) the prescribing of standards of higher education for each institution, (b) the determination of functions and courses of study in each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed, and (c) the granting of degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses in all of such institutions.

Oklahoma currently operates 27 public institutions of higher education, including 14 two-year colleges, 10 four- and five-year universities, and two comprehensive graduate universities. One of the primary goals of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is to provide access at some public institution for all Oklahoma citizens whose interests and abilities qualify them for admission. Given the large number of individuals who annually seek admission to the State System, it is recognized that no single institution can physically accommodate the total student body, nor can any institutional type meet the diverse needs and demands of all the students for various kinds of educational programs. Therefore each institution and each institutional type has been assigned a specialized role within the total State System, in order that all qualified individuals may be accommodated at some institution, although not necessarily at the institution of first choice.

Oklahoma two-year colleges currently enroll over one-half of the entering freshman students in the public sector, with the regional universities and comprehensive graduate universities sharing the remainder of the entering student load. Given this division of labor at the entering level, it is important that continuing access be provided for students in the two-year colleges who desire to pursue an upper-division program at a public baccalaureate institution. The policy statement to follow is designed to guarantee an orderly transition for students in programs leading toward the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degrees at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

### I. Standards of Education for Completion of Associate Degrees

The minimum requirements for the Associate of Arts or the Associate of Science degree at any institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall include the following.

#### STANDARDS FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES ASSOCIATE DEGREES

1. The completion of 60 semester-credit-hours exclusive of basic required physical education activity courses or military science courses with a grade point average of 2.0.

The completion, as a portion of the overall 60 semester-credit-hours of a basic general education core, of a minimum of 37 semester-credit-hours which shall include the following:



- a. English Composition . . . . . 6 hours
- b. American History and U.S. Government . . . . . 6 hours
- c. Science . . . . . 6 hours  
(One course must be a laboratory science)
- d. Humanities . . . . . 6 hours  
(Chosen from nonperformance courses defined as humanities by the institution granting the associate degree)
- e. At least one course from two of the following areas . . . . . 6 hours  
Mathematics, Psychology, Social Sciences, Foreign Languages, Fine Arts (Art, Music, Dramatics)

Additional liberal arts and science courses needed to meet the minimum total of 37 credit hours required in this policy. (The Oklahoma State Regents' policies require a minimum of 40 semester hours of General Education for the Baccalaureate degree.)

Credits earned consistent with the Oklahoma State Regents' policy, *Standards of Education Relating to Advanced Standing Credit*, may be used to satisfy given requirements.

- 3. The remaining minimum of 23 semester-credit-hours of academic work shall be applicable to the student's major objective including any prerequisite courses necessary for his/her anticipated upper-division program. A majority of such student credit hours should be taken in courses classified as liberal arts and sciences.
- 4. The associate degree general education core of 37 semester-credit-hours listed in item 2 above shall be considered minimal and each two-year college may, with the approval of the State Regents, develop additional lower-division general education requirements for its own students.

## II. Guidelines for the Transfer of Students Among Institutions

In order that students completing the above degree requirements may move vertically through the State System with a minimum loss of time and financial outlay, the following guidelines for transfer of students among institutions are hereby adopted for The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

- 1. A student who has completed the prescribed lower-division requirements of a State System institution developed in accordance with the standards set forth in Section 1 of this policy may transfer into a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree program at any senior institution of the State System and be assured of completing his or her program in sequential fashion. Senior institutions may, with the approval of the State Regents, require

that transferring students complete additional general education work for the degree. However, such additional work shall be programmed as a part of the upper-division requirements of the senior institution in order that any student shall be able to complete a baccalaureate program in a number of semester hours equal to the total specified for graduation published in the receiving institution's official catalog.

2. It is understood, however, that it might be necessary for certain students to take additional courses in general education to meet minimum professional certification requirements, as defined by the state. (Example health and physical education, geography, Oklahoma History, etc., for teacher education certification.) It is also understood that the completion of these requirements does not preclude requirements of senior institutions of particular grade points for admission to professional departments or fields.
3. It is further understood that it is the responsibility of the transferring institution to provide adequate counseling to enable a student to complete during the freshman and sophomore years those lower-division courses which are published prerequisites to pursuit of junior level courses of his or her chosen major disciplinary field.
4. The baccalaureate degree in all Oklahoma senior-level institutions shall be awarded in recognition of lower-division (freshman and sophomore) combined with upper-division (junior and senior) work. If a student has completed an Associate of Science or Associate of Arts degree, the lower-division general education requirement of the baccalaureate degree shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the associate degree, providing the general education requirements specified herein are met. If, for any reason, a student has not completed an associate degree program prior to his or her transfer to another institution, the general education requirements shall become the responsibility of the receiving institution. However, the receiving institution will recognize general education credit for all transfer courses in which a reasonable equivalency of discipline or course content exists with courses specified as part of general education at the receiving institution, provided that there is an appropriate correspondence between the associate degree and the baccalaureate degree being sought.
5. If a student has completed general education courses at a baccalaureate degree-recommending institution within the State System, the receiving baccalaureate institution will recognize general education credit for all courses in which a reasonable equivalency of discipline or course content exists with courses specified as part of general education at the receiving institution, provided that there is an appropriate correspondence of disciplinary study.
6. Lower-division programs in all state institutions enrolling freshmen and sophomores may offer introductory courses which permit the student to explore the principal professional specializations that can be pursued at the baccalaureate level. These introductory courses shall be adequate in content to be fully counted toward the

baccalaureate degree for students continuing in such a professional field of specialization. The determination of the major course requirements for a baccalaureate degree, including courses in the major taken in the lower-division, shall be the responsibility of the institution awarding the degree. However, courses classified as junior-level courses generally taken by sophomores at senior institutions, even though taught at a two-year institution as sophomore-level courses, should be transferable as satisfying that part of the student's requirement in the content area.

7. Courses offered at the freshman or sophomore (1000 or 2000) level at baccalaureate degree-recommending institutions may be offered at a two-year institution provided that such courses are included in the two-year institution's approved instructional program.
8. Other associate degrees and certificates may be awarded by institutions for programs which have requirements different from the aforementioned degrees, or a primary objective other than transfer. Acceptance of course credits for transfer from such degree or certificate programs will be evaluated by the receiving institution on the basis of applicability of the courses to the baccalaureate program in the major field of the student. Each receiving institution is encouraged to develop admission policies that will consider all factors indicating the possibility of success of these students in its upper division.
9. Each baccalaureate degree-recommending institution shall list and update the requirements for each program leading to the baccalaureate degree and shall publicize these requirements for use by all other institutions in the State System. Each baccalaureate degree recommending institution shall include in its official catalog information stating all lower-division prerequisite requirements for each upper-division course. All requirements for admission to a university, college, or program should be set forth with precision and clarity. The catalog in effect at the time of the student's initial full-time enrollment in a State System college or university shall govern lower-division prerequisites, provided that the student has had continuous enrollment as defined in the college or university catalog.

### **III. Advisory Articulation Committee Philosophy and Functions**

1. An advisory articulation committee composed of members of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Council on Instruction representing the various types of institutions within The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall be established to work with the State Regents' staff to review and evaluate articulation policies and practices and to make recommendations for improvement as needed.

2. Institutions planning on making changes in programs which will affect transfer students, such as substantive course revision, addition or deletion of courses, admission requirements, degree requirements, should utilize the advisory articulation committee as an inter-institutional communication process.

**Effective Date of Policy**

This policy will be effective with the 1987 fall semester.

Adopted December 15, 1975.

Revised March 25, 1987.

REVISED APRIL 24, 1992  
OSRHE AGENDA

**POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ARTICULATION OF STUDENTS  
AMONG INSTITUTIONS IN THE OKLAHOMA STATE  
SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Article XIII-A of the Constitution of Oklahoma provides that the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education shall constitute a coordinating board of control for all State System institutions with certain specific powers including (a) prescribing of standards of higher education for each institution, (b) determination of functions and courses of study in each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed, and (c) granting of degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of prescribed courses in all of such institutions.

Oklahoma currently operates 27 public institutions of higher education, including 14 two-years colleges, 10 four- and five-year universities, and 2 comprehensive graduate universities. One of the primary goals of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is to provide access at some public institution for all Oklahoma citizens whose interests and abilities qualify them for admission. Given the large number of individuals who annually seek admission to the State System, it is recognized that no single institution can physically accommodate the total student body, nor can any institutional type meet the diverse needs and demands of all the student for various kinds of educational programs. Therefore, each institution and each institutional type has been assigned a specialized role within the total State System, in order that all qualified individuals may be accommodated at some institution, although not necessarily at the institution of first choice.

Oklahoma two-year colleges currently enroll over one-half of the entering freshman students in the public sector, with the regional universities and comprehensive graduate universities sharing the remainder of the entering student load. Given this division of labor at the entering level, it is important that continuing access be provided for students in the two-year colleges who desire to pursue an upper-division program at a public baccalaureate institution. The policy statement to follow is designed to guarantee an orderly transition for students in programs leading toward the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degrees at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.

**I. Standards of Education for Completion of Associate Degrees**

The minimum requirements for the Associate of Arts or the Associate of Science degree at any institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall include the following:

**STANDARDS FOR ARTS AND SCIENCES ASSOCIATE DEGREES**

1. ~~The completion of 60 semester credit hours exclusive of basic required physical education activity courses or military science courses with a grade point average of 2.0. Students recommended for the Associate of Arts or Associate of Sciences degrees must achieve a grade point average of 2.0 as a minimum on all course work attempted (a minimum of 60 hours) excluding any courses repeated or reprieved as detailed in the State Regents' Grading Policy and excluding physical education activity courses or military sciences courses.~~

## STANDARDS OF EDUCATION FOR AWARDING THE ASSOCIATE DEGREE IN PROGRAMS OF TECHNICAL-OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

The minimum standards for the awarding of associate degrees in technical-occupational areas of specialization at institutions in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education shall be as follows:

1. The completion of 60 semester credit hours, exclusive of basic required physical education or military science courses, with an overall grade point average of 2.0.
2. The completion as a portion of the overall 60 semester credit hours of a basic general education core of a minimum of 17 semester credit hours which shall include the following:
  - a. Communications ..... 3 hours  
This must include either (1) a college-level communications course in technical communication designed around the technical-occupational specialty or (2) a course in English grammar or composition.
  - b. Social Studies ..... 6 hours  
This must include one college-level American history course and one American government course.
  - c. Selected Electives ..... 8 hours  
Electives may be selected electives, approved or free electives from the following areas: science, mathematics, human relations, management, behavioral science, economics and communication.
3. Technical-Occupational Specialty ..... 29 hours
4. Technical-Occupational Support Courses ..... 8 hours  
Courses that are not a part of the technical-occupational specialty but which support the specialty, i.e., math-science for electronics.
5. Technical-Occupational Related Course Work ..... 6 hours  
Courses that are considered part of the specialty job cluster, i.e., engineering drawing for electronics.

### Summary of Minimum Standards

1. General Education ..... 17 hours
2. Technical-Occupational Specialty ..... 29 hours
3. Technical-Occupational Support Courses ..... 8 hours
4. Technical-Occupational Related Course Work ..... 6 hours
- Total Minimum Semester Credit Hours ..... 60 hours

## AUTHORIZATION FOR CONFERRAL OF ASSOCIATE DEGREES

Institutions are authorized to confer either the "Associate in Technology" or the "Associate in \_\_\_\_\_ Technology" upon students successfully completing degree requirements in programs of technical-occupational education. The word "Technology" may be preceded by any one of the following qualifying adjectives: Agricultural, Business, Health, Home Economics, Engineering, or Human Service.

---

Adopted June 30, 1978.

### PART III. REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS

Part III sets forth a list of requirements, standards, and recommendations for use by institutions in the development and evaluation of bachelor's degree programs. Also, this section will be helpful to the State Regents in reviewing both new and existing baccalaureate programs to help determine their quality and viability.

1. Traditional bachelor's degrees—all degrees with the exception of professional or conservatory-type degrees—should be attainable in four years of full-time academic study. Bachelor's degrees shall be based upon at least 120 semester hours of course work.
2. The faculty of the awarding institution should have an opportunity to make a judgment as to the candidate's fitness for the degree. Therefore, a minimum of 30 hours of resident credit applied toward the bachelor's degree shall be taken at the awarding institution, exclusive of extension and correspondence work.
3. Each bachelor's degree awarded by a State System institution shall be based on a minimum of 40 hours of general education. Normally, most general education courses will occur at the lower-division level; however, it is recommended that at least one upper-division general education course be required by the awarding institution.
4. Bachelor's degrees shall be based upon a minimum of 40 hours of upper-division course work. Ideally, upper-division courses should be taught at a level either sequentially above or conceptually higher than lower-division courses.
5. At least 15 of the final 30 hours applied toward the degree must be done at the awarding institution.
6. Bachelor's degrees should be based upon a minimum of 30 semester hours of credit in the area of specialization; however, the major area is defined by the institution. Of the 30 hours in the major field, 15 must be taken at the upper-division level. (Normally, 50 percent of the area of specialization should be taken at the upper-division level.)
7. Students recommended for the bachelor's degree must achieve a ~~cumulative~~ grade point average of 2.0 as a minimum on all course work counted toward satisfaction of degree requirements attempted excluding any courses repeated or reprieved as detailed in the State Regents' Grading Policy.
8. The requirements and standards set forth in this policy statement should be considered minimal, allowing for change by individual institutions upon approval by the State Regents.

**Effective Date:** The criteria and standards in this policy shall be effective for students entering State System colleges and universities beginning with the fall semester of 1984. Students currently pursuing degree programs under criteria and standards contained in existing institutional catalogs shall have the option of continuing under those requirements so long as continuous progress is being made toward graduation on a systematic basis.



## **APPENDIX D**

### **HISTORICAL STUDENT TRANSFER ACTIVITY**

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

**HISTORICAL STUDENT TRANSFER ACTIVITY**  
**ALL OKLAHOMA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS**  
 Fall 1986 through Fall 1990

|                           | Total Students Transferring To: |               |               |               |               |               | % Chg<br>86 to 90 | Total Student Transferring From: |               |               |               |               |               | % Chg<br>86 to 90 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                           | Fall 1986                       | Fall 1987     | Fall 1988     | Fall 1989     | Fall 1990     | Total         |                   | Fall 1986                        | Fall 1987     | Fall 1988     | Fall 1989     | Fall 1990     | Total         |                   |
| University of Oklahoma    | 1,400                           | 1,449         | 1,164         | 957           | 1,297         | 6,267         | (7.36%)           | 1,574                            | 1,493         | 1,566         | 1,708         | 1,566         | 7,907         | (0.51%)           |
| Oklahoma State University | 1,605                           | 1,477         | 1,573         | 1,495         | 1,444         | 7,594         | (10.03%)          | 1,832                            | 1,712         | 1,801         | 1,742         | 1,652         | 8,739         | (9.83%)           |
| Comprehensive Tier:       | 3,005                           | 2,926         | 2,737         | 2,452         | 2,741         | 13,861        | (8.79%)           | 3,406                            | 3,205         | 3,367         | 3,450         | 3,218         | 16,646        | (5.52%)           |
| Univ of Central Oklahoma  | 1,624                           | 1,501         | 1,628         | 1,573         | 1,839         | 8,165         | 13.24%            | 1,653                            | 1,556         | 1,643         | 1,504         | 1,546         | 7,902         | (6.47%)           |
| East Central University   | 314                             | 443           | 442           | 405           | 509           | 2,113         | 62.10%            | 422                              | 379           | 383           | 359           | 370           | 1,913         | (12.32%)          |
| Northwestern State Univ   | 942                             | 935           | 1,037         | 1,126         | 1,016         | 5,056         | 7.86%             | 619                              | 552           | 693           | 631           | 658           | 3,153         | 6.30%             |
| Northwestern OK St Univ   | 161                             | 121           | 129           | 143           | 174           | 728           | 8.07%             | 187                              | 261           | 189           | 178           | 168           | 983           | (10.16%)          |
| Southeastern OK St Univ   | 264                             | 254           | 287           | 308           | 404           | 1,517         | 53.03%            | 196                              | 239           | 198           | 186           | 200           | 1,019         | 2.04%             |
| Southwestern OK St Univ   | 420                             | 226           | 304           | 297           | 358           | 1,605         | (14.76%)          | 447                              | 490           | 467           | 481           | 469           | 2,354         | 4.92%             |
| Cameron University        | 175                             | 176           | 215           | 163           | 126           | 855           | (28.00%)          | 259                              | 234           | 259           | 231           | 278           | 1,261         | 7.34%             |
| Langston University       | 254                             | 226           | 338           | 313           | 501           | 1,632         | 97.24%            | 173                              | 133           | 135           | 145           | 172           | 758           | (0.58%)           |
| Un of Sci & Arts of OK    | 140                             | 116           | 100           | 81            | 100           | 537           | (28.57%)          | 122                              | 117           | 148           | 146           | 123           | 656           | 0.82%             |
| OK Panhandle St Univ      | 88                              | 87            | 63            | 80            | 86            | 404           | (2.27%)           | 58                               | 39            | 58            | 45            | 60            | 260           | 3.45%             |
| Four-Year Tier:           | 4,382                           | 4,085         | 4,543         | 4,489         | 5,113         | 22,612        | 16.68%            | 4,136                            | 4,000         | 4,173         | 3,906         | 4,044         | 20,259        | (2.22%)           |
| Connors State College     | 98                              | 95            | 138           | 112           | 142           | 585           | 44.90%            | 323                              | 351           | 333           | 320           | 371           | 1,698         | 14.86%            |
| Eastern OK State College  | 76                              | 93            | 14            | 91            | 13            | 287           | (82.89%)          | 318                              | 304           | 417           | 274           | 396           | 1,709         | 24.53%            |
| Murray State College      | 21                              | 44            | 32            | 35            | 43            | 175           | 104.76%           | 203                              | 24            | 253           | 224           | 295           | 999           | 45.32%            |
| NE Oklahoma A&M Coll      | 19                              | 31            | 68            | 47            | 40            | 225           | 110.53%           | 575                              | 460           | 562           | 508           | 591           | 2,696         | 2.78%             |
| Northern Oklahoma Coll    | 216                             | 278           | 224           | 254           | 199           | 1,171         | (7.87%)           | 284                              | 249           | 286           | 291           | 321           | 1,431         | 13.03%            |
| Rogers State College      | 265                             | 253           | 378           | 253           | 262           | 1,411         | (1.13%)           | 444                              | 426           | 486           | 547           | 499           | 2,402         | 12.39%            |
| Tulsa Junior College      | 1,980                           | 1,579         | 1,821         | 1,809         | 1,963         | 9,152         | 40.86%            | 960                              | 953           | 1,282         | 1,214         | 1,369         | 5,778         | 42.60%            |
| OSU TB, Oklahoma City     | 1,275                           | 1,311         | 1,391         | 1,527         | 727           | 6,231         | (42.98%)          | 614                              | 632           | 595           | 621           | 697           | 3,159         | 13.52%            |
| OSU TB, Okmulgee          | 114                             | 112           | 177           | 98            | 191           | 692           | 67.54%            | 56                               | 40            | 111           | 121           | 145           | 473           | 158.93%           |
| Western OK State College  | 26                              | 38            | 71            | 93            | 44            | 272           | 69.23%            | 219                              | 174           | 171           | 179           | 195           | 938           | (10.96%)          |
| Redlands Community Coll   | 118                             | 109           | 124           | 112           | 102           | 565           | (13.56%)          | 219                              | 241           | 250           | 238           | 250           | 1,198         | 14.16%            |
| Carl Albert State College | 91                              | 97            | 80            | 97            | 121           | 486           | 32.97%            | 241                              | 271           | 185           | 243           | 226           | 1,166         | (6.22%)           |
| Sayre Junior College      | 34                              |               |               | 17            | 33            | 84            | (2.94%)           | 75                               |               |               | 40            | 31            | 146           | (58.67%)          |
| Seminole Junior College   | 107                             | 103           | 43            | 19            | 10            | 282           | (90.65%)          | 266                              | 253           | 296           | 285           | 299           | 1,399         | 12.41%            |
| Rose State College        | 2,121                           | 3,135         | 2,087         | 2,077         | 2,287         | 11,707        | 7.83%             | 1,123                            | 1,052         | 1,084         | 1,013         | 1,025         | 5,297         | (8.73%)           |
| OKC Community College     | 833                             | 838           | 839           | 780           | 701           | 3,991         | (15.85%)          | 1,031                            | 1,093         | 1,126         | 1,160         | 1,128         | 5,538         | 9.41%             |
| Two-Year Tier:            | 7,394                           | 8,116         | 7,487         | 7,441         | 6,878         | 37,316        | (6.98%)           | 6,951                            | 6,523         | 7,437         | 7,278         | 7,838         | 36,027        | 12.76%            |
| <b>Total:</b>             | <b>14,781</b>                   | <b>15,127</b> | <b>14,767</b> | <b>14,382</b> | <b>14,732</b> | <b>73,789</b> | <b>(8.33%)</b>    | <b>14,493</b>                    | <b>13,728</b> | <b>14,977</b> | <b>14,634</b> | <b>15,100</b> | <b>72,932</b> | <b>4.19%</b>      |

## VITA

Ricky Neal Baser

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

**Thesis:** A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS OF PUBLIC TWO-AND FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA TOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

**Major Field:** Higher Education

### **Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Sacramento, California, November 19, 1957, the son of Rev. Gerald L. and Bettie L. Baser.

**Education:** Graduated from Miami, High School, Miami, Oklahoma, in May 1975; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Science & Arts of Oklahoma, Chickasha, Oklahoma, in April 1979; received the Master of Arts degree from Oklahoma State University in May 1981; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in July 1992.

**Professional Experience:** Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Speech Communication, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1980-81; Speech Faculty, Coffeyville Community College, Coffeyville, Kansas, 1981-82; Director of Alumni Association and High School & College Relations, University of Science & Arts of Oklahoma, Chickasha, Oklahoma, 1982-89; Graduate Research Associate, High School & College Relations, Oklahoma State University, 1989-91; School Relations Professional, High School & College Relations, Oklahoma State University, 1991-92.

**Honors and Achievements:** Phi Theta Kappa, 1976; Pi Kappa Delta National Champion, Phi Kappa Phi, 1991; Robert B. Kamm Distinguished Graduate Fellowship, 1991.