

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION,
FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPROVING
ARTICULATION

By

ALI NAZARI-ROBATI

Bachelor of Cooperation and
Social Security
Tehran College of Insurance
Tehran, Iran
1974

Master of Business Administration
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
1979

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
December, 1981

Thesis
1981D
NB355
cop. 2



A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR
INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION,
FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPROVING
ARTICULATION

Thesis Approved:

Robert M. Kamm

Thesis Adviser

William Adams

Jack Bank

Judith E. Dobson

Norman N. Durkan

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The fact that this research effort exists is due to sound cooperation of many individuals. I owe debts of gratitude to those who helped bring this study to a successful conclusion. I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the members of my doctoral committee. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Dr. Robert B. Kamm, thesis adviser and the committee chairman, for his wise counsel, sound encouragement, and concern for excellence. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Jacob D. Zucker, Dr. William B. Adrian, and Dr. Judith E. Dobson for their guidance, support, and patience as members of the thesis committee. These individuals have formed the kind of graduate committee with which every doctoral candidate should be blessed.

I am very much grateful to Dr. Thomas A. Karman, Dr. Patrick Forsyth, Dr. Noma J. Campbell, and Dr. Kenneth St. Clair for their concern and guidance. A special thanks is offered to Mrs. Betty Rutledge, the departmental secretary, for her assistance. Appreciation is also expressed to the chief academic administrators of 140 junior and senior colleges who willingly cooperated in the survey and provided the data.

I admire and thank my youngest brother, Hamid, as well as my good friend, Rose Marie, whose assistance have been vital to my progress in this work. This study is especially dedicated to my parents, Hassan and Zahra, and to my four brothers, whose constant support and encouragement have made learning a natural and inevitable part of my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Hypotheses	7
Definition of Terms	8
Scope of the Study	9
Assumption of the Study	10
Significance of the Study	11
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	12
Attitudes Toward Junior Colleges	12
Arguments for Junior College	14
Arguments Against Junior Colleges	16
Transfer of Students	20
Types of Transfer Processes	21
Junior College Transfer Students	22
Reasons for Transfer	24
Academic Success After Transfer	25
Problems Encountered by Transfer Students	27
Articulation Between Junior and Senior Institutions	29
Articulation Defined	29
Articulation Problems	30
Articulation Process/Systems	32
Selected Ways of Improving the Junior and Senior Relationships	35
Articulation Guidelines/Transfer Policies	35
Upper-Division College	37
Fostering Communication and Cooperation Among Institutions	39
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	41
Identification of Population	42
Selection of the Sample	42
Research Instrument	45
Data Collection Procedure	49
Statistical Procedures	50
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	54

Chapter	Page
Testing the Hypotheses	58
Major Hypothesis 1	59
Major Hypothesis 2	70
Other Findings	81
V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
Summary	85
Discussion	93
Recommendations	96
Recommendations for Practioners	96
Recommendations for Future Research	97
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	99
APPENDIX A - JAMES' CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND "t" VALUES USED TO SELECT ITEMS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	106
APPENDIX B - THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY AS DEVELOPED BY JAMES (1969)	108
APPENDIX C - THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY AS UTILIZED BY RICE (1976)	112
APPENDIX D - THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY AS EMPLOYED IN CURRENT STUDY	118
APPENDIX E - THE LETTER SENT TO THE PARTICIPANTS WITH THE FIRST MAILING PACKAGE FOR DATA COLLECTION	124
APPENDIX F - THE LETTER SENT TO THE PARTICIPANTS WITH THE FOLLOW-UP MAILING PACKAGE FOR DATA COLLECTION	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Distribution of Population of the Type of Articulation Plan	43
II. Distribution of Population by States and Types of Institutions	44
III. Distribution of Sample by States and Types of Institutions	46
IV. Response Rate by States and Types of Institutions	51
V. The Usable Responses by States and Institutions	55
VI. Distribution of Female Chief Academic Administrators by States and Institutions	56
VII. The Mean Attitude Scale Scores for the Questionnaire Items Describing Junior College and Some of its Aspects	59
VIII. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Junior and Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Education	60
IX. Mean Scores Concerning Junior College Education	61
X. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Junior and Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Faculty	62
XI. Mean Scores Concerning Junior College Faculty	63
XII. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Junior and Senior College Academic Administrators toward Junior College Students	64
XIII. Mean Scores Concerning Junior College Students	65
XIV. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Junior and Senior College Academic Administrators toward Junior College Programs	66
XV. Mean Scores Concerning Junior College Programs	67

Table	Page
XVI. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Junior and Senior College Academic Administrators toward Junior College Administration	68
XVII. Mean Scores Concerning Junior College Administration . .	69
XVIII. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Junior and Senior College Academic Administrators toward Junior College Facilities	70
XIX. Mean Scores Concerning Junior College Facilities	71
XX. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Education	73
XXI. Mean Scores for Junior College Education	73
XXII. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Faculty	74
XXIII. Mean Scores for Junior College Faculty	74
XXIV. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Students	75
XXV. Mean Scores for Junior College Students	76
XXVI. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Programs	77
XXVII. Mean Scores for Junior College Programs	77
XXVIII. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Administration	78
XXIX. Mean Scores for Junior College Administration	79
XXX. Analysis of Variance for the Attitudes of Senior College Academic Administrators Toward Junior College Facilities	80
XXXI. Mean Scores for Junior College Facilities	80
XXXII. James' Correlation Coefficients and "t" Values Used to Select Items for Junior College Attitude Survey Questionnaire	107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of two-year colleges has capitalized a special impulse through the system of higher education which deserves considerable attention in order to fulfill the obligations created by the current trends of educational accountability, consumerism, and lifelong learning. As a vital step, it is important to focus on the relationship between junior and senior colleges in terms of articulation activities and transfer programs.

The foundations for the junior college idea were laid by some prominent educators during the nineteenth century. In 1852, Henry P. Tappen indicated the need for a change in the traditional four-year college (Landrith, 1971:15). David S. Jordan and Alexin F. Lange are credited with labeling the concept of the junior college and giving directions for its movement (Monroe, 1977:10). William R. Harper advocated the division of undergraduate college into two levels and called them "junior college" and "senior college" (Brubacher and Rudy, 1976:254). However, he is credited with being influential in the establishment of the first public junior college in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901 (Monroe, 1977:9).

Since the birth of Joliet College, there have been significant changes in the directions of role, functions, control and other facets of junior colleges. At first, these institutions were expected to

provide a substitute education for freshman and sophomore programs at the university (Wattenbarger, 1971:307). Today, they are actively involved with more than ten important functions (Monroe, 1977:32-45). Despite all this, in the near future they must meet the challenges presented by lack of funds, growing government control, uncertain enrollment projections, and potential changes in public policy (Hill, 1979: 55).

In the early years of the community college movement, most of the two-year institutions were private. But this trend undertook considerable changes during the past few decades. Reynolds (1965:9) and Monroe (1977:13) report, in 1915, of 74 colleges listed, 55 were private and 19 were public. In 1948, public junior colleges for the first time outnumbered the private junior colleges. The 1980 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory's data support the continuation of this trend up to 1979. That is, from a total number of 1,230 two-year colleges, 1,044 were public and 186 were independent (AACJC, 1980:61-63).

There has been a drastic increase in the number of community colleges and in their enrollment. The number of two-year colleges increased from 74 in 1915 (Thompson, 1978:11) to 677 in 1960 (Landrith, 1971:32). While the recent data indicates as many as 1,230 two-year colleges (AACJC, 1980:61), there will be approximately 1,400 of these colleges in the United States by the year 2000 (Hill, 1979:53). In correspondence with the number of junior colleges, the enrollment in these institutions has grown as well. In 1958, the number of students enrolled in two-year colleges was close to 375,000 (Allan, 1974:1). Enrollment in 1960 totaled 566,224, as compared to 2,366,028 in the fall of 1971 (Harper, 1971:259). Menacher (1974:201) also reported that by

1974 over two million of the approximately eight million students in higher education enrolled in two-year colleges. Likewise, the recent data suggest that the total enrollment of these institutions as of 1978 was 4,299,149; and as of 1979, was 4,437,872 (AACJC, 1980:61).

Higbee's data presents a closer picture of the community college clients. He reported that:

In 1960, one in 4.3 or 23% of first-time college students were enrolled in some type of a community or junior college. In 1965, these figures had increased to one in every 3.7 or 27%, and in 1970, one in 2.9 or 34%. If the trend continues, it is estimated that by 1979, one in every 2.5 students or 40% of those enrolled in higher education for the first time will be attending a community or junior college (Higbee, 1973:44).

However, a number of factors have been responsible for the growth of junior colleges. Landrith (1971:39-42) identifies some of them as: population growth, changes in technology, changes in attitude toward education, accessibility of the local junior colleges, low tuition, variability of transfer and vocational courses, better qualified faculty, and the junior college facilities. Higbee (1973:44) also states that such growths are due to three major reasons: the accessibility of the community and junior colleges; the quality of teaching, and personal nature of the community and junior college environment; and the increasing demand for technical and vocational training. Similar positions are taken by Monroe (1977:3) and Cohen and Brawer (1977:11).

Complementary to any of these causes, the vital role of senior colleges and universities in the growth of two-year institutions has been noticeable in many respects. In the early development of the junior colleges, the major impetus was from the university. The greatest growth of two-year colleges took place in those states where the leadership of the university was favorable and dynamic (Fields, 1962:19).

This and similar arguments lead us to believe that the growth and functioning of two-year colleges is related to the attitudes and view of senior college on people toward junior college education. However, the community colleges are now unquestionable partners with senior institutions. Thus, mutual respect and cooperation between these groups are a necessary condition for an adequately functioning system of higher education (Menacher, 1974:201). To strengthen the relationship between the two levels of higher education, there is a real need for an effective system of communication and articulation. Yet, although articulation has received widespread attention recently, very few attempts have been made to comprehensively investigate the concept (Hurley, 1973:3).

Statement of the Problem

In a survey of 65 California junior colleges in 1965, Peterson reported the "two-year and four-year articulation" as the ninth most critical problem facing community colleges (Johnson, 1979:10). This suggests that the relationship between junior and senior institutions has not always been fruitful and without problems. For the most part, such problems were raised from ineffective transfer processes which reflected into disadvantages for the transfer students. Armenio (1978:29) argues that for many years, colleges and universities failed to address themselves in meaningful and equitable ways to the needs of students transferring from one institution to another. Higbee (1973:44) also states that the junior college transfer student has long been perplexed with the problem of moving from the junior to the senior college without some loss of credit, money, time, emotional, and physical energy.

At the heart of such problems lies the fact that the senior institutions often questioned the "quality" which might be expected of the junior colleges. Could they secure competent staff? Would their "standards" be high enough so that their transfer students could do well in the four-year institutions? (Gleazer, 1968:11). Further questions are raised by Hills (1965:210): Could transfer shock merely be a function of the junior colleges having more generous grading standards? Could the shock and poor performance compared with the natives be due to such things as weak faculty and poor facilities at the junior colleges?

On the other hand, Allan (1974:2) refers to a lack of understanding on the part of the four-year college faculty and administration. It is argued that:

There is an ubiquitous lack of information among the four-year college faculty members, department heads, and college curriculum committees, about the nature, scope, and quality of two-year college curriculum. This is compounded by a sometimes smug and patronizing attitude toward two-year colleges in general (Allan, 1974:3).

Due to the importance of junior and senior colleges relationships, this study was conducted to address two major questions:

1. Which aspect(s) of the two-year college--faculty, students, programs, administration, and/or facilities--is(are) the major source of conflict between junior and senior colleges?
2. Which articulation plan(s)--formal, legal, state agency, institutional system, and/or voluntary agreements--is(are) more adequate in improving the relationship between junior and senior colleges?

Purpose of the Study

The extent to which the junior and senior college people are willing to communicate, cooperate, and improve their relationships depends

upon how they perceive each other, since their attitudes affect their behavior and actions. The attitudes may persist or change in order to preserve consistency between perceptions or actions (Morgan and King, 1966:613). Likewise, it would be naive to say that there is no relationship between attitude and behavior (Triandis, 1971:14). Thus,

since attitudes, opinions, and beliefs determine so greatly how individuals will react to social situations, it is not strange that there should be considerable interest in the precise measurement of attitudes (Morgan and King, 1966:615).

There have been a number of landmark studies concerning the transfer of students and articulation programs, but very few researchers have focused on the attitudes of junior and/or senior college people with regard to their relationships. In 1976, Rice studied the attitudes of senior college faculty toward junior college education in general. Regardless of the importance of his study, some features were absent in the research: there was no determination of attitudes of administrators of either type of college; the attitudes of senior college faculty were not compared with those of their counterparts at junior colleges; and a detailed analysis of various aspects of junior colleges were not reflected in the attitude measurement of senior college faculty. The present study was aimed mainly at these dimensions.

The purpose of this research effort was two-fold:

1. To assess and compare the attitudes of junior and senior college academic administrators toward junior college education, and five facets of junior college--faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities.
2. To examine and compare the attitudes of senior college academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans,

toward junior college education and the five stated facets of junior college.

The main objectives of this study were to identify the areas of concern affecting the articulation programs between the two- and four-year colleges; and to pinpoint the existing articulation system(s) through which the tensions between the two levels might be minimized.

Hypotheses

In light of the above problems, purposes, and objectives, two major hypotheses and ten sub-related hypotheses were tested.

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators toward junior college education.

1a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with regard to junior college faculty.

1b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college students.

1c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college programs.

1d. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college administration.

1e. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college facilities.

2. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, regarding junior college education.

2a. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college faculty.

2b. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college students.

2c. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college programs.

2d. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college administration.

2e. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college facilities.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study and to assure common understanding, the terms used throughout the study are defined here:

Junior college--refers to colleges authorized to offer courses no higher than sophomore level which lead to an associate degree. The

terms "junior college," "community college," and "two-year college" were used interchangeably.

Senior college--refers to institutions authorized to offer programs leading to a bachelors, or higher degree. The Carnegie Commission (1973:1-4) classifies these institutions into: doctoral-granting institutions; comprehensive universities and colleges; and liberal arts colleges. The terms "senior college," "four-year college," and "university" were used interchangeably.

Articulation--is the

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 (Ernest, 1978:32).

Articulation plans--refers to the three major types of articulation systems identified by Kintzer (1973:35-106) as: formal and legal policies; state system policies; and voluntary agreements.

Academic administrator--refers to the college and university administrators who deal directly with the academic affairs of the institution. Such an administrator may bear a title of academic vice-president, academic dean, dean of academic affairs, dean of the college, or dean of the faculty.

Attitude--Triandis (1971:2) defines attitude as "an idea charged with emotion which predisposes a class of actions to a particular class of social situations"

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study was limited to the public junior and senior colleges in those 22 states whose articulation plans were identified by

Kintzer (1973, 1975) as being classified into one of the three major forms: formal and legal plans; state system policies; and voluntary agreements. Only the public junior colleges which are the members of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1980) were included in the research. Also, the study included only the public senior colleges listed by the Carnegie Commission (1973). Finally, the main thrust in the data analysis was limited to only five aspects of junior colleges--faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities--in a general sense, rather than the details of each aspect.

Assumptions of the Study

1. It is assumed that the classification of articulation plans, and states utilizing those plans, as identified by Kintzer (1973) and his update (1975), are still valid.

2. It is assumed that the measuring instrument was adequate for the purpose of this study.

3. It is assumed that minor modifications of the questionnaire had no significant effect on the validity and reliability of the whole instrument.

4. It is assumed that responses to the questionnaire items reflected the actual attitudes of the respondents to various aspects of junior college.

5. It is assumed that academic administrators as defined in this study, do play a major role in the articulation processes and, thus, their attitudes do have a stake in the decisions concerning articulation and transfer processes.

Significance of the Study

There is a strong belief that articulation is both a process and an attitude, with attitude being the more important (Waller, 1980:19; O'Grady, 1974:38). Based on this assessment, identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the junior college in terms of its faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities, as reflected in the thinking of academic administrators at both levels; and more knowledge about the effects of various articulation plans on attitude toward junior college education seem vital. Such data will have a multidimensional significance. First, to provide information which may be used to detect the areas of conflict between junior and senior colleges, and to use such information for improving the relationship between the two levels. Second, the information developed should aid the educational administrators and planners to examine the present perceptions of junior colleges and move in the direction of a more effective higher education system for the future. Third, in addition to the population under study, the findings should be of value to those states which are in the process of developing effective articulation and transfer policies. Finally, the study has the potential of making contributions to the literature on the nature of two-year institutions, while expanding the data base for further studies in related areas.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The vitality and importance of community and junior college philosophy has been reflected extensively in the literature. Numerous books and articles have focused on the history, role, and characteristics of the two-year colleges for more than half a century. Only the recent literature has dealt closely with such themes as articulation. While several authors have expressed their positive and/or negative perceptions and feelings concerning two-year institutions, a search of the literature for studies of the attitudes toward junior colleges revealed very little research. However, the pattern followed in the review of literature in this study was to report only that literature which appeared relevant to the problems influencing the effective relationships between the junior and senior colleges. This included the following areas of interest. First, an overview of attitudes toward junior colleges. Second, some insights on the transfer of students. Third, articulation between junior and senior institutions. Finally, selected ways of improving the junior and senior college relationships.

Attitudes Toward Junior Colleges

The community college has evolved and prospered because it has met, and continues to meet, needs not fulfilled by any other educational institution (Nolan and Paradise, 1979:402). These institutions

have been a major instrument in the educational upgrading process (Wattenbarger, 1971:309). Although the university people have played a vital role in the development and planning of junior colleges (Fields, 1962:19), they, from time to time, have questioned the expected quality from two-year colleges, their faculty, programs, and students (Gleazer, 1968:11).

Much has been said about this controversial issue, but very few studies have been conducted. One major study was done by Rice (1976). He surveyed the attitude of 400 full-time faculty members from Oklahoma's six regional universities toward junior college education. His study revealed that there was no significant difference in attitude toward junior college education by: sex of the faculty member; the proximity of their universities to the nearest junior college; and age of the faculty member. On the other hand, there was a significant difference in attitude toward junior college education between the faculty members who had visited a junior college and those who had not; the faculty members who attended a junior college and those who did not; the faculty members who took a course dealing with junior college education and those who had not; the faculty members who had taught in a junior college and those who had not; and the faculty members whose assignment was primarily lower division teaching and those whose teaching assignment was upper division and graduate. In sum, the senior college faculties characterized by these factors had a more favorable attitude toward junior college education than those who lacked such characteristics (Rice, 1976:96-97).

Since "attitudes refer to the stands the individual upholds and cherishes about objects, issues, persons, groups, or institutions"

(Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergal, 1965:4), the reviewed literature revealed two sets of arguments or attitudes, in favor of and against junior colleges and/or its components.

Arguments for Junior College

Placed as the immediate stage between the high school and the senior colleges, the two-year college has become an important step in the overall educative process (Landrith, 1971:57). Medsker and Tillery (1971) maintain that these colleges are called on to perform a greater variety of services for a more diverse clientele than any other category of higher education. Gleazer (1971:256) wrote "the community college is the final link in the national chain of effort to democratize and universalize opportunity for college training." Likewise, Frankie and DuBois (1971:46) state that the emerging community-junior college, with its extended commitment to comprehensiveness offerings appealed to many.

What stands at the heart of these institutions, then, is that:

. . . the community college is--or attempts to be--all things to all people, trying valiantly to serve simultaneously as custodian, trainer, stimulant, behavior-shaper, counselor, advisor, and caretaker to both young and old (Cohen, 1969: xvi).

Similar claim is made by the American Association of Junior Colleges:

For some, they mean the best, if not the only hope for educational experience beyond the high school. For others, they may represent the best means to a baccalaureate degree . . . For still others, the junior or community college may mean the chance for experience and training that will lead to satisfying jobs in a wide range of fields. . . . There are many extra-curricular activities available for those who wish to participate . . . (1966:n.p.).

Considering such contributions of the two-year colleges, many writers admire them for their strong determination of responsiveness toward educational and societal needs of citizens. Goodrich (1971:291)

stated that a growing number of junior colleges are engaged in creative programs aimed at recognizing and addressing the new student's academic and social needs. Gleazer (1971:255) also indicated "the community college will become an increasingly more viable instrument of social and cultural change." Likewise, it is argued by Johnson (1979:14) that these institutions can achieve and maintain a state of creative flexibility which will permit them to adapt to the changing requirements and needs of our nation and its citizenry.

The foundation for the junior colleges responsiveness to the educational and societal environments rests with their mission of expanding educational opportunities for all who wish for a higher education without regard to their sex, age, race, physical or academic abilities, and nationality. Nolan and Paradise (1979:398) said that "the origins of the community college can be traced to the principle, of universal educational opportunities in early America." Wattenbarger (1971:310) maintained that "a major responsibility for providing the extended educational opportunity will fall upon community colleges." Similar view is expressed by Frankie and DuBois (1971:47), Sawyer and Nickens (1980:115-123), Harper (1971:261), and many others.

To foster their effective roles of social catalyst and extending educational opportunities, the community colleges have adapted unique philosophies or doctrines. Monroe (1977:32) refers to the comprehensive curriculum, open-door policy, and community orientation as the main objectives of community colleges. In addition to other aims and characteristics, Kaster (1979:28) emphasizes on the community-based aspects of two-year colleges. Foresi (1974:7-10) admires these colleges for their aims of: preparing students for upper division work at senior

colleges; multi-purpose structure; comprehensive posture; open-door nature; emphases on guidances, and community oriented. Also, according to Harper (1971:259-260), the well-known features of community colleges are open admission, low cost, varied programs, community service, accessibility, teaching orientation, and innovative programs and activities. Historically, the low cost aspects of these institutions has had a significant impact on breaking the barriers which prevented many low income or minority groups from attending colleges. Landrith (1971:13) notes that the community college has placed education within the financial reach of thousands of students who might otherwise be denied post-high school training. Simonsen (1974:20) also argues that tuition is out of place in the community college.

In relation to these philosophies, the community colleges are credited for their multi-function and diverse programs. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965:6) said that the two-year college is potentially capable of fulfilling a wide range of functions in contemporary society. Monroe (1977:32-45) and Landrith (1971:58-59) identify several of such functions as transfer curricula, general education, remedial programs, occupational training, community services, and so on.

In sum, expressing a strong gesture for community colleges, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1970:1) maintained "the community college has proved its great worth to American society. Community college should be available, . . ."

Arguments Against Junior College

Despite the growth of junior colleges and the increased role that they have continued to take in higher education, they have been the

target of several criticisms from senior college people and/or other sources. Monroe (1977:63) argues that "prior to 1950, even up to 1960, community colleges, as a group, had such a poor image in higher education circles that most senior institutions tended to ignore them." Hertig (1973:40) maintains that tension between two-year and four-year college faculties often stems from the attitude that the two-year college staff is inferior. According to Beals (1971:22), many of the four-year institutions' faculty members and administrators question the ability of the junior colleges to provide quality education at the lower-division level. Similar claim is made by Gleazer (1968:10-11). He mentioned that "retarding community college development in some places was the lack of enthusiastic reception by existing colleges and universities" (1968:10).

• While some of the criticisms are justified through evidences, others are simply a reflection of negative attitudes of senior college people toward junior colleges. Besides the literature reveals that the critics and questions have been addressed to various aspects of these colleges.

Monroe argues that:

. . . the community college still falls short of being the poor man's college . . . the majority of the youth from the lowest socioeconomic quarter will not be served by the community college, until better programs for disadvantaged students are provided and more financial aid is given to the low-income student (1977:186).

Following other similar claims that junior colleges have not provided educational opportunities to low socioeconomic status (SES) students, Sawyer and Nickens (1980:113-124) conducted a study to investigate the validity of these criticisms. The results of their data analysis of

graduated students from 15 selected Florida community colleges did not support such criticisms. In their study it was shown:

1. Low SES students were proportionally represented among community college graduates.
2. Low SES students continued their education at a senior university in proportion to the numbers that graduated.
3. Low SES did not restrict achievement of desired educational goal or participation in the various curricula in the university (1980:123).

A number of questions are addressed concerning junior college administration. Medsker and Tillery (1971:110) noted that in the last few years, many people have expressed concern about the available quality and quantity of administrative manpower to enable community colleges to discharge their obligations. According to these authors,

the historical affiliation of community colleges with public schools, until recently at least, tended to result in a more conservative and conventional approach to governance than that generally found in colleges and universities (1971:11).

After visiting six junior colleges in the midwest, George and George (1970:157) concluded that junior personnel administrators have adopted their programs from high school programs with little effort to innovate more valuable programs to meet the non-academic needs of the junior college students. It is also argued that "the autocratic tradition of public-school administrators became the pattern of community college administration" (Monroe, 1977:314). Palinchack (1973:93-94) is another critic of junior college administration.

Another group of critics focus on the junior college faculty. Jamerson states that:

. . . the community college is not living up to its original philosophy. My feeling is that this dysfunction between the stated goals and the actual practice of the community college, is in great part, due to the faculty's lack of information and training about the community college purpose (1979:7).

Similar dilemma is described by Landrith (1971:49), "many junior college instructors and senior college faculty, too--lack an appreciation of what the first two years of college are trying to accomplish." Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965:160) have the same perception toward junior college faculty.

The community college student is the target of, yet, another group of writers. According to Landrith (1971:249), "one of the criticisms aimed at the two-year college has been that they admit students who are not qualified for college level work." George and George (1970:155) characterize junior college students as less academically able than the student of the four-year college. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965:240) make the same assessment of junior college students.

With regard to articulation and transfer of students, senior college people have been critical of junior colleges for their failure to comply with the programs and policies of senior colleges. Thompson (1978:12) mentions that the representatives of four-year institutions frequently complain that junior colleges do not consult senior institutions when developing transfer courses and thereby create problems from that outset. Likewise, Kintzer says that:

University professors claim that two-year colleges because of inexperience mix subcollege with college material in courses that are classified for transfer, and the professors feel they have no control over this dilution of content. They also believe that community colleges develop transfer courses without consultation with senior institutions; fail to establish a system for managing articulation within the institution itself; . . . (1973:28).

Finally, Zwerling (1976:xvii) is highly critical of junior college. He describes these institutions as another barrier in the system of higher education. Cohen, Brawer, and Lombardi (1971:3) also maintain that "the uncritical prevailing view that holds the institution to be

a social pranacea is shown to be unrealistic, shortsighted, and potentially debilitating."

Despite all criticisms mentioned, Masat believes that:

. . . whether of their own violation or because of new pressures, four-year institutions are beginning to shed some of the hardened snobish attitudes of the past vis-a-vis community and junior colleges. Maybe it is because they need those transfer students (1980:10).

Transfer of Students

Although community colleges now perform many roles, the transfer function continues to be a major concern (Wattenbarger and Medford, 1974:21). According to Monroe (1977:59), before 1950, the transfer program overshadowed all other programs. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965:31) refer to the transfer function as "the oldest and most reversed of the educational services which the two-year colleges provided." It is generally expressed by many educators, including Kelly and Connolly (1970:67), that the transfer function will stabilize but will continue to be an important role for the colleges.

Every year, thousands of students move among institutions of higher education. In Kintzer's (1976:1) view, around 600,000 college students apply for transfer to a different institution every year. This estimate clearly indicates that not all junior college students expect or do transfer. Gleazer maintains that:

. . . community college students characteristically will declare, upon enrollment, that they intend to go on to a four-year college--nationally about two-thirds state this intention. However, one third actually do transfer. . . . (1968:54).

In a study of 15 selected Florida community colleges, Sawyer and Nickens (1980:122) found that for all family income levels over 50 percent of

the community college graduates continued their education by transferring to a senior college. Similar findings are reported by Landrith (1971:65). The data of a 1960 national study by Medsker indicate that most of the junior college students (about two-thirds) had enrolled in programs which prepared them for transfer to senior colleges, even though only half of them really transferred.

According to Rinehart (1977:37), the National Center for Education Statistics in 1976 (reporting on high school seniors' plans) showed that more of them (30 percent) planned to attend a two-year college and then transfer to a four-year college than any other plan. In comparison, 22 percent had planned to attend a four-year college directly from high school.

Several questions might be raised concerning transfer students. What are the characteristics of transfer students? Where do they transfer? To what fields of study commonly do they transfer? Why do they transfer? How do they do in the new institutions? and What problems do they face? The answers to most of these questions are found in the literature extensively, while others need more attention in the future.

Types of Transfer Processes

There are many types of transfer students as related to the variation in transfer processes. Rinehart (1977:38) offers a major classification of transfers as follows:

1. Articulated Vertical Transfer. Students moving directly from parallel, articulated programs in a two-year college into the upper-division of the program in a four-year college.

2. Traditional Horizontal Transfer. Students moving from one four-year college to another because of family migration, changes in educational plans, dissatisfactions, and/or financial constraints.
3. Non-traditional Transfer. Two- and four-year college transfers who do not follow the usual patterns, including adults who have been out of college for some years.
4. Reverse Transfer. Students transferring from a four-year to a two-year college.
5. Open Door Transfer. Transfers from one two-year college to another.
6. Double Reverse Transfer. Those reverse transfers who return to a four-year college.
7. Vocational to Changed Major Transfer. The individuals transferring from a career program in a two-year college to a related but different baccalaureate program in a four-year college.
8. Upside-down Curriculum Transfer. This classification includes individuals who transfer into 'upside-down' degree programs that exist in some four-year colleges (1977:38).

The diversity in the types of transfers is pinpointed by Kintzer (1976:2). He refers to the reverse transfer or drop-down, the open-door transfer, the intercollege-interuniversity transfer, and the vocational-technical education major.

Junior College Transfer Students

Focusing on the students transferring from two-year colleges to senior institutions, the literature reveals some of the characteristics of such students. The majority of students at junior college comes directly from high school. Landrith recognizes at least four groups of such students:

. . . the highly qualified high school graduate who is eligible for an honors program; the qualified high school graduate who can meet entrance requirements at many institutions; the high school graduate who is considered a poor risk; and the high school drop-out with work experience (1971:49).

While these students are different from each other on certain aspects, George and George suggest a number of common characteristics for them:

1. Junior college students are, in general, much more likely to commute from home while attending school rather than live on campus.
2. They are less academically able than the students of four-year colleges.
3. On the average, they come from lower socioeconomic backgrounds than do students in four-year colleges.
4. A very high percentage of the two-year college students work part-time while attending college.
5. In general, they indicate they have less interest in student activities sponsored by the college than do the typical four-year college students (1972:155-156).

Blocker, Plummer and Richardson summarize some of the characteristics of two-year college transfers as:

1. Two year college students are, on the average, less academically able than students of four-year colleges and universities.
2. Two-year college students, on the average, come from lower socioeconomic background than do their counterparts in four-year colleges and universities.
3. Two-year college students are facing the most critical period of their lives in terms of vocational choice.
4. A substantial number of two-year college students will continue their education at other insitutions of higher education.
5. The students of two-year colleges, considered as a whole, are more similar to other students of higher education than they are different (1965:240-241).

In their national study, Knoel and Medsker (1965:18) reported similar characteristics of junior college transfer students. Likewise, these data are presented by Monroe (1977:181-206). However, the results of a study conducted by the Florida Community/Junior College Inter-Institutional Research Council (IRC), reported by Nickens (1976:37),

indicate that there is a tendency among transfer students to choose the university nearest their community college or home. Many of these students may be working while attending the university. The data also indicate that "community college transfer students tend to choose Education or Business far more often than any other major in each university with the exception of the University of Florida where social science enrolled a few more transfer students than did Business" (1976: 37). Although transfer students select a major from among various fields of study, limited studies have examined the specific trends.

Reasons for Transfer

Due to the increased number of transfer students, it is essential to realize why the students intentionally choose the transfer programs, while there is a high possibility of loss of credit, time, and money. According to Rinehart (1977:37-38), in addition to the traditional intention of entering a transfer program with the express goal of moving on to a four-year college, other reasons include such things as: changes of educational goals; subsequent awareness of educational options and specialization opportunities; and family relocation.

A report presented by the North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities lists a number of reasons as follows:

The prevalent one is the student's desire to advance his education, such as from junior to senior level. Another is the student's need to accommodate himself better to academic standards, programs, costs or geographic location. One student, for instance, may want a more academically challenging college. Another may need a school less challenging, or less expensive, or with a special program in which he has acquired an interest. And, of course, there is always the student who transfers simply for no other reason than to be closer to a friend (1977:1).

The results of a study of 315 students, conducted by Kuznik, Maxey, and Anderson revealed the following reasons for their reverse transfer:

1. Financial reasons: most community colleges have lower student costs than do public and/or private universities.
2. Academic failure at the four-year institutions.
3. The lack of personalization on the four-year college campuses (1979:25).

Academic Success After Transfer

As cited by Brawer (1980:65), Russell and Perez state that community colleges "were, are, and will be evaluated to a major degree upon the success of their transfer students to the four-year colleges and universities." Senior college people generally question the academic ability of the two-year college transfers in handling upper-division courses. But the results of various studies contradict this attitude of senior colleges to a great extent.

The data from Rinehart's (1977:42) study revealed that transfer students suffered a reduction of grade-point average in the first semester after transfer and then they improved in subsequent marking periods. In his view, the existence of transfer shock and recovery might be a fair explanation of this situation. In a study of 239 Massachusetts community college transfers to the University of Massachusetts in 1966, Beals found that:

1. The academic aptitude of community college students as measured by high schools SAT's and class rank was significantly lower than the high school SAT's and class rank of regularly enrolled university students.
2. There is no significant difference in the aptitude of the transfer student as measured by high school SAT's and class rank among or within the respective eight community colleges.

3. The first-semester-after-transfer grade point average for community college transfers is significantly lower than the fifth semester grade point average of regularly enrolled university students.
4. The eighth semester grade point average for the community college transfers was not significantly different from grade point averages of the regularly enrolled university students (1971:23).

In another study of 20,000 transfer applicants to 48 Massachusetts colleges and universities for fall, 1973, Beals (1974:87-93) shows the satisfactory performance of transfer students. The College of Engineering at Berkeley conducted a seven year study of 500 transfer students.

The main results derived from this study were:

1. The percentage of failures of transfer students was approximately 2 percent whereas the continuing Berkeley student failure rate was about 1.6 percent.
2. Approximately 67 percent of the transfer students graduated in two years, and 66 percent of the 'native' students took two years--an almost identical amount of time.
3. Approximately 50 percent of the 'native' students met graduate school requirements, as compared with 45 percent of the 'eligibles' and 40 percent of the 'second-chance' transfers.
4. Grade point average differences were minimal (Foresi, 1974:66-67).

As Nickens (1976:38) suggests, community college transfer students tend to be successful in most majors in all the universities.

Knoel and Medsker's 1965 study was perhaps one of the landmark researches on transfer students which set the tone of numerous publications. Some of their findings are:

Sixty-two percent of the junior college students were granted their baccalaureate degree within three years after transfer. The records of the students who transferred with junior standing was much better than those of students who transferred with lower class standing. Most junior college students experienced some drop in grades when they transferred, particularly in their first term. The pattern of native-transfer

differences was less likely to occur in the teachers colleges than in the major state universities (Knoel and Medsker, 1965: 19-20).

Reviewing a number of studies of transfer students, Nolan and Hall (1978:543) found that there is a general trend that "grade point averages dropped during the first semester after transfer indicating the effects of transfer shock." Palinchack (1973:191-192) lists four general conclusions emerging from studies concerning public two-year transfer students, among which are:

1. Transfer students from community colleges achieve records about the same as those made by transfers from four-year colleges and by native students, sometimes better, sometimes worse. They usually show a drop in grade point average in the first term after transfer but then recover that loss.
2. Community college transfers retain their relative scholastic standing after transfer that they held before transfer.

O'Banion and Thurston (1972:158-159) also summarize the general conclusions of previous studies, which in sum support the successful movement of transfer students in the senior colleges. Despite these findings, Harrison argues that:

. . . the success of the transfer students after making the transition depends critically on matching his own preparation with the range of options available in the upper-division institution (1972:518).

In sum:

. . . there is little substance to the notion that community college students aren't as well prepared as their counterparts at the university. The old cliché that community college students are 'second rate' is no longer true (Masat, 1980:11).

Problems Encountered by Transfer Students

The junior college students transferring to senior institutions may face a variety of problems, such as some loss of credit, time, money,

and emotional energy, from which credit loss usually overshadows and/or causes other problems. Menacher (1974:201) recognizes this problem by arguing that the most serious problem at present is the need to improve credit transfer. The results of a number of studies also show this barrier. Knoel and Medsker (1964:64) found that eight percent of junior college students lost at least a full semester's credit upon transfer. The Willingham and Findikyan's report indicated 13 percent (Menacher, 1974:201). In this regard, Masat maintains:

The award of credit in past years has been the most serious problem for transfers. Many institutions maintain a complex array of policies affecting the transfer of credit. Within universities, individual colleges often have contradictory positions regarding the transfer of credit, D grades and credit limitations (1980:12).

The problems are so varied which may cause a lot of anxiety for transfer students. Furniss and Martin (1974:15) list several of the barriers, such as: lack of standardization of grading systems; difficulty with pass/fail grading systems; lack of synchronized academic calendars; lack of agreement on external degree standards; lack of agreement on validity of credit for life experiences; lack of standardized admission standards; lack of agreement on core curricula; lack of understanding of course content and objectives. Yet, most transfer students encounter a problem called "transfer shock" (Reid, 1976:19).

It is argued that:

. . . in many cases, these problems are created by the students themselves who change their educational goals or select institutions or programs for which they are not properly qualified. Sometimes, however, the problems stem from unnecessary differences in admission procedures and general education requirements among the institutions . . . (North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities, 1977:1).

No matter who is the source of the problems, students, institutions, or both, the students are who should bear them. As Kintzer (1976:1) notes,

many of them encounter discouragement, endless delays, and frustrations.

Similar claim is made by Allan (1974:3). He states:

. . . transfer often means loss of credits, time, money, and even enthusiaum . . . Barriers to transfer resulting from sheer parochialism rather than honest efforts in developing creditable procedures continue to hamper the students' smooth transition (1974:3).

In fact, 'most of the problems facing transfer students arise from the lack of an effective system of articulation and coordination within the system and among the institutions of higher education.

Articulation Between Junior and Senior Institutions

Articulation Defined

The term "articulation" is not well-known to many laymen and school of college people. At the heart of various definitions presented in the literature rests the mechanism by which the flow of transfers could be eased, the unnecessary duplication of courses could be prevented, and the cooperative relationship between and among educational institutions could be improved.

Kintzer (1971:581) defines articulation as "a process which, when operating properly, provides a continuous smooth flow of students from grade to grade and school to school." Based on the Handbook VI, Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems, articulation is referred to as:

The manner in which the classroom instruction, curricular activities and instructional services of the school system are interrelated and interdependent, the aim being to facilitate the continuous and efficient education program of the pupils, . . . to interrelate various areas of the curriculum . . . and/or to interrelate the school's instructional program with

the program of out-of-school educational instruction (Linson, Wilson, and Hunt, 1971:29).

Hurley (1973:2-3) states that the concept of articulation is that of a collection of statements and criteria which allows a student to pass from one institution to another institution. Operationally defined, articulation as a process embodies the notion of jointedness or connectedness. According to McKinnerney et al., articulation is the relationship between educational programs, which are designed to provide a smooth transition for the student from one educational program to another (Buffer, 1977:8). Thompson (1978:12) and Reid (1976:5) present similar meaning for articulation. Likewise, Allan maintains that:

. . . a sound academic articulation procedure is one which facilitates the student's progress from his first year in a community college through his last year and baccalaureate degree from a college or university in the shortest possible time and in a manner conducive to proper academic standards (1974:3-4).

Articulation Problems

Articulation, as stated by Kintzer (1976:2), "is an extremely complex concept." The results of two studies (Johnson, 1979:11) as well as other related literature clearly indicate that articulation between two- and four-year colleges was a more serious problem in the 60's than it is now. According to Monroe (1977:64), scarcely any formal arrangement existed for facilitating articulation between community colleges and the senior institutions before 1950. By 1960, arrangements had been developed in California, Florida, and Illinois. By 1970, most states had adapted some form of articulation program.

In a study of 178 four-year accredited institutions, Meskill (1971: 24) reported that "an obvious deficiency in admissions programs for

transfer students was the substantial lack of formal articulation between two- and four-year schools." The articulation problems may be caused by different sources. Wattenbarger and Medford (1974:26) maintain that such problems derive from at least four sources: the senior institutions, the community college, the student, and specialized accrediting agencies. Ernest (1978:32) argues that one of the problems leading to the ineffective articulation efforts of an institution is the lack of a clearly-stated working definition which can be easily understood by those charged with developing and implementing articulation activities.

Knoel and Medsker specify four problem areas in planning for articulation:

1. The students: their choices of programs, their degree goals, class attendance patterns, academic and economic resources, and the characteristics and requirements of the colleges they choose.
2. Curriculum and instruction: acceptance of transfer credit, coordination of teaching methods and materials, grading standards, classroom experimentation, and teacher training.
3. Student personnel services: financial aid, orientation programs, improved counseling, and adjustment to transfer.
4. Facilities and resources: priorities, enrollment quotas, specialized programs, and calendar coordination (1965: 76-76).

According to Buffer (1977:9), the problem areas in articulation include: students, curriculum and instruction, student personnel services, facilities and resources, mistrust among faculties, and institutional autonomy. Wattenbarger pinpoints some of the articulation problems (O'Banion and Thurston, 1972:156-160). He states a major portion of articulation problems are related directly to matters which may be

characterized as the bookkeeping of education. Community colleges themselves often cause similar problems. Furthermore, he identifies four general areas of concern: the students, the personnel services, the educational programs, and the resources. Hertig believes that the articulation problems stem from three common failures at the department level:

1. A lack of mutual respect and acceptance among two- and four-year college faculty.
2. Failure to recognize the necessity of attacking articulation problems on a local, or at most, regional scale.
3. The absence of mechanisms which allow for curriculum planning and interdigitation, providing for student follow-up . . . (1973:40).

Three studies conducted by Larsen (1979:4433-A); Shannon (1978:4083-A); and Messer (1973:7553-A) all recognize the articulation problems so far discussed. In general, as Hurley (1973:1) states the "institutional differences at both levels of education, student differences, and program differences, especially at the upper division level, extend the problems of articulation," unless serious consideration is devoted to the matter. Wattenbarger maintains that the articulation problems are never truly "laid to rest" because as soon as a workable procedure is reached and/or a decision made with clear and certain understanding on the part of all concerned, there might happen something, like personnel changes, which endanger the process (O'Banion and Thurston, 1972:156).

Articulation Process/Systems

Articulation is not only a product of attitude, but it also involves a complex process. Kintzer (1973:25) maintains that

"articulation in education is definitely a team process--a series of complex and interlocking formal relationships between schools . . . articulation is also an attitude." He further explains that differences in institutional philosophy is not always identifiable, while individual prejudices are often hard to overcome. Waller (1980:19) also states that "articulation is both a process and an attitude, with attitude being the more important." The process contains a series of steps, taken by the senior institution, junior college and the transfer student, which provide a smooth flow from subject to subject, grade to grade and college to college.

The articulation process, as stated by Knoel and Medsker (1965:77-78), involves people as well as problems and procedures. Such a complex process requires the institutions to know how it ought to be involved and how to make it work. Reid (1976:6) also realizes another aspect of articulation process. He believes that "one of the most important aspects of the articulation process has to do with the new types of clientele being served by institutions of higher education." Yet, the process may be viewed in a broader context. According to a consortium of Missouri institutions:

Articulation involves people, policies, and procedures, and the problems which evolve as advisors guide their students in the assimilation of earned credit from pairs of programs and/or colleges. Articulation also pertains to students and college personnel, curricula, and degree requirements, and/or campus atmosphere (Buffer, 1977:5).

This assessment may necessarily require that the articulation process reach out various segments of an institution on the one hand, and among various institutions on the other. Monroe (1977:64) notes that articulation occurs not only at the level of the top administrators, but

also between department chairmen and faculty members of both the community college and the university. Buffer (1977:5) also identifies two grounds upon which articulation may occur. He says that the dialogue regarding articulation may be between institutions on an equal level in the academic hierarchy (horizontal articulation), or between institutions that are either above or below each other in that order (vertical articulation).

However, Kintzer (1973:5) argues that articulation, until very recently, has been a one-way situation. He further maintains that while articulation agreements between senior colleges and high schools were generally well developed before 1960, programs centering attention on the two-year college graduates were scarce. This issue is still critical for two-year occupational majors. According to Walsh (1980:5), in many cases the legitimate goals of two-year occupational graduates are left unfulfilled because of a lack of meaningful articulation.

In a comprehensive study, Kintzer analyzed articulation practices and plans in 50 states in 1973 and updated the information in 1975. His initial findings revealed that 22 states had some type of improved articulation plan as classified into three major styles: formal and legal policies; state system policies; and voluntary agreements among institutions. Under the first two styles are two different plans or policies (1973:33-34). Although his later data suggest minor changes (1975), he states except in a few states, many others have started to develop some type of articulation system. As far as articulation guidelines and transfer policies are concerned, Kintzer (1976:1), points out that 39 states are at that stage. It is stated that the statewide policies are emerging rapidly.

Selected Ways of Improving the Junior and Senior College Relationships

While the nature and extent of articulation programs are dependent upon the institutions' missions and goals (Ernest, 1978:33), the foundation upon which any articulation effort must rest is a mutual respect and acceptance between the people of two- and four-year institutions (Hertig, 1973:40). Such a respect not only strengthens the relationship between the two levels, it also leads to a higher degree of effectiveness and educational quality. The institutions of higher education (voluntarily, legally mandated, or through cooperative bodies) have adopted a number of policies and guidelines to improve their cooperative relationship.

Articulation Guidelines/Transfer Policies

According to Kintzer (1976:1) various state agencies, commissions, and legislatures have given increasing attention to articulation and transfer in recent years. According to Allan (1974:12), the efforts at improving articulation may be classified as national, state, or local in scope. Although the federal government has not offered any significant assistance in this area, state and local efforts have been appreciable. Today, various states have some forms of articulation and/or transfer policies and guidelines such as those adopted in Florida, Missouri, Hawaii (Buffer, 1977:16), and in many other states (Kintzer, 1973). For instance, a Joint Committee on College Transfer Students was created in 1965 by the four organizations representative of the entire spectrum of higher education in North Carolina in order to develop guidelines for transfer and articulation. The guidelines recommended

covered nine areas: admission, biological science, English, foreign languages, humanities, mathematics, physical education, physical sciences, and social sciences (North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities, 1977:2). The master plan in many states like Florida, Oklahoma, Illinois, etc. contains such guidelines.

Perhaps the most important of such guidelines which has set the tone of most state and local policies are the product of a joint statement of the Association of American Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Offices (1966:7-17). These guidelines were developed to deal with issues related to admissions; evaluation of transfer courses; curriculum planning; advising, counseling, and other student personnel services; and articulation programs. Another set of national guidelines are presented by the Airlie House Conference of December 1973 on College Transfer (Rinehart, 1977:45).

In addition, the literature contains other recommendations or proposed guides. Waller (1980:14-24) presents guidelines for articulation in the social sciences. The elements of his guidelines are "substance, opportunity, community, enquiry, enjoyment, transfer, and yardstick." Hertig (1973:40, 42) proposes a model for improving articulation which focuses on such aspects as attitude revision, communication, student follow-up, etc. Similarly, Linson, Wilson, and Hunt (1971:30) set forth a number proposes for an effective articulation plan in vocational education. Allan (1974:17-20) also offers an articulation plan between two- and four-year colleges.

In general, most of these guidelines and plans emphasize the voluntary articulation arrangements, closer communication and cooperation among institutions; and the trend toward more statewide policies.

Upper-Division College

As a new phenomenon in the system of higher education, upper division college refers to the:

. . . baccalaureate-granting institutions which admit students only after completion of a minimum of two years of collegiate work and which, themselves, offer only the junior, senior, and in some cases post-graduate years (Altman, 1970:xi).

Kintzer (1979:36) maintains that although the upper-level movement is a relatively newcomer to the higher education scene (much newer than the two-year college which it serves as a prime receiver of Associate in Arts degree graduates), its philosophical roots are a century and more old.

There are several of such institutions through the United States. By 1973, Kahns reported 25 of them offering only upper-division or upper-division and graduate work (Rice, 1976:25). As cited by Kintzer (1979:35), the 1975 Directory of the Association of Upper-Level Colleges contained 22 members in 11 states. Yet, some reports count as many as 31 of such institutions. According to Higbee (1973:44), prior to 1964 only California, Tennessee, and Indiana had upper level institutions and in each case these were privately supported. Between 1964 and 1972, four such colleges were established in Florida. Texas has five of them and Illinois two.

The current literature suggest some controversial points of view concerning upper level colleges. Kintzer (1979:37-39) identifies the missions of these colleges as: to serve students transferring from

community and junior colleges to senior institutions; to provide excellent teaching; to give emphasis to career education; to provide a balance between the applied arts and the liberal arts; and to be an innovative institution. Cloud and Rodriguez also list several advantages of upper-level universities which adequately assist transfer students as follows:

1. The faculty and administration are positively oriented toward transfer students.
2. Upper-division institutions are teaching oriented in the same manner as community colleges.
3. Students are admitted to upper-division institutions with minimum loss of academic credit, time, and money.
4. Upper-division institutions offer specialized concentration in baccalaureate and graduate education and thus serve as a means of direct entry into occupations.
5. Instruction and student services are tailored specifically for the convenience of the transfer students.
6. At the upper-division institutions, every entering student has previously earned credits at another college or university. There is no competition with students who have already been on campus for two or more years (1979:393).

Higbee (1973:45, 48) also presents a similar set of benefits from upper-level college to transfer students.

On the other hand, Kintzer explains some of the shortcomings of these colleges, among which are:

. . . they remain in the somewhat ignominious situation of a transition school between community colleges and traditionally organized universities; an ineffective balance between liberal or theoretical and practical education; poor communication and poor coordination with two-year colleges (1979:39-40).

In sum, Higbee claims that these institutions seem to be the answer to problems with which transfer students have long been plagued (1973:48). Kintzer (1979:40) believes that they provide the most optimistic view of the future. Similarly Altman (1970:174) views them as the most

viable in relation to either conversion of existing junior colleges or creation of many four-year institutions.

Fostering Communication and Cooperation

Among Institutions

The junior colleges are intimately concerned with all the problems of higher education. They have become full partners in the enterprise and will bear an increasing share of each of the burdens (Thornton, 1968:17). Thus, according to Ernest (1978:33), where the junior and senior institutions are serving the higher education needs of the same region, it is particularly important that the two types of institutions understand their respective contributions to the area they are serving and work to complement each other's efforts rather than overlap or compete. Indeed, such a cooperative effort requires mutual respect and understanding among the parties involved. Allan (1974:11) realizes the need for such understanding between the faculties at both levels.

As Kintzer points out:

. . . attitudes are important here--the willingness or reluctance of responsible personnel to enter voluntarily into cooperative planning agreements, placing the student ahead of administrative expediency (1973:2).

He further states that the success of the transfer process depends on continued, close interinstitutional communication and cooperation. Similarly, Harrison (1972:517) maintains that the appropriate coordination and articulation of community college academic programs with those of four-year institutions lead to flow very considerable intellectual benefits both to the student and to the institution to which he transfers.

The cooperation between junior and senior colleges should be comprehensive enough to benefit every aspect of higher education, including faculty, student, administration, programs, etc. Landrith (1971:50) notes that universities and colleges need a higher degree of cooperation in planning curricula for junior college personnel. Hertig (1973:41) urges the establishment of a mechanism for promoting visits between institutions, seminars, and lecture programs in which two-year and four-year colleges can reciprocate, thereby increasing the extent of communication and expanding the flow of information. Kinney (1976:35) recommends to establish personnel liaison between university and community college people for the purpose of teacher development and in-service programs improvement at both levels.

Many other educators favor a close partnership between two- and four-year colleges. Among them are Kintzer (1979:38); O'Grady, Jr. (1974:38-39); O'Banion and Thurston (1972:166); and so on.

However, while in many states like Oklahoma, there is a state coordinating body which facilitates the communication and cooperation among the institutions of higher education, Masat suggests that:

. . . the solving of transfer and articulation problems through cooperative and mutual agreements is preferable to state and government regulations that are sure to follow if institutions do not regulate themselves in meeting the needs of transfers (1980:13).

Therefore, what is evident is that whatever the motive behind it, there is now a concern for improving relations. The only thing community colleges and universities have to offer each other is an honest attempt by the people at both levels to understand each other (Kinney, 1976:36-37).

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was two-fold. First, to assess and compare the attitudes of junior and senior college academic administrators toward junior college education, and five facets of junior college-- faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities. Second, to examine and compare the attitudes of senior college academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, toward junior college education and the five stated facets of junior college. The perceptions and attitudes were quantified in terms of the scores on the Junior College Attitude Survey (Rice, 1976:122-125).

This chapter includes the various components of the research design utilized in the study by which: the intended purposes were accomplished; the research hypotheses were tested; and the research questions were answered. As Kerlinger states:

. . . research design is the plan, structure, and strategy of investigation conceived so as to obtain answers to research questions, . . . , and to control the experimental, extraneous, and error variances of the particular research problem under study (1964:300).

Therefore, the subsequent parts of this chapter are: the definition and selection of population and sample, a description of the research instrument, the procedures used in data collection and analysis; and the statistical tool used in manipulating collected data.

Identification of Population

The population of this study comprised two groups of academic administrators in 22 states.

1. The chief academic administrators in public senior colleges in the 22 states.

2. The chief academic administrators in public two-year colleges and members of the AACJC in the 22 states.

In a national study, Kintzer (1973:35-106) found 22 states to have one of the three major articulation plans: formal and legal; state system policies; and voluntary agreement. With the first two plans having two subplans, the 22 states were classified into five categories of articulation systems, as seen in Table I. Yet, each classification contains an unequal number of states. As shown, three states are in the first plan, one state in the second plan, five states in the third plan, 12 states in the fourth plan, and two states in the fifth plan. A summary of these 22 states with the number of public junior and senior colleges operating in each state is presented in Table II.

Because the sample selected to participate in this research effort was drawn from the population described above, no attempt should be made to generalize the findings of this study to a broader population of other states, private institutions, or college people other than chief academic administrators. Yet, the implications of the results may be useful in focusing future research efforts.

Selection of The Sample

The sample of this study included five states and a total of 187 subjects. Those five states--Georgia, Illinois, Virginia,

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY THE
TYPE OF ARTICULATION PLAN

Types of Articulation Plans	States
Formal and legal policies	
1. Formal plans	Florida Georgia Texas
2. Legal plans	Illinois
State system policies	
3. State agency	North Carolina Oklahoma Oregon Virginia
4. Institutional system	Hawaii Kentucky Nebraska Wisconsin Iowa Arizona Massachusetts Missouri New Jersey New York Pennsylvania Washington
5. Voluntary agreements	California Michigan

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION BY STATES
AND TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

State	Number of Public Junior Colleges; AACJC Members	Number of Public Senior Colleges	Total Number of Public Institutions
Arizona	16	3	19
California	89	27	116
Florida	31	7	38
Georgia	13	15	28
Hawaii	7	2	9
Illinois	43	11	54
Iowa	16	3	19
Kentucky	12	7	19
Massachusetts	14	12	26
Michigan	28	14	42
Missouri	15	12	27
Nevada	4	2	6
New Jersey	14	9	23
New York	36	24	60
North Carolina	53	16	69
Oklahoma	15	12	27
Oregon	13	6	19
Pennsylvania	16	19	35
Texas	53	22	75
Virginia	23	14	47
Washington	23	5	28
Wisconsin	<u>16</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>29</u>
Total	550	255	805

Massachusetts, and Michigan--were chosen from among 22 states by a stratified random selection method.

The stratified sampling method with a table of random numbers were used to secure one state from each of the classification of articulation plans given in Table I. According to Gay (1976:71), this sampling method is appropriate "to select equalized samples from each of a number of subgroups if subgroup comparisons are desired."

All public two-year colleges in these five states, which were the AACJC members, were considered for the study. Likewise, all public senior colleges and universities in the five states were assigned to the study. The first group totaled 121 junior colleges and the second group comprised 66 senior institutions. The chief academic administrators of all of these 187 institutions participated in the study. The distribution of subjects by states is shown in Table III.

In the process of sample selection, a number of sources were used: the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's (1973), A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, was used to draw the list of public junior and senior colleges in the five states. The Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (AACJC, 1980) was a useful guide to differentiate the two-year AACJC members from non-members. Finally, the Yearbook of Higher Education (Marquis Academic Media, 1980-81) was mainly used to draw the address of each institution and the list of academic administrators in the selected colleges and universities.

Research Instrument

The Junior College Attitude Survey (Rice, 1976:122-125) was employed in this study to collect data concerning the attitudes of chief

TABLE III
 DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY STATES
 AND TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

State	Number of Subjects in Public Junior College	Percent of the Whole Sample	Number of Subjects in Public Senior College	Percent of the Whole Sample	Total Subjects	Cumulative Percent
Georgia	13	7%	15	8%	28	15%
Illinois	43	23%	11	6%	54	29%
Virginia	23	12%	14	8%	37	20%
Massachusetts	14	8%	12	6%	26	14%
Michigan	<u>28</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>22%</u>
Total	121	65%	66	35%	187	100%

academic administrators at junior and senior colleges with regard to junior college education and five aspects of junior colleges--faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities. This instrument was developed by James as his doctoral dissertation at the University of Illinois in 1969. According to Rice (1976:50), this questionnaire dealt particularly with attitudes of high school counselors toward the junior college, but it was so designed that it could be used in the attitude assessment of many different groups. After a thorough review of the instrument, it was found to be applicable in this study.

The instrument contained 39 Likert-type items and was constructed from a large pool of items obtained from a variety of sources. The response for each item includes a five option range of "strongly disagree," "disagree," "undecided," "agree," and "strongly agree." The selection of these 39 items was based on three pilot studies, administering the correlation coefficients and "t" values, and rank ordering those "t" values. (See Appendix A.) To validate the discriminating power of the selected items, James utilized an item analyses method. According to Rice:

The 39 items chosen did show a substantial correlation with the total score; indicating that different responses were elicited for those who score high, and those who score low on the total test. The substantial correlation coefficient and the high "t" statistics indicate that the questionnaire is internally consistent, or that every item is related to the same general attitude (1976:54).

The items developed by James are shown in Appendix B. Rice (1976: 122-125) made minor revisions in the instrument, without altering the intent or direction of the attitude statements involved, to assess the attitude of full-time faculty members toward junior college education. The 39 items as utilized in Rice's study is given in Appendix C.

For the purpose of this study, the questionnaire was used with similar format as Rice utilized in his study. The items describing the junior college's faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities were singled out but remained in the questionnaire as they were. Since the number of items related to junior college administration and facilities were few, four new items were developed by the researcher to assure at least four items for each aspect of junior college. The new items were reviewed by the members of the doctoral committee and after their approval, were placed into the questionnaire. Although some of the items were not describing any of the five stated aspects, they were not omitted so that other purposes of the study might be achieved.

Therefore, the Junior College Attitude Survey as was used in this study consisted of 43 Likert-type items as shown in Appendix D. In the new format, items 8, 14, 23, and 37 were developed by the researcher. The items describing junior college students are items 4, 13, 15, 18, 36, 38, and 43. Items 3, 10, 19, 35, and 41 are related to junior college faculty. The junior college programs are explained by items 1, 25, 27, 28, 31, 39, and 42. The four items--2, 8, 23, and 33--describe the junior college administration. Finally, the items related to junior college facilities are 6, 9, 11, 14, and 37. The last page of the instrument contained six demographic information which made the total items, to be completed by the respondents, 49.

Based on the instruction given in page one of the questionnaire, there were no right or wrong answers. The subjects were asked to respond to the items according to their own beliefs and perceptions. Also, they were asked to comment about the questionnaire, junior colleges, or the study, if they desired.

Data Collection Procedure

Due to the large sample size and wide geographic dispersion of subjects considered for this study, the mail survey seemed the most appropriate procedure for data collection. In addition to numerous common advantages of this method, such as less cost, inclusion of large sample sizes, and simplicity of the process (Rice, 1976:59), it is the most appropriate method when the researcher is dealing with attitudes (Koos, 1928:147-149).

On April 16, 1981, the first mailing packages containing a letter, the instrument, and a stamped-self addressed return envelope were sent to 187 participants. The letter explained the study and its significance and requested the participation and cooperation of respondents. (See Appendix E.) The confidentiality of the responses was clearly assured in the letter. To secure higher returns, it was decided to use letterhead stationary from the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education with each letter personally signed in ink by the Department Head and by the researcher. On the other hand, the respondents were greeted in the letter by simply stating "Dear Chief Academic Administrator," rather than indicating the name or positions because of two reasons: time limitation, and fear that such a person might no longer be at that position.

The instrument was made fairly nice and simple to deal with. A four letter code was printed in the upper-left-hand corner of the first page of each questionnaire. The first letter (T or F) indicating whether the response was from a "Two or Four" year institution. The second letter (G, I, V, Ma, or Mi) identified the state in which that institution was located as explained here: G for Georgia; I for

Illinois; V for Virginia; Ma for Massachusetts; and Mi for Michigan. The third and fourth letters were the serial letters identifying the specific institutions and respondents.

The third component of the package, the self-stamped envelope contained the department's address for returned responses.

During one month after the first mailing, a total of 108 (57.8%) of the questionnaires were returned including 67 (55%) of junior colleges and 41 (62%) of senior colleges.

On May 16, 1981, the second mailing package containing similar material as the first package was sent to about 80 subjects whose questionnaires were not returned. The second letter is shown in Appendix F. The original code was used with the addition of number "2" at the end indicating the second mailing. As a result of this follow-up, 28 (15%) additional questionnaires were returned. Thus, the cumulative response after the follow-up was 136 (72.7%) as of June 16, 1981. (See Table IV.) The responses received after this date were reported but were not included in the analyses. Because of the adequate rate of return, it was decided not to request further assistance from the non-respondents sample.

Statistical Procedures

The statistical techniques utilized for testing the research hypotheses of this study were: the single classification, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the Scheffe multiple range test, and the Duncan multiple range test.

For the first major hypotheses and its five subsequent and related hypotheses, the aim of the study was to determine if a significant

TABLE IV
 RESPONSE RATE BY STATES AND
 TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

State	Junior Colleges				Senior Colleges				Cumulative		
	Total Sent	1st Returns	2nd Returns	Total	Total Sent	1st Returns	2nd Returns	Total	Sent	Receive	Percent
Georgia	13	11	2	13	15	10	3	13	38	26	68.4
Illinois	43	18	11	29	11	5	3	8	54	37	68.5
Virginia	23	15	0	15	14	8	2	10	37	25	67.6
Massachusetts	14	7	2	10	12	7	2	9	26	19	73.0
Michigan	<u>28</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>69.0</u>
Total	121	67	18	85	66	41	10	51	187	136	72.7

difference existed between the mean scores of two independent groups chosen randomly from two different populations which both seem to be normally distributed and have approximately the same variability (homogeneity of variance).

For the second major hypotheses and its five subsequent and related hypotheses, the attempt in the study was to determine if a significant difference existed among the mean scores of five independent groups chosen randomly from a population which seems to be normally distributed and contains a homogeneity of variance.

In either case, the researcher dealt with unequal sample sizes (unequal n's) and two variables. For both sets of hypotheses, the dependent variable was the "attitude of chief academic administrators." While the "type of institution" (junior or senior) formed the independent variable of the first six hypotheses, the independent variable for the hypotheses 7 through 12 was the "types of state" or, as defined before, the "types of articulation plans."

The statistical techniques used in this study has been advised by many statisticians and researchers. Burtz states:

. . . one of the most useful techniques in statistics is the analysis of variance (abbreviated AV or ANOVA). This technique allows us to compare two or more means to see if there are significant differences between or among them (1976:270).

Gay (1976:254) makes similar argument for this method. Nevertheless, the use of this technique requires that four main assumptions be met:

1. It is assumed that the distribution of the variable in the population from which our k samples are drawn is normal.
2. It is assumed that all k groups have the same variance.
3. It is assumed that the factors which account for deviation in an individual's score are additive.

4. It is assumed that the subjects are assigned at random to the k groups (Kurtz and Mayo, 1979:417).

As explained earlier, these assumptions were present in this study. Therefore, after the returned questionnaires were tabulated, the data were keypunched and using the SPSS computer programs, the results produced by the analysis of variance and the two multiple range tests were analyzed, tabulated, and interpreted in subsequent sections.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data gathered from the questionnaires were analyzed from three distinct points of view: first, the demographic information; second, testing the research hypotheses; and third, the pattern of responses to certain items of the questionnaire. This chapter not only contains the results and findings of this study as they relate to these viewpoints, it also presents the findings which were not originally aimed at.

Of the 187 chief academic administrators of 121 public two-year colleges and 66 public senior colleges in the five states--Georgia, Illinois, Virginia, Massachusetts, and Michigan--136 or 72.7% responded to the questionnaires and returned them during the two months, April 16, 1981 to June 16, 1981. Four questionnaires were returned too late for inclusion. Counting these four late responses, the number of questionnaires returned totaled 140 or 74.8% of the original sample.

In addition to the late responses, six questionnaires returned unanswered with attached notes stating that they either preferred not to be included in the study, or thought the study was not applicable to their institutions. Thus, leaving a total of 130 or 70% of the original sample of 187 for the data analysis. The percentage of usable responses is shown in Table V.

The 81 usable responses from junior colleges indicated that 71 (88%) of the respondents were males and 10 (12%) were females. For the

TABLE V
THE USABLE RESPONSES BY STATES
AND INSTITUTIONS

State	Junior College			Senior College			Total		
	Returns	Usable	Percent	Returns	Usable	Percent	Returns	Usable	Percent
Georgia	13	12	92%	13	13	100%	26	25	96%
Illinois	29	27	93%	8	8	100%	37	35	95%
Virginia	15	15	100%	10	10	100%	25	25	100%
Massachusetts	9	9	100%	9	8	89%	18	17	94%
Michigan	<u>19</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>95%</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>91%</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>93%</u>
Total	85	81	95%	51	49	96%	136	130	96%

senior institutions, 44 (90%) of the 49 usable responses indicated males and five (10%) indicated females. Thus, 115 (88.5%) of the total 130 chief academic administrators at junior and senior institutions, whose responses were used in the study, were males and 15 (11.5%) were females. In general, fewer women hold the job of academic administrator in senior institutions (5) than in junior colleges (10) among all 130 respondents. There was a slight difference among the five states concerning the number of female chief academic administrators: only one in Virginia; two in Georgia; and four in each of the states, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Michigan. (See Table VI.)

TABLE VI
DISTRIBUTION OF FEMALE CHIEF ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS BY STATES AND
INSTITUTIONS

State	Junior College	Senior College	Total
Georgia	1	1	2
Illinois	2	2	4
Virginia	1	0	1
Massachusetts	3	1	4
Michigan	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
Total	10	5	15

The average age of all 130 respondents was 46.6. The academic administrators in senior colleges are slightly older than their counterparts in junior colleges. The average age of academic administrators in two-year colleges was 45 as compared to 49, the average age of academic administrators in senior institutions. The ages reported by all respondents ranged from a low of 31 years to a high of 66 years of age. Two females and one male respondent chose not to report their age.

The majority of respondents at both junior and senior colleges held doctorate degrees. Of the 81 junior college respondents 58 (71.6%) were doctors, 21 (25.9%) were masters, one (1.2%) was a bachelors, and one (1.2%) was an educational specialist. Among the 49 senior college respondents there were 45 (92%) doctors, three (6%) masters, and one (2%) educational specialist. The cumulative figures for the whole 130 respondents consisted of 103 (79.2%) doctors; 24 (18.5%) masters; two (1.5%) educational specialists, and one (.77%) bachelors.

The number of years in current position for all respondents ranged from one to 20. On the average, the academic administrators of junior colleges have been 6.08 years in their current position as compared to 6.52 years for their counterparts at senior institutions. Thus the average years which all respondents have been in their current position is 6.25 years. Two junior college participants failed to indicate the years in their current positions.

Almost one fifth, 25 (19.2%), of the respondents had been students at a junior college. One junior college respondent did not mention if he had attended a junior college. The proportion of junior college academic administrators who had attended two-year college significantly exceeded the proportion of senior college academic administrators who

had attended two-year colleges. Of the 80 junior college respondents answering this question, 20 (25%) had once been junior college students. On the other hand, five out of 49 (10%) of senior college participants had attended two-year colleges.

This study gained the interest of several of the respondents. Of the 130 participants, five did not specify whether they wished to receive the results of this study. Of the 125 remaining, 88 (68%) wished to receive the results of the study as compared to 37 (29.65) who did not want the results.

Testing the Hypotheses

For this study the ($P < .05$) was considered the base to judge whether various "F" ratios were significant. The data were treated not only for the analysis of variance between and among different groups, they were also used to identify the groups whose mean score on the Junior College Attitude Survey were above the average (indicating favorable attitude toward junior college or any of its aspects), and below average (indicating unfavorable attitude toward junior college or any of its aspects). The mean attitude scale scores considered for this purpose are shown in Table VII. For the 43 items on the questionnaire, the mean is 129; for the five items describing junior college faculty, the mean is 15. Likewise, the mean for items representing junior college facilities is 15; seven items for each of the two aspects of junior college--students and programs--are included in the instrument which makes the mean score for each aspect 21. The mean score for the four items describing junior college administrators is 12.

TABLE VII
 THE MEAN ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES FOR THE
 QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS DESCRIBING
 JUNIOR COLLEGE AND SOME OF
 ITS ASPECTS

Junior College Aspect	Number of Items	Mean Score
Junior College Education	43	129
Junior College Faculty	5	15
Junior College Students	7	21
Junior College Program	7	21
Junior College Administration	4	12
Junior College Facilities	5	15

Major Hypothesis 1

The first major hypothesis and its five related sub-set hypotheses were tested by utilizing the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and reporting the "F" values for each hypothesis.

Major Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators toward junior college education.

The F value of ($F = 150.20$) for the two groups ($N = 81$ and 49) with the degrees of freedom ($1,128$) was significant at (0.05) level. Thus, the first major null hypothesis was rejected. The mean attitude scale score for junior college academic administrators was 179.14 compared to 147.33 , the mean score for senior college academic administrators.

The mean score for both groups together was 167.15. These mean attitude scores compared to the mean score on the instrument (129) indicate the whole sample of 130 subjects have a high favorable attitude toward junior college education. Yet, although there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups, they both displayed a favorable attitude toward junior college education. The F ratio and these mean scores are shown in Tables VIII and IX.

TABLE VIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD JUNIOR
COLLEGE EDUCATION

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	1	30891.79	3089.79	150.20	0.05
Within Groups	128	26326.11	205.68		

Hypothesis 1a: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with regard to junior college faculty.

With the $F(1,128) = 124.58$, this hypothesis was rejected at ($P = 0.05$) indicating a significant difference between the attitudes of the two groups toward junior college faculty. Meanwhile, considering the mean score for the items describing junior college faculty ($\bar{X} = 15$), the

TABLE IX
 MEAN SCORES CONCERNING JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95 POT Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior College Academic Administration	81	179.1	13.0	1.45	176.25 to 182.02
Senior College Academic Administration	<u>49</u>	<u>146.3</u>	<u>16.3</u>	<u>2.33</u>	<u>142.65</u> to <u>152.00</u>
Total	130	167.1	21.1	1.85	163.49 to 170.80

community college participants, with a mean attitude score of 20.05, had a favorable attitude as compared to a mean score of 15.00 for senior college participants indicating a neutral attitude toward junior college faculty. These data are presented in Tables X and XI.

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD JUNIOR
COLLEGE FACULTY

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	1	778.42	778.42	124.58	0.05
Within Groups	128	799.80	6.25		

Hypothesis 1b: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college students.

The comparison of attitude scores of academic administrators of two-year and four-year colleges provided $F(1,128) = 42.56$ which is significant at ($P < 0.05$) level. Based on this F value, this hypothesis was rejected. Having had the mean score for the items related to junior college student to be 21, both groups had a favorable attitude toward junior college students. Yet, the difference between their mean scores was significant. The mean for the first group was 27.70 and for

TABLE XI
 MEAN SCORES CONCERNING JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY

	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95 POT Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior College Academic Administration	81	20.05	2.30	0.26	19.54 to 20.56
Senior College Academic Administration	<u>49</u>	<u>15.00</u>	<u>2.80</u>	<u>0.40</u>	<u>14.20</u> to <u>15.80</u>
Total	130	18.15	3.50	0.31	17.54 to 18.75

the second group was 23.53. These results are provided in Tables XII and XIII.

TABLE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD JUNIOR
COLLEGE STUDENTS

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	1	531.65	531.65	42.56	0.05
Within Groups	128	1599.08	12.49		

Hypothesis 1c: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college programs.

The analysis variance for this hypothesis resulted to the $F(1,128) = 111.85$ which is significant at ($P < 0.05$) level. Thus, meaning that there is a significant difference between the mean attitude scores of the two groups concerning junior college programs. Regardless of the rejection of this null hypothesis, both groups expressed a favorable attitude toward junior college programs with the means of 29.46 (for first group) and 24.25 (for second group) both exceeding the mean for items describing the programs at two-year colleges (21). For the details of these results see Tables XIV and XV.

TABLE XIII
MEAN SCORES CONCERNING JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95 POT Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior College Academic Administration	81	27.70	3.27	0.36	26.98 to 28.43
Senior College Academic Administration	<u>49</u>	<u>23.55</u>	<u>3.93</u>	<u>0.56</u>	<u>22.40</u> to <u>24.66</u>
Total	130	26.13	4.06	0.36	25.43 to 26.84

TABLE XIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC
ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD JUNIOR
COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	1	829.36	829.36	111.85	0.05
Within Groups	128	949.15	7.42		

Hypothesis 1d: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college administration.

Tables XVI and XVII display the F value and the mean scores of the two groups concerning junior college administration. With the $F(1,128) = 111.49$ being significant at ($P < 0.05$), this null hypothesis was also rejected. Such F ratio indicates that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups with regard to junior college administration. Comparing the average scores for items related to junior college administration (12) with the means of group one (16.88) and the mean of group two (13.20), it is obvious that both groups had a favorable attitude but with different intensity. While the junior college academic administrators had a highly favorable attitude mean score (16.88 vs. 12.00), the senior college administrators expressed a slightly favorable attitude (13.20 vs. 12.00).

TABLE XV
MEAN SCORES CONCERNING JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAMS

	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95 POT Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior College Academic Administration	81	29.46	2.45	0.27	28.91 to 30.00
Senior College Academic Administration	<u>49</u>	<u>24.24</u>	<u>3.12</u>	<u>0.45</u>	<u>23.35</u> to <u>25.14</u>
Total	130	27.49	3.71	0.33	26.85 to 28.14

TABLE XVI
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
 JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC
 ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD JUNIOR
 COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	1	411.76	411.76	111.49	0.05
Within Groups	128	472.72	3.69		

Hypothesis 1e: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college facilities.

This hypothesis was rejected since the analysis of variance revealed the $F(1,128) = 13.63$ which is significant at ($P < 0.05$) level. Therefore, the mean scores of the two groups are significantly different in relation with the junior college facilities. As seen in Tables XVIII and XIX, the mean scores of both groups (19.06 and 17.16) exceeded the average score (15) for items describing junior college facilities.

Therefore, according to the data shown in Tables VIII through XIX, the first six null hypotheses were rejected at $P < 0.05$ level. (It might be noted that the F values for all of these six hypotheses were also significant at .001 level.) Except for minor instances, both groups of academic administrators expressed favorable attitudes (with the mean differences remaining significant) toward junior college education and junior college faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities.

TABLE XVII
 MEAN SCORES CONCERNING JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95 POT Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior College Academic Administration	81	16.88	1.71	0.19	16.50 to 17.26
Senior College Academic Administration	<u>49</u>	<u>13.20</u>	<u>2.23</u>	<u>0.32</u>	<u>12.56</u> to <u>13.84</u>
Total	130	15.49	2.62	0.24	15.04 to 15.95

TABLE XVIII
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
 JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC
 ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD JUNIOR
 COLLEGE FACILITIES

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	1	110.04	110.04	13.63	0.05
Within Groups	128	1033.38	8.07		

Major Hypothesis 2

Major Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, regarding junior college education.

For testing this hypothesis and its five related hypotheses, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to see if a significant difference existed among the mean scale scores of the senior college academic administrators in Georgia, Illinois, Virginia, Massachusetts, and Michigan. For the F values significant at the ($P = .05$) level, two multiple range tests, Scheffe, and Duncan were utilized to specify exactly where the differences fall.

For the second major hypothesis, the analysis of variance resulted a $F(4,44) = 2.85$ which is significant at ($P < .05$). Based on this F value, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating a significant difference among the attitude of senior college academic administrators in the five states under study toward junior college education. Yet, the

TABLE XIX
 MEAN SCORES CONCERNING JUNIOR COLLEGE FACILITIES

	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	95 POT Conf. Int. for Mean
Junior College Academic Administration	81	19.06	2.95	0.33	18.40 to 19.71
Senior College Academic Administration	<u>49</u>	<u>17.16</u>	<u>2.65</u>	<u>0.38</u>	<u>16.40</u> to <u>17.92</u>
Total	130	18.35	2.98	0.26	17.83 to 18.86

Scheffe multiple range test indicated that no two groups were significantly different at the 0.05 level. Due to these differences resulting from the ANOVA and Scheffe, the Duncan multiple range test, a more liberal test, was used to locate the difference among the attitude of the five groups. The results of the Duncan test suggested that the mean attitude scale score of group one, 157.62 (the subjects in Georgia), was significantly different at ($P < .05$) from the means of groups three, 140.8 (the subjects in Virginia), and group four, 138.25 (the subjects in Massachusetts).

The mean scores for the 49 subjects in the five states ranged from the lowest 111.00 in Massachusetts to the highest 176.00 in Georgia. Comparing with 129, the mean scale score on the 43 items of the instrument, the data indicated that some subjects in Illinois, Virginia, and Massachusetts had unfavorable attitudes toward junior college education. But, on the whole, the mean scores of all five states exceeds 129, indicating a favorable attitude. Tables XX and XXI show the data from the analysis of variance and mean scores for the second major hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2a: There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college faculty.

With the $F(4,44) = 1.45$, $P > .05$, this null hypothesis was not rejected, meaning that differences among the attitudes of the five groups were not significant. For such a non-significant F value, neither the Scheffe nor the Duncan test were needed. With the average scores of items related to junior college faculty, 15, the average for the 49 responses ranged from 9.00 in Massachusetts to 25.00 in Illinois. Based on the mean scores from each state, the participants of

two states, Virginia and Massachusetts had slightly unfavorable mean scores. (See Tables XXII and XXIII.)

TABLE XX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	4	2619.51	654.88	2.85	.05
Within Groups	44	10109.27	229.76		

TABLE XXI
MEAN SCORES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Group (state)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	13	157.62	12.33	138.00	176.00
Illinois	8	144.25	16.40	117.00	172.00
Virginia	10	140.80	17.16	116.00	166.00
Massachusetts	8	138.25	18.28	111.00	169.00
Michigan	10	150.20	12.52	133.00	174.00

TABLE XXII
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
 SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
 TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	4	43.80	10.99	1.45	NS
Within Groups	44	332.20	7.55		

TABLE XXIII
 MEAN SCORES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY

Group (state)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	13	16.08	2.02	12.00	20.00
Illinois	8	15.25	4.16	12.00	25.00
Virginia	10	14.50	2.80	11.00	18.00
Massachusetts	8	13.25	2.31	9.00	16.00
Michigan	10	15.40	2.46	12.00	19.00

Hypothesis 2b: There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college students.

This null hypothesis was not rejected since the $F(4,44) = 2.22$ is not significant at the (0.05) level. There seemed unnecessary to consider the multiple range tests. All five groups of participants had favorable mean attitude scores (more than 21, the average scale score for the items presenting junior college students). For the 49 subjects, the mean score ranged from 15.00 (unfavorable attitude by a subject in Massachusetts) to 32.00 (very favorable attitude by a subject in Georgia). (See Tables XXIV and XXV.)

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	4	.124.74	31.18	2.22	NS
Within Groups	44	742.20	14.03		

TABLE XXV
MEAN SCORES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Group (state)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	13	25.85	3.48	21.00	32.00
Illinois	8	21.75	3.58	16.00	28.00
Virginia	10	22.50	3.92	17.00	29.00
Massachusetts	8	22.13	4.26	15.00	28.00
Michigan	10	24.10	3.60	19.00	31.00

Hypothesis 2c: There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college programs.

Tables XXVI and XXVII presents the analysis of variance and scores related to junior college programs. At (0.05), the $F(4,44) = 2.22$ is not significant. Therefore, hypothesis 2c was not rejected, indicating that the mean differences among the groups was not significant. With these results, no multiple range test was needed. The mean attitude scores ranged from 17.00 (a respondent in Illinois) to 31.00 (a respondent in Georgia) compared to the 21.00 average score for the instrument items related to junior college programs. Nevertheless the means of all five groups were greater than 21.00, indicating a favorable attitude on the part of all groups.

TABLE XXVI
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
 SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
 TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	4	78.51	19.63	2.22	NS
Within Groups	44	388.56	8.83		

TABLE XXVII
 MEAN SCORES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Group (state)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	13	25.77	3.54	19.00	31.00
Illinois	8	22.88	3.44	17.00	27.00
Virginia	10	23.40	3.44	19.00	28.00
Massachusetts	8	22.88	1.81	20.00	25.00
Michigan	10	25.30	1.71	23.00	27.00

Hypothesis 2d: There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college administration.

Since $F(4,44) = 1.73$ is not significant at the (0.05) level, this hypothesis was not rejected. This result suggests that the subjects of the five groups had a mean attitude score not significantly different from each other. All five groups had a slightly favorable attitude toward junior college administration. For the 49 subjects individually, the lowest mean score was 9.00 (a subject from each of the states, Virginia, Massachusetts, and Michigan); and the highest mean score was 18.00 (a subject in Massachusetts). (See Tables XXVIII and XXIX.)

TABLE XXVIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	4	32.35	8.09	1.73	NS
Within Groups	44	205.61	4.67		

TABLE XXIX
 MEAN SCORES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

Group (state)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	13	14.54	1.81	11.00	17.00
Illinois	8	12.50	2.20	10.00	16.00
Virginia	10	12.90	2.23	9.00	16.00
Massachusetts	8	12.63	2.62	9.00	18.00
Michigan	10	12.80	2.10	9.00	16.00

Hypothesis 2e: There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college facilities.

The analysis of variance revealed that $F(4,44) = 1.28$, ($P > .05$). Since this F value is not significant at (.05), the hypothesis 2e was not rejected. The mean attitude score of all groups exceeded 15, the average scale score on the items related to junior college facilities. For the subjects individually, the range of mean scores was between 11.00 (a subject in Illinois) and 22 (a subject in Massachusetts). These data are shown in Tables XXX and XXXI.

TABLE XXX
 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDES OF
 SENIOR COLLEGE ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
 TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE FACILITIES

Source	df	SS	MS	F	P
Between Groups	4	35.00	8.75	1.28	NS
Within Groups	44	301.70	6.86		

TABLE XXXI
 MEAN SCORES FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE FACILITIES

Group (state)	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Georgia	13	18.68	2.33	12.00	21.00
Illinois	8	18.00	3.42	11.00	21.00
Virginia	10	16.00	2.87	12.00	21.00
Massachusetts	8	16.38	2.97	13.00	22.00
Michigan	10	17.10	1.45	15.00	20.00

Other Findings

Although the questionnaire items as a whole, or in varying groups, provided data for the analysis of variance between the subjects at two- and four-year colleges; and among the subjects at four-year institutions, it seemed appropriate to report on the way the subjects responded to some of the items particularly. Thus, of the 43 items, the response to eight of them are analyzed in the following pages but no attempt was made to test the level of significance of the differences to these items.

Item: Junior colleges are for the dumb rich and the bright poor.

It was assumed that the less a respondent agreed with such statements, the more favorable attitude that person had toward junior college. Of the 81 subjects at junior colleges, 64 (79%) strongly disagreed with the item, 14 (17%) disagreed, one (1%) was neutral, and two (2%) agreed. On the other hand, of the 49 subjects at senior colleges, 23 subjects (47%) strongly disagreed, 25 (51%) agreed, and one (2%) was neutral. The mean score on this item for the first group was 4.73 and for the second group was 4.45. As a result, the junior college respondents had a more favorable attitude on this item than senior college subjects.

Item: It would be better to expand four-year colleges and universities than to build junior colleges.

It was assumed that the less a respondent agreed with the statement, the more favorable attitude that person had toward junior college. Among junior college subjects, 58 (72%) strongly disagreed, 39 (48%) disagreed, three (4%) were neutral, and one (1%) strongly agreed with the statement. On the other hand, six (12%) of senior college subjects

strongly disagreed, 18 (37%) disagreed, 12 (24%) were neutral; 10 (20%) agreed, and three (5%) strongly agreed. The mean attitude score on this item for the first group was 5.63 and for the second group was 3.29 indicating a more favorable attitude expressed by the first group.

Item: In the coming years, junior colleges will enroll an increasingly larger proportion of the college students.

The assumption for this statement was that, the more a subject agreed, the more favorable attitude he/she expressed toward junior colleges. Of the 81 participants at junior colleges, 27 (33%) strongly agreed, 50 (62%) agreed, and four (5%) were neutral. But of the 49 participants at senior colleges, one (2%) strongly agreed, 26 (52%) agreed, 12 (24%) were neutral, and 10 (20%) disagreed. These results indicate that junior college academic administrators are more optimistic about the future of junior colleges than their counterparts at senior colleges.

Item: I would advise students against attending a junior college.

The more disagreement to this item, the more favorable a respondent may be toward junior colleges. Sixty-five (80%) of junior college subjects strongly disagreed, 15 (19%) disagreed, and one (1%) was neutral. On the part of senior college respondents, 10 (20%) strongly disagreed, 26 (52%) disagreed, nine (18%) were neutral, and four (8%) agreed with the statement. Likewise, for this item junior college subjects expressed a more favorable attitude toward junior colleges.

Item: Junior colleges are the wastebaskets of higher education.

It was assumed that the more a subject disagrees with this statement, the more favorable attitude he/she might have toward junior colleges. Sixty-seven (83%) of junior college respondents strongly

disagreed, 12 (15%) disagreed, one (1%) was neutral, and one (1%) agreed. For the senior college respondents, these data consisted of 15 (30%) strongly disagreements, 32 (64%) disagreements, and two (4%) neutrals. The comparison of these data indicate a more favorable attitude on the part of junior college respondents.

Item: The junior college is more a liability than an asset to its community.

Evidently the subjects who disagreed more with the statement had a more favorable attitude toward junior colleges. Of the 81 junior college subjects, 70 (86%) strongly disagreed, 10 (12%) disagreed, and one (1%) agreed. On the other hand, 15 (30%) of senior college subjects strongly disagreed, 33 (66%) disagreed, and one (2%) was neutral. These findings suggest a more favorable attitude expressed by junior college participants than those at senior colleges.

Item: Junior college teachers have more personal interest in the students than teachers in most colleges and universities.

For this item, two assumptions were made. First, the more a subject agreed with the statement, the more favorable he/she might be toward junior colleges. Second, the item is meant that junior college teachers are more student-centered than their colleagues at senior colleges. 26 (32%) of junior college participants strongly agreed, 41 (51%) agreed, 10 (12%) were neutral, and four (5%) disagreed with the statement. For the subjects at senior colleges, only two (4%) strongly agreed, nine (18%) agreed, 14 (28%) were neutral, 21 (42%) disagreed, and three (6%) strongly disagreed with the item. These findings clearly provide two grounds: first, a more favorable attitude was expressed by junior college subjects; and second, more junior college academic administrators than their counterparts at senior colleges believed that

junior college faculty are student-centered as compared to senior college faculty.

Item: Accepting all students who apply give the junior college a bad image.

It was assumed that the more a subject disagreed with this item, the more favorable attitude he(she) had toward junior college especially the open-door policy of these institutions. Ten (12%) of junior college subjects strongly disagreed; 39 (48%) disagreed; 14 (17%) were neutral; 15 (19%) agreed; and three (4%) strongly agreed. On the other hand, three (6%) of senior college subjects strongly disagreed; 17 (34%) disagreed; eight (16%) were neutral; 20 (40%) agreed; and one (2%) strongly agreed. These data also give a margin of favorableness for junior college subjects over senior college participants.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The community/junior colleges are now close partners with senior institutions, which makes the mutual respect, cooperation, and communication between the two levels an absolute necessity. This theme led to the research study summarized in this chapter. Based on the findings of the study, a set of conclusions and recommendations were given by the researcher which are provided in this chapter.

Summary

The purpose of this research was to help refine and strengthen the relationship between junior and senior institutions of higher education through: first, assessment and comparison of the attitudes of junior and senior college academic administrators toward junior college education and five facets of junior college--faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities, and second, similar assessment among the academic administrators of senior colleges in five states with different articulation plans.

The major problems on which the study concentrated were to determine which aspect(s) of the two-year college--faculty, students, programs, administration and facilities--is(are) the main source of conflict between junior and senior colleges, and also to determine which articulation plan(s)--formal, legal, state agency, institutional system,

and/or voluntary agreement is(are) more adequate in improving the relation between junior and senior colleges.

Two major hypotheses and ten sub-set hypotheses were developed and tested:

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators toward junior college education.

1a. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with regard to junior college faculty.

1b. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college students.

1c. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college programs.

1d. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college administration.

1e. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college facilities.

2. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, regarding junior college education.

2a. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college faculty.

2b. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college students.

2c. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college programs.

2d. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college administration.

2e. There is no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college facilities.

The five states, Georgia, Illinois, Virginia, Massachusetts, and Michigan, were selected through a stratified random method from among 22 states identified by Kintzer (1973:35-106), to have some type of improved articulation plan. (See Table I.) A total of 187 chief academic administrators from all public junior and senior colleges in these five states were participated to collect data concerning attitudes toward various aspects of junior colleges. These subjects represented 121 two-year colleges and 66 four-year colleges and universities.

The Junior College Attitude Survey, along with a cover letter explaining the significance of the study and a self-stamped return envelope were mailed to all subjects on April 16, 1981. The follow-up packages were sent to about 80 subjects whose responses were not

received by May 16, 1981. The cumulative returns after the follow-up was 140 (74.8%) of the original 187 subjects. Four responses were too late to include. Six of the returned questionnaires were not completed, leaving a total of 130 (70%) of the sample for the data analysis.

The statistical techniques chosen for testing the research hypotheses were the single classification, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the Scheffe multiple range test, and the Duncan multiple range test. The F values provided the bases for explaining whether or not the differences between and among the attitude scale scores of various groups of participants were significant at the .05 level of significance. Consequently, the findings of the study concerning the 12 hypotheses were:

1. There was a significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators toward junior college education, $F(1,128) = 150.199$, $P < .05$.

2. There was a significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with regard to junior college faculty, $F(1,128) = 124.58$, $P < .05$.

3. There was a significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college students, $F(1,128) = 42.557$, $P < .05$.

4. There was a significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college programs, $F(1,128) = 111.846$, $P < .05$.

5. There was a significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators concerning junior college administration, $F(1,128) = 111.494$, $P < .05$.

6. There was a significant difference between the attitudes of junior and senior college chief academic administrators with respect to junior college facilities, $F(1,128) = 13.63$, $P < .05$. (It is interesting to mention that all of the six above F values were also significant at the .001 level.)

7. There was a significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, regarding junior college education, $F(4,44) = 2.85$, $P < .05$. Based on the Duncan multiple range test, the mean scores of the subjects in Georgia, with formal articulation plan, was significantly different (.05) from the means of subjects in Virginia and Massachusetts with state system articulation policies.

8. There was no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, toward junior college faculty, $F(4,44) = 1.45$, $P > .05$.

9. There was no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college students, $F(4,44) = 2.22$, $P > .05$.

10. There was no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college programs, $F(4,44) = 2.22$, $P > .05$.

11. There was no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with

different articulation plans, toward junior college administration, $F(4,44) = 1.73, P > .05$.

12. There was no significant difference among the attitudes of senior college chief academic administrators, representing states with different articulation plans, concerning junior college facilities, $F(4,44) = 1.28, P > .05$.

The mean attitude scale score for the instrument was 129. The subsequent mean scale scores for the questionnaire items related to junior college faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities were 15, 21, 21, 12, and 15. In each case, all mean scores falling above these instrument means were considered favorable attitudes toward that aspect.

Regardless of the significant differences between the attitudes of junior and senior college people, revealed by this study, neither group had any mean score below the stated mean scale scores, indicating that in all cases both groups had positive attitudes. The average score for five groups of subjects representing various articulation plans were in all cases above the mean scale scores. Yet, the data clearly suggest that the subjects in Georgia with a formal articulation plan had the highest means for all cases identified by the last six hypotheses. Michigan with the voluntary articulation arrangements had subjects with the second highest mean scores and Virginia with a state agency was next. Generally, the subjects in Illinois with a legal articulation plan and Massachusetts with an institutional system had subjects with the lowest mean scores in most cases. A summary of these and other findings are as follows:

1. Compared to the mean scale score on the instrument (129), junior college subjects had a more favorable attitude score (179.1) than senior college subjects (147.3).

2. Compared to the mean scale score on junior college faculty (15), junior college subjects were very favorable (20.05) while senior college subjects were neutral (15.00).

3. Compared to the mean scale score on junior college students (21), junior college subjects had a more favorable attitude score (27.70) than senior college subjects (23.55).

4. Compared to the mean scale score on junior college programs, junior college subjects had a more favorable attitude score (29.46) than senior college subjects (24.24).

5. Compared to the mean scale score on junior college administration (12), junior college subjects had a much more favorable attitude score (16.88) than senior college subjects (13.00).

6. Compared to the mean scale score on junior college facilities (15), junior college subjects had a more favorable attitude score (19.06) than senior college subjects (17.16).

7. Concerning junior college education, subjects from all articulation plans, had favorable attitudes with the order of scores: Georgia (formal plan, highest), Michigan (voluntary plan), Illinois (legal plan), Virginia (state plan), and Massachusetts (institutional plan, lowest).

8. Concerning junior college faculty, subjects from Georgia, Michigan, and Illinois were slightly favorable while subjects from Virginia and Massachusetts were slightly unfavorable.

9. Concerning junior college students, subjects from all articulation plans had favorable attitudes with the order of scores: Georgia (highest); Michigan, Virginia, Massachusetts, and Illinois (lowest).

10. Concerning junior college programs, subjects from all articulation plans had favorable attitudes with the order of scores: Georgia (highest); Michigan, Virginia, and Illinois/Massachusetts (both lowest).

11. Concerning junior college administration, subjects from all articulation plans had favorable attitudes with the order of scores: Georgia (highest); Virginia, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Illinois (lowest).

12. Concerning junior college facilities, subjects from all articulation plans had favorable attitudes with the order of scores: Georgia (highest); Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Virginia (lowest).

13. More males (115 or 88.5%) than females (15 or 11.5%) held the position of chief academic administrator at institutions of higher education. The percent of females at junior colleges is slightly higher (12%) than at senior colleges (10%).

14. The average age of senior college chief academic administrators is higher (49) than that of their counterparts at junior colleges (45).

15. The majority of subjects at both junior and senior colleges held doctorate degrees. Yet, the percentage of doctorates at senior colleges was higher (92%) than at junior colleges (71.6%).

16. On average, senior college academic administrators were longer (6.52 years) in their current positions than those at junior colleges (6.08 years).

17. More junior college academic administrators (25%) than senior college subjects (10%) had once attended junior college as students.

18. The junior college academic administrators are more optimistic about the future of junior colleges.

19. More junior college academic administrators than their counterparts at senior colleges believe that junior college faculty are student-centered.

20. More junior college academic administrators than those at senior colleges favor open-door policy of junior colleges.

Discussion

The general pattern of results revealed from this study leads to a number of conclusions and implications vital to various elements involved in the articulation activities and transfer programs. Consistent with the literature, the traditional tension and disagreement between the junior and senior college people is still evident. Regardless of the various types of improved articulation plans (Kintzer, 1973:35-106), data from this research indicate significant attitude differences, at (.05) confidence level, between the chief academic administrators of the two types of institutions as far as junior college education; and junior college faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities are concerned. Based on these findings, the first major hypothesis and its five sub-hypotheses were rejected. Three conclusions might be drawn from the rejection of these hypotheses: first, senior college academic administrators might not be well informed regarding the nature of junior colleges; second, the current dialogue between junior and senior colleges might not be very effective; third, among various aspects of junior colleges, there might be need for further development and improvement of faculty, students, programs, administrators, and

facilities. Perhaps such improvements might be more meaningful and effective if people from senior colleges shared in planning and implementing such programs and efforts. Therefore, there is a greater need for extensive communication and cooperation between the representatives of junior and senior colleges.

Except for a few individual responses, the chief academic administrators at both levels, as two distinct groups, had mean attitude scale scores of above average, indicating favorable attitude toward the junior college and its aspects. Also the five groups of senior college academic administrators from states with varying articulation plans had, collectively and/or by groups, favorable attitudes but to a different extent. These findings tend to be congruent with Rice's findings concerning the attitudes of full-time teaching faculty members in Oklahoma's six regional universities toward junior college education. Likewise, the findings support various positive perceptions and attitudes toward junior colleges which have appeared in the literature. One main explanation for these results might be the recent national and local attentions on articulation and transfer programs which have provided information and experiences for various members of educational society. If this trend continues in the future, it is expected that the differences between the two groups will be less significant.

There seems a general consensus on the part of senior college academic administrators in perceiving various aspects of junior college, regardless of the type of articulation plan in effect. But, considering junior college education in general, the type of articulation was a major variable responsible for the significant differences among the attitudes of senior college academic administrators. The main

implication of such conclusions is that an appropriate articulation plan should be selected and implemented so that the relationship among institutions might be improved. Then, the focus of people involved should be on improving specific aspects of junior and senior colleges cooperatively.

The results of this study suggest that we consider the formal and/or voluntary articulation plans as the most likely systems for closing the attitudinal difference gap between junior and senior colleges. This conclusion is in agreement with the 1966 joint statement of the Association of American Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers; and with the literature. Wattenbarger and Medford (1974:29) predicted that "the formal articulation policy statements will become the general foundations for institutional transfer policies." The guidelines of the joint committee recommended the articulation machinery should be voluntary rather than legally mandated (1966:16). In all hypotheses related to the types of articulation plans, the subjects from Georgia with the formal articulation plan had the highest mean scores, the subjects from Michigan with a voluntary arrangement had the second highest mean scores, the subjects from Virginia with a state agency, subjects from Massachusetts with an institutional system, and Illinois with a legal plan had the lowest mean scores in many cases. A main implication of these results will be the direction which educational policy makers in states with no articulation plan should take in improving the relationship among the educational institutions in their states. Also states with less favorable existing plans might adapt a more favorable plan through the course of time.

Recommendations

As this study progressed, a number of recommendations began to emerge. It is in consideration of the findings, the implications of those findings, and the potentials for further research that the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendations for Practitioners

1. The administrators at both junior and senior colleges should encourage and seek closer cooperation and communication between the two levels. This might be accomplished through a mechanism which promotes regular visits between institutions, joint planning, personnel exchange programs, seminars, and joint publications. Rice (1976:104) found that the senior college faculty members who had contact with junior colleges displayed a more favorable attitude toward junior colleges than those who had no contact.

2. A liaison office should be established at both types of institutions, whose duties might include facilitating articulation and transfer activities and programs; ensuring the prompt counseling for students before and after transfer; providing published program guides for transfer students; and informing students about ultimate options which save them time, money, and emotional energy.

3. The formal and/or voluntary articulation plans should be considered thrust in improving the relationships between junior and senior colleges.

4. Junior and senior colleges should be involved and/or informed about various activities at junior colleges which are vital to the

mutual benefits and cooperation of both levels. Senior college faculty and administration may play an effective role in the development of faculty, administration, programs, and other aspects of junior colleges through joint workshops, seminars, and visits. Likewise, various aspects of senior colleges might be developed through such joint activities.

5. Both junior and senior colleges should provide an informative transfer guide, explaining the options, programs, and requirements to the students.

6. The instructional television may be a viable alternative for joint program offerings between junior and senior colleges. This is especially useful in a junior college lacks faculty or facilities for certain courses.

7. If proximity allows, there should be a mechanism which permits junior college people to use the facilities of senior colleges, especially the library.

8. To maintain a cooperative and close relationship, the institutional and personal autonomy should be respected by people of both junior and senior colleges.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study laid a unique foundation for future improvement of the two- and four-year colleges relationships. Despite the shortcomings or any unexpected bias one may discover in this research attempt, it is hoped the findings and recommendations will be of some use in the very large era of educational community. The effects will be, perhaps compounded, if further information concerning the relationship between the

two levels of higher education could be generated. The following are some suggestions for further research:

1. A similar study might be desirable on the national level.
2. A similar study might be appropriate among the states not covered in this research.
3. A similar study might be conducted among the institutions of a particular state.
4. Other aspects of junior college, in addition to faculty, students, programs, administration, and facilities, should be incorporated in the study.
5. A number of hypotheses might be tested concerning the subjects' demographic data.
6. In addition to the chief academic administrators, other personnel at both levels, who are involved in the transfer and articulation activities, might participate in the study.
7. The Junior College Attitude Survey would be appropriate for these types of research, perhaps with minor modifications.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan, Beverly. Two-Year/Four-Year College Articulation With Comments on State-Level Articulation Efforts in Virginia. ERIC Document ED 062 287, October, 1974.
- Altman, Robert A. The Upper Division College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1970.
- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. 1980 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.
- American Association of Junior Colleges. Many Things to Many People. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.
- Armino, Joseph A. "Easing Transition: An Historical Overview of Articulation." Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Vol. 23 (December, 1978), pp. 29-31.
- Association of American Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, and American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers. Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Bartz, Albert E. Basic Statistical Concepts in Education and the Behavioral Sciences. Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company, 1976.
- Beals, Ernest W. "Changing Criteria for Community College Transfers." National ACAC Journal. Vol. 16 (May, 1971), pp. 21-23.
- Beals, Ernest W. College Transfer Students in Massachusetts: A Study of 20,000 Transfer Applicants to 48 Massachusetts Colleges and Universities for Fall 1973. Boston: Massachusetts State Board of Higher Education, ERIC Document ED 096 927, 1974.
- Blocker, C. E., R. H. Plummer, and R. C. Richardson Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Bogart, Q. J. and E. A. Elson. "Role of the University in Community College in-Service Education." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, Vol. 1 (April-June, 1977), pp. 219-230.

- Bogue, Jesse P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950.
- Brawer, Florence B. "Personality Attributes of Two-Year College Instructors." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 7 (Spring, 1979), pp. 22-26.
- Brubaeker, John S. and W. Rudy. Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1976.
- Buffer, L. C. and others. Articulation in Education. ERIC Document ED 130 098, April, 1976.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. California: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.
- Cloud, Robert C. and Louis J. Rodriguez. "Articulating the Community College with the University: The Upper-Division Concept." Phi Delta Kappa, Vol. 60 (January, 1979), pp. 393-394.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Associates. A Constant Variable. Washington: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1971.
- Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills, California: Glenco Press, 1969.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. Student Characteristics: Personality and Dropout Propensity. Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College/American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.
- Defore, Jesse J. "An Articulation Challenge for Technical Institutes and Senior Institutions." Community College Review, Vol. 1 (Winter, 1974), pp. 16-23.
- Ernest, Richard J. "Articulation: A Working Definition." Community College Review, Vol. 5 (Spring, 1978), pp. 32-34.
- Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.
- Foresi, Joseph Jr. Administrative Leadership in the Community College. New York: Exposition Press, 1974.
- Frankie, Richard J. and Eugene E. DuBois. "The Community-Junior College in Historical and Cultural Perspective." School & Society, Vol. 99 (January, 1971), pp. 45-47.
- Gay, L. R. Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.

- George, R. L. and K. A. George. "Meeting the Non-Academic Needs Unique to the Junior College Student." NASPA Journal, Vol. 9 (October, 1971), pp. 155-160.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. "The Emerging Role of the Community Junior College." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 48 (July 1971), pp. 255-256.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. This is the Community College. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.
- Harper, W. A. "The Community and Junior College: An Overview." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 48 (July, 1971), pp. 257-261.
- Harrison, Michael J. "Community Scholars and University Dollars." Educational Forum, Vol. 36 (May, 1972), pp. 515-521.
- Hertig, W. H., Jr. "A Model for Improving Articulation." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43 (March, 1973), pp. 40-41.
- Higbee, Marvin, J. "Upper Division Colleges: An End to Transfer Hurdles." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 43 (March, 1973), pp. 44, 46, 48.
- Hill, Andrew. "Critical Issues for the 1980s." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 7 (Summer, 1979), pp. 53-55.
- Hills, J. R. "Transfer Shook: The Academic Performance of the Junior College Transfer." Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 33 (1965), pp. 201-215.
- Huck, Schuyler W., William H. Cornier, and G. Bounds Jr. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Hurley, Rodney G. The Program of Articulation for Florida's Public Institutions of Higher Education. ERIC Document ED 097 063, February, 1973.
- Johnson, B. L. "Critical Community College Problems Then and Now: The Mid-'60 and the Late '70s." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 7 (Summer, 1979), pp. 8-14.
- Jumepson, Frances. "The Community College Teacher: A Confused Identity." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 7 (Spring, 1979), pp. 5-7.
- Kaster, H. H. Jr. "Modifying the Open-Door Policy." Community College Review, Vol. 6 (Spring, 1979), pp. 28-33.
- Kelly, M. F. and John Connolly. Orientation for Faculty in Junior College. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges/American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kinney, James. "Community Colleges and Universities: What Can They Offer Each Other?" ADE Bulletin, N. 51 (November, 1976), pp. 34-37.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. Articulation and Transfer. Washington: National Inst. of Education, ERIC Document ED 130 746, December, 1976.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. Emerging Patterns of Statewide Articulation Transfer Agreements. ERIC Document ED 129 374, 1976.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. "Junior College Senior College Articulation in the 70's." College and University, Vol. 46 (1971), pp. 587-605.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. Middleman in Higher Education: Improving Articulation Among High School, Community College and Senior Institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. "The Articulation Scene - 1975." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 3 (Spring, 1975), pp. 18-22.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. "The Role of the Upper-Level University in American Higher Education." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 7 (Summer, 1979), pp. 35-40.
- Kintzer, Frederick C. Updating Statewide Articulation Practices, 1974. Gainesville: Institute for Higher Education, Florida University, ERIC Document ED 105 946, 1975.
- Knoell, Dorthy M. and Leland L. Medsker. Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two- and Four-Year Colleges. Berkeley: University of California, 1964.
- Knoell, Dorthy M. and Leland L. Medsker. From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student. Berkeley: University of California, 1965.
- Koos, Leonard W. The Questionnaire in Education: A Critique and Manual. New York: Macmillan Company, Inc., 1928.
- Kurtz, Albert K. and Samuel T. Mayo. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1979.
- Kuznik, Anthony E., James E. Maxey, and Duane D. Anderson. "Reverse Transfers: A Survey." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44 (February, 1974), pp. 25-27.
- Landrith, Harold F. Introduction to Community College. Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Landrith, Harold F. "Two-Year College." School & Society, Vol. 99 (January, 1971), pp. 49-51.

- Larsen, Gwynne E. "Articulation Problems of Business Students Transferring From Community Colleges to Four-Year Colleges." Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 40 (February, 1980), pp. 4433-4434A.
- Linson, M. G., T. W. Wilson, and M. G. Hunt. "Is Articulation Possible?" American Vocational Journal, Vol. 47 (October, 1971), pp. 29-31, 88.
- Lombardi, John. "The Myth of No-Tuition College." Community College Review, Vol. IV (Summer, 1976), pp. 59-63.
- Marquis Academic Media. Yearbook of Higher Education. Illinois: Marquis Who's Who Inc., 1980-81.
- Masat, Francis E. "Easing the Trauma of Transfer." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 50 (February, 1980), pp. 10-13.
- ✓ Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tillery. Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Menacher, Julius. "Two-Year and Four-Year College Curriculum Articulation." Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 22 (Summer, 1974), pp. 201-203.
- Meskill, Victor P. "Transfer Student Performance and Admissions Policies and Practices for Transfers." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 16 (July, 1971), pp. 23-24.
- Messer, Milford D. "An Investigation of Articulation Problems Perceived by Transferring Junior College Students at the University of Oklahoma." Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 34 (June, 1974), p. 7552-A.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.
- Morgan, C. T. and R. A. King. Introduction to Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Nickens, John M. and others. Articulation. Tallahassee: Florida State Dept. of Education, ERIC Document ED 116 721, April, 1975.
- Nolan, E. J. and D. L. Hall. "Academic Performance of the Community College Transfer Student: A Five-Year Follow-Up Study." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 19 (November, 1978), pp. 543-548.
- Nolan, E. J. and L. V. Paradise. "An Overview of Community College Counseling." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 20 (September, 1979), pp. 398-402.

- North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities. Guidelines for Transfer. Recommendations of the Joint Committee on College Transfer Students. Chapel Hill: North Carolina University, ERIC Document ED 140 722, February, 1977.
- O'Banion, T. and A. Thuston. Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- O'Grady, James P. Jr. "Articulation for Higher Education in Business: Participation Needed." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44 (February, 1974), pp. 38-40.
- Palinchok, Robert. The Evolution of the Community College. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1973.
- Parsons, Michael H. "Realizing Part-Time Faculty Potential." New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 8, No. 2 (1980), pp. 47-54.
- Reid, Alban E. "Articulation: A Community College Perspective." Some Concerns and Promises of Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges in Illinois: Further Deliberation on Articulation. Macomb: Western Illinois University, ERIC Document ED 136 879, 1976.
- Reimer, Milton K. "Areas of Concern for Comprehensive Community Colleges." School & Society, Vol. 99 (January, 1971), pp. 47-49.
- Reynolds, James W. The Junior College. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.
- Rice, Odus W. "An Analysis of Attitudes of Full-Time Teaching Faculty in Six Oklahoma State Universities Toward Junior College Education." (Unpub. Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976.)
- Rinehart, Richard. "Assessing Successful Articulation of Transfer Students." New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 18 (Summer, 1977), pp. 37-49.
- Romine, Stephen. "Articulation: The Continuing Challenge." Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 23 (Summer, 1975), pp. 157-159.
- Rushing, Joe B. Changing Role of the Community College President in the Face of New Administrative Pressures. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.
- Sawyer, James A. and John M. Nickens. "The Fulfillment of the Democratization Role of the Community College." College and University, Vol. 55 (Winter, 1980), pp. 113-124.
- Simon, Kenneth. Projects of Education Statistics to 1979-80. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

- Sherif, C. W., M. Sherif and R. E. Nebergall. Attitude and Attitude Change. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1965.
- Shook, H. K. "Interest and Involvement in Direct Transfer Programs Between Two-Year Colleges and Four-Year Colleges and Universities." National ACAC Journal, Vol. 17 (August, 1972), pp. 21-22.
- Stanton, Henry T. "A Study of Factors Related to the Difficulties Encountered by Two-Year Business Transfer Students Matriculating at a Private Four-Year Institution: An Articulation Inventory Index." Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 39 (February, 1979), p. 4083A.
- Thompson, Joan W. "The Growing Role of Community Colleges." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 19 (January, 1978), pp. 11-15.
- Thornton, James W. Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Triandis, Harry C. Attitude and Attitude Change. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Waller, Robert A. "Guidelines for Articulation in the Social Sciences." Community College Review, Vol. 7 (Spring, 1980), pp. 19-26.
- Walsh, Michael E. "Articulation Problems of Vocational-Technical Students." Community College Review, Vol. 5 (Winter, 1978), pp. 50-54.
- Wattenbarger, James L. and Ray L. Medford. "Improving Articulation." New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 2 (Summer, 1974), pp. 21-30.
- Wattenbarger, James L. "The Future of the Community Junior College." Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 48 (July, 1971), pp. 307-313.
- Woelfer, C. P., A. S. Scott and M. A. Carter. "Vocational Education Curriculum Articulation in North Carolina." Community College Review, Vol. 8 (Summer, 1980), pp. 38-44.

APPENDIX A

JAMES' CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND "t" VALUES
USED TO SELECT ITEMS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE
ATTITUDE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE XXXII

JAMES' CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND "t" VALUES
USED TO SELECT ITEMS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE
ATTITUDE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Item	Rank	t	Correlation Coefficient
1.	5	5.66	.462
2.	1	5.80	.481
3.	8	5.41	.494
4.	26	3.60	.460
5.	10	5.05	.503
6.	15	4.50	.397
7.	9	5.08	.578
8.	3	5.68	.395
9.	22	3.76	.481
10.	14	4.51	.421
11.	29	3.51	.404
12.	18	4.42	.506
13.	19	4.27	.471
14.	17	4.44	.384
15.	21	3.83	.421
16.	28	3.51	.377
17.	13	4.73	.331
18.	12	4.74	.486
19.	16	4.47	.443
20.	20	4.05	.449
21.	4	5.66	.559
22.	11	4.85	.484
23.	29	3.51	.445
24.	38	3.02	.211
25.	23	3.76	.276
26.	6	5.50	.452
27.	27	3.54	.331
28.	35	3.11	.229
29.	31	3.48	.407
30.	2	5.68	.411
31.	33	3.27	.349
32.	34	3.13	.253
33.	32	3.37	.393
34.	7	5.41	.297
35.	25	3.65	.328
36.	37	3.05	.252
37.	39	3.01	.304
38.	36	3.09	.267
39.	24	3.72	.344

APPENDIX B

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY AS
DEVELOPED BY JAMES (1969)

JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY (James)

<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>
1	2	3	4	5

-
1. Students get the same quality of education in a junior college as they get in a four-year college or university.
 2. The administrators of junior colleges are usually bright, dynamic, and highly competent leaders.
 3. Junior college teachers are not as interested in their professional development as teachers in other colleges and universities.
 4. The junior college serves chiefly the inept and unable student.
 5. Junior colleges are for the dumb rich and the bright poor.
 6. The facilities of the junior college compare unfavorably with those of four year colleges.
 7. The junior colleges appear to have a good understanding of the needs of their students.
 8. The opportunities for participation in extra curricular activities are very limited at the junior college.
 9. Teachers in the junior college "spoon feed" their students with easy work and easy grading.
 10. Vocational programs in the junior college have sufficient equipment to prepare students for occupations.
 11. It would be better to expand four year colleges and universities than to build junior colleges.
 12. Junior college transfers should perform as well in a four year college as they did in the junior college.
 13. The lack of juniors and seniors leaves the junior college without competent student leaders.
 14. Some of the most important aspects of attending college are missed on the junior college campus.
 15. In the coming years, junior colleges will enroll an increasingly larger proportion of the college students.

<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>
1	2	3	4	5

-
16. Students from all levels of ability can be served well by the junior college.
 17. Vocational teachers in the junior college are well prepared for their task.
 18. I would advise students against attending a junior college.
 19. The junior college has done a good job of communicating the goals of the junior college to the surrounding communities.
 20. Junior colleges are the wastebaskets of higher education.
 21. The junior college is in reality a glorified high school.
 22. Course work in the junior college adequately prepares the student for transfer to a four year college.
 23. The bright student should consider attending a junior college only if there are financial difficulties.
 24. Junior college gives mostly "lip service" to their guidance and counseling function.
 25. Vocational courses in the junior colleges should be recommended to persons seeking vocational skills.
 26. The junior college is organized much the same as a high school.
 27. The college-bound student should consider junior college only after being denied admission by four year colleges and universities.
 28. The advising and counseling functions in the junior colleges should be emphasized more highly than in the four year colleges.
 29. The junior college is more a liability than an asset to its community.
 30. Junior college presidents and deans are well prepared for their positions.
 31. Junior colleges are more concerned with their relationships with the high schools than with the four year colleges.
 32. Junior college teachers have more personal interest in the students than teachers in most colleges and universities.
 33. The junior college student is considered a second-class citizen in the population of higher education.

<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>
1	2	3	4	5

34. Living at home is a handicap to the personal development of the junior college student.
35. Junior college programs provide little about which students could get excited.
36. Junior colleges provide better opportunities for student-teacher interaction than do four year colleges and universities.
37. Faculty members in the junior college are better qualified for academic advising than are the counselors.
38. Courses which do not lead to a degree weaken the image of the junior college as a college.
39. Accepting all students who apply gives the junior college a bad image.

APPENDIX C

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY AS
UTILIZED BY RICE (1976)

JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY
Instructions for Marking Responses

As Utilized by Rice

The following questionnaire is designed to provide a measure of your attitudes and beliefs concerning a number of aspects of the 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	SD	D	U	A	SA
	students should attend junior	/	/	/	/	/
	colleges.					

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 letter 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 letters 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
2. The administrators of junior colleges are usually bright, dynamic and highly competent leaders.

SD	D	U	A	SA
3. Junior college teachers are not as interested in their professional development as teachers in other colleges and universities.

SD	D	U	A	SA
4. The junior college serves chiefly the inept and unable student.

SD	D	U	A	SA
5. Junior colleges are for the dumb rich and the bright poor.

SD	D	U	A	SA
6. The facilities of the junior college compare unfavorably with those of the four-year college.

SD	D	U	A	SA
7. The junior colleges appear to have a good understanding of the needs of their students.

SD	D	U	A	SA
8. The opportunities for participation in extra-curricular activities are very limited at the junior college.

SD	D	U	A	SA
9. Teachers in the junior college "spoon feed" their students with easy work and easy grading.

SD	D	U	A	SA
10. Vocational programs in the junior college have sufficient equipment to prepare students for occupations.

SD	D	U	A	SA
11. It would be better to expand four-year colleges and universities than to build junior colleges.

SD	D	U	A	SA
12. Junior college transfers should perform as well in a four-year college as they did in the junior college.

SD	D	U	A	SA
13. The lack of juniors and seniors leaves the junior college without competent student leaders.

SD	D	U	A	SA
14. Some of the most important aspects of attending college are missed on the junior college campus.

SD	D	U	A	SA

15. In the coming years, junior colleges will enroll an increasingly larger proportion of the college students.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
16. Students from all levels of ability can be served well by the junior college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
17. Vocational teachers in the junior college are well prepared for their task.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
18. I would advise students against attending a junior college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
19. The junior college has done a good job of communicating the goals of the junior college to the surrounding communities.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
20. Junior colleges are the wastebaskets of higher education.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
21. The junior college is in reality a glorified high school.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
22. Course work in the junior college adequately prepares the student for transfer to a four-year college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
23. The bright student should consider attending a junior college only if there are financial difficulties.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
24. Junior colleges give mostly "lip service" to their guidance and counseling function.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
25. Vocational courses in the junior colleges should be recommended to persons seeking vocational skills.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
26. The junior college is organized much the same as a high school.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
27. The college-bound student should consider junior college only after being denied admission by four-year colleges and universities.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
28. The advising and counseling functions in the junior colleges should be emphasized more highly than in the four-year college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
29. The junior college is more a liability than an asset to its community.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /

30. Junior college presidents and deans are well prepared for their positions. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
31. Junior colleges are more concerned with their relationships with the high schools than with the four-year colleges. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
32. Junior college teachers have more personal interest in the students than teachers in most colleges and universities. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
33. The junior college student is considered a second-class citizen in the population of higher education. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
34. Living at home is a handicap to the personal development of the junior college student. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
35. Junior college programs provide little about which students could get excited. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
36. Junior colleges provide better opportunities for student-teacher interaction than do four-year colleges and universities. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
37. Faculty members in the junior college are better qualified for academic advising than are the four-year college faculty members. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
38. Courses which do not lead to a degree weaken the image of the junior college as a college. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
39. Accepting all students who apply gives the junior college a bad image. SD D U A SA
/ / / / /

PERSONAL DATA ITEMS

Please place X's in the appropriate spaces.

40. Sex: ___ Male ___ Female
41. Is your present assignment:
 Full-time teaching ___
 Part-time teaching ___
 Administrative ___
 Part-time teaching, remainder of time committed to other
 functions at the institution ___

42. Highest degree earned: Bachelors Masters Doctorate
 Specialist.
43. Have you had the opportunity to visit a junior college?
 Yes No
44. Approximately how far is your institution located from the nearest junior college? Less than 20 miles More than 20 miles
45. Have you ever been a student at a junior college? Yes No
46. In your educational training have you have a course dealing primarily with junior college education? Yes No
47. Have you ever taught in a junior college? Yes No
48. Is your current teaching assignment primarily: Lower division
 Upper division and/or graduate
49. Please indicate your age. _____
50. Years of teaching experience in Oklahoma. _____
51. Total years of teaching experience. _____

APPENDIX D

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY AS
EMPLOYED IN CURRENT STUDY

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 the 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	SD	D	U	A	SA
	students should attend junior	/	/	/	/	/
	colleges.					

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 letter 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 letters 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
/	/	/	/	/

2. The administrators of junior colleges are usually bright, dynamic and highly competent leaders.

SD	D	U	A	SA
3. Junior college teachers are not as interested in their professional development as teachers in other colleges and universities.

SD	D	U	A	SA
4. The junior college serves chiefly the inept and unable student.

SD	D	U	A	SA
5. Junior colleges are for the dumb rich and the bright poor.

SD	D	U	A	SA
6. The facilities of the junior college compare unfavorably with those of the four-year college.

SD	D	U	A	SA
7. The junior colleges appear to have a good understanding of the needs of their students.

SD	D	U	A	SA
8. The administrative behavior of public school administration has become the pattern of community college administration.

SD	D	U	A	SA
9. The opportunities for participation in extra-curricular activities are very limited at the junior college.

SD	D	U	A	SA
10. Teachers in the junior college "spoon feed" their students with each work and easy grading.

SD	D	U	A	SA
11. Vocational programs in the junior college have sufficient equipment to prepare students for occupations.

SD	D	U	A	SA
12. It would be better to expand four-year colleges and universities than to build junior colleges.

SD	D	U	A	SA
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
14. The junior college facilities are adequate for student development and progress.

SD	D	U	A	SA
15. The lack of juniors and seniors leaves the junior college without competent student leaders.

SD	D	U	A	SA

16. Some of the most important aspects of attending college are missed on the junior college campus.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
17. In the coming years, junior colleges will enroll an increasingly larger proportion of the college students.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
18. Students from all levels of ability can be served well by the junior college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
19. Vocational teachers in the junior college are well prepared for their task.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
20. I would advise students against attending a junior college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
21. The junior college has done a good job of communicating the goals of the junior college to the surrounding communities.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
22. Junior colleges are the wastebaskets of higher education.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
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
/ / / / /
24. The junior college is in reality a glorified high school.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
25. Course work in the junior college adequately prepares the student for transfer to a four-year college.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
26. The bright student should consider attending a junior college only if there are financial difficulties.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
27. Junior colleges give mostly "lip service" to their guidance and counseling function.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
28. Vocational courses in the junior colleges should be recommended to persons seeking vocational skills.
- SD D U A SA
/ / / / /
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 college.
- 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 the high schools than with the 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 sport 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 four-year college faculty members.
- 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. Sex: () Female () Male

45. Age: _____

46. Highest Degree Earned: () Bachelors; () Master;
() Doctorate; () Other Specify:

47. Years in your current position: _____

48. Have you ever been a student at a junior college: () Yes () No

49. Do you wish to receive a summary of the results of this study:

() Yes () No

APPENDIX E

THE LETTER SENT TO THE PARTICIPANTS WITH
THE FIRST MAILING PACKAGE FOR
DATA COLLECTION



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 624-7244

Dear Chief Academic Administrator:

Ever increasing numbers of students are entering postsecondary education via the two-year college. Because of this phenomenon, it is vital that the relationship between two- and four-year institutions be studied systematically to learn the extent to which the overall system of higher education is integrated.

The Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education at Oklahoma State University is deeply interested in this as an area of fruitful research, and the initial step is to collect the perception of selected key academic administrators at both two-year and four-year institutions. Responsibility for this first step has been assigned to Mr. Ali Nazari-Robati, who is a doctoral student working under the direction of Dr. Robert B. Kamm, University Professor and Past President of Oklahoma State University.

As a research faculty, we would greatly appreciate it if you would please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience. It should take approximately 15 minutes for you to complete it. Of course, your responses will be treated with professional confidentiality.

If you feel a summary of the initial research findings would be useful to you and your institution, please check the appropriate box at the end of the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Karman
Professor and Head

Ali Nazari-Robati
Graduate Research Associate

APPENDIX F

THE LETTER SENT TO THE PARTICIPANTS WITH
THE FOLLOW-UP MAILING PACKAGE
FOR DATA COLLECTION

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
309 GUNDERSEN HALL
405/624-7244

Dear Chief Academic Administrator:

Recently we sent a copy of the enclosed questionnaire to you asking for your help in a research project concerning the relationship between two- and four-year institutions of higher education. We have not heard from you and since the possibility exist that your response may have been lost in the mail or mislaid, we have enclosed another.

Due to the time limit for the research, we hope you will take the approximately 15 minutes required to complete the questionnaire and mail it back to us in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that we have enclosed. Of course, your responses will be treated with professional confidentiality.

Thank you again for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Karman
Professor and Head

Ali Nazari-Robati
Graduate Research Associate

VITA

Ali Nazari-Robati

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION TOWARD JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION, FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPROVING ARTICULATION

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kerman, Iran, July 12, 1951, the son of Mr. Hassan Nazari-Robati and Zahra Karami.

Education: Graduated from Pahlavi High School, Kerman, Iran, May, 1969; received Bachelor of Cooperation and Social Security from Tehran College of Insurance, Tehran, Iran, in summer 1974; received the Master of Business Administration degree at Oklahoma City University in May, 1979; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1981.

Professional Experience: Graduate Research Associate in the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education at Oklahoma State University, October, 1980 through December, 1981; published articles in the Community College Review, and in the Community/Junior College Research Quarterly; presented paper at the 1980 National Conference on Finance and Management, Tucson, Arizona.