

AN OPINION SURVEY OF PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS IN
CERTAIN ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC AREAS
BY ASSOCIATE DEGREE TRANSFER STUDENTS
IN THE SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY,
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

By

RAYMOND FRANCIS DAVIDSON

Associate of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1963

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1967

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1974

SEP 3 1974 SEP 3 1974 SEP

AN OPINION SURVEY OF PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS AND OF PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS IN
CERTAIN ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC AREAS
BY ASSOCIATE DEGREE GRADUATES AND TRANSFER STUDENTS
IN THE SCHOOL OF THE SCIENCE OF TECHNOLOGY,
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved: Thesis Approved: Thesis Approved:

[Handwritten Signature]

Thesis Adviser

[Handwritten Signature]

Thesis Adviser

[Handwritten Signature]

Dean of the Graduate College

891293 891293 891293

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude and sincere appreciation to his advisor, Dr. Donald S. Phillips for his interest and supervision. The author also wishes to express his appreciation to Drs. Cecil Dugger and Lloyd Briggs and James Key for their suggestions and help.

The author wishes to extend a special thanks to all those students who gave of their time to make this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Need for the Study	5
Assumptions	6
Definition of Terms	6
Limitations of the Study	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Quantitative Findings	8
Qualitative Findings	12
Summary	15
III. METHODOLOGY	17
Selection of the Population	17
Development of the Instrument	18
Interview Schedule	18
IV. RESULTS	21
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
Summary	30
Conclusions	34
Recommendations	37
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A great abundance of statistics, research studies, and related literature exist which details the rapid rise in numbers of and enrollments in junior and community colleges since their inception. In state after state, junior colleges are being expanded or established for the purpose of carrying a large part of the load of additional college students. On the basis of numbers easily obtained, the junior college is the fastest growing segment of higher education in America today.

The growth of the junior college in Oklahoma is exemplified by a report issued by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (5).

In 1958, 3,611 students were enrolled in the state supported junior colleges. In 1968, 7,020 were enrolled. By 1975, it may be assumed that this number will more than double as Tulsa Junior College develops and as the other junior colleges assume a greater share of the responsibility of providing lower division collegiate instruction and technical education for the residents of Oklahoma.

At the present time there are thirteen public and four private junior colleges in Oklahoma. Seven of the public junior colleges are supported by the state and six are public municipal colleges.

The junior college is generally established to meet three objectives: to provide occupational and technical education, general education, and education for transfer. By providing education for transfer, the junior college is relieving much of the burden placed upon the four-year institutions of higher education. A student may

complete most, if not all, of his lower division course work at a junior college, at minimum expense, and then transfer to a four-year institution where he may complete the Baccalaureate degree in two more years. In this manner, the four-year institution may place more emphasis in the upper-division curricula and in graduate level work.

This has created a multitude of studies pertaining to the analysis of the academic performance of the junior college transfer student. These studies are not new; some of the earliest being done in 1919. However, work still needs doing since the junior college transfer is gaining an ever increasing percentage of the upper-division enrollment at the four-year institutions.

A cursory survey of these studies show that, in general, junior college grade point average is predictive of the success of the transfer student at a four-year institution. It is also shown however, that during the first semester after transfer, the transfer students' grade-point-average (GPA) generally drops. Also, an inordinately high percentage of transfer students are placed on academic probation at the end of the first semester after transfer (fifth semester). Some of the reasons cited in various works are:

1. University-level work is naturally more difficult than that encountered in a junior college.
2. A junior college transfer student is typically unprepared to enter upper-division courses at a four-year institution.
3. A transfer student is highly frustrated due to the "culture shock" experienced upon coming from a small junior college into a large university.

As previously stated, research studies abound concerning the junior college transfer student. There are, however, two characteristics associated with this large body of literature. The first characteristic is that most of this literature falls into two categories. The first category is a statistical study of the transfer student in the academic realm based upon GPA's, persistence, and other quantitative variables. The second category is a study of the transfer student in the non-academic areas such as social problems, financial problems, and social or ethnic backgrounds. However, even this second category is based somewhat upon statistics derived from some of the same sources as those of category one.

The second characteristic is that the majority of studies deal only with transfer students who received general or transfer-oriented education at the junior college. This tends to ignore the student who undertakes technical or occupational education, sometimes termed terminal education, and then transfers to further his educational career.

Statement of the Problem

The formal problem with which this study deals then is that relatively little is known about the technical or occupational transfer student in other than strictly quantitative terms. This study attempts to find out what happens to those students and what opinions and impressions they have.

A sub-area of this study is to bring to light problems encountered by transfer students who were in terminal programs at a junior college which are not experienced by transfer students who were in general or transfer oriented programs at their junior college.

This author developed an interest in the problems of students transferring into the School of Technology after having taught both at the School of Technology in its B.S. program and having also taught technical courses in an Associate degree program at a state junior college. It seems that many people have opinions about the success of this type of transfer student but no one has bothered to tabulate what the students themselves think.

Purpose of the Study

This study also investigates the transfer student. However, as opposed to the majority of other studies in this area, this study focuses upon the transfer student from the transfer students' own point of view. Thus, this study is a survey of opinions expressed by transfer students concerning certain academic and non-academic problems and concerns encountered during their first semester at Oklahoma State University. Further, this study focuses on only those transfer students who attained an Associate degree in a technical or occupational area and who subsequently transfer into baccalaureate program in the School of Technology at Oklahoma State University.

The major purpose of this study is to gather, in a strictly informal manner, and summarize the opinions expressed by students transferring from a junior college into Oklahoma State University's School of Technology. The opinions gathered will be those of students concerning the following major areas.

I. Non-academic problems and concerns

- A. Housing
- B. Financial
- C. General Social
- D. University

II. Junior College related problems and concerns

- A. Counseling
- B. Relevancy of education
- C. Evaluation of junior college

III. University or academic problems and concerns

- A. Academic progress
- B. Counseling
- C. Transfer problems
- D. Specific or general course problems

In addition to specific questions asked about the above areas, this study will gather comments from the transfers reflecting their general feelings concerning transfer from a junior college to Oklahoma State University.

Need for the Study

Administrators and counselors working with transfer students often have little information on how junior college transfer relates to the four-year institution. Often, the information those officials do work with is obtained from the types of literature described earlier. Very seldom, if ever, do these officials have any information on how the transfer students themselves view their problems.

This survey then should be very useful to those who counsel transfer students coming from junior colleges into a four-year institution. Although this study is restricted to students transferring into the School of Technology, it should prove useful to anyone counseling students transferring into any particular school or college within the university.

Assumptions

It is assumed that:

1. The Associate degree junior college transfer students who transferred into their fifth semester in the School of Technology at Oklahoma State University are representative of the past and future student population of this type in this school.
2. These transfer students are representative of similar students who transfer into similar programs at other institutions.

Definition of Terms

Associate Degree is one awarded after successful completion of a two-year prescribed curriculum in an institution of higher education.

Transfer Student is one who has attended another institution of higher education prior to attendance at the present institution. For the purpose of this study, the transfer student will be one who has earned an Associate degree at a junior college and is presently pursuing a B.S. degree at Oklahoma State University.

Native Student is a student who has matriculated at a particular university or four-year institution without previous college experience.

Grade Point Average (GPA) is based on applying the following numerical value to the letter grade received in a course: A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1, F = 0. The following equation is then used in computing averages for the total number of course hours attempted.

$$\text{GPA} = (\text{credit hours}) \cdot (\text{course study}) / (\text{Total hours attempted})$$

Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of this study are those posed by any survey using an interview as its information gathering instrument. Two major problems are the personal bias of the interviewer and a low degree of continuity from one interview to another. Both of these limitations, especially the second, are reduced by employing the interview schedule listed in Chapter III. The schedule, however, does not mean the interviews are rigidly structured. Indeed, the interviews are as unstructured as possible; the schedule only serving as a guide.

Since this study does not attempt to test a hypothesis of any sort, the limitation of preconceived opinions, though present, is reduced.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter concerns itself with some of the relevant studies in the area of transfer students' academic patterns and general characteristics. These reviews will be presented chronologically and categorically by two major areas. Those areas are: (1) quantitative findings and (2) qualitative findings. The first, and most prolific area, is composed of findings supported by detailed analysis of progressive and cumulative GPAs, persistence, graduation rates, test scores and other easily quantifiable variables used to compare groups of native and transfer students. The second area is composed of findings supported by analysis of questionnaires and other derived personal and background information related to the academic and non-academic comparisons of native and transfer students.

Quantitative Findings

One of the earlier studies comparing native and junior college transfer students was done in 1938 by Cowley (1). Cowley found, upon comparing native and transfer students at Oklahoma A & M, that the lower division GPA of the transfer students was .16 grade points above the native group. However, after transfer the GPA of the transfer group fell about .1 grade points below the native group. Therefore,

the junior college transfers were not quite equal in academic achievement to the native students in upper division achievement.

Martorana and Williams (9) during 1954 conducted research concerning matched groups of junior college transfers and native students at the State College of Washington. They found that during the fifth semester, the average of the junior college group was between .2 and .3 grade points below that of the native group. However, at the end of the eighth semester, the average GPA for the transfers was only .15 grade points below the natives.

Hoyt (4), in a study done in 1960, found that for junior college students transferring into Kansas State University: 1. junior college grades averaged substantially higher than did later grades obtained at Kansas State University, and 2. a comparison of the mean GPA before and after transfer indicated a drop of .492 grade points average following transfer for engineering students.

In 1960, Medsker (11) reported the results of an exhaustive study involving sixteen four-year colleges located in eight states. Over 2,500 junior college transfer students' performance was analyzed and, in most cases, compared to the performance of native students. For twelve of the sixteen colleges, the natives obtained higher grade point averages than did the transfers. Medsker also implies that junior college transfer students are slower at getting degrees than the natives. It should be noted, however, that Medsker's did not control for academic aptitude of the natives and transfers.

In a very comprehensive study by Knoell and Medsker (6) the per semester and cumulative GPAs' for 9,000 junior college students transferring into forty-one selected four-year colleges across the

nation were compared in various ways to a similar set of GPAs' for a like number of natives from the involved four-year colleges. It was found that, for the transfer students themselves, the fifth semester GPA was .3 grade points lower than their cumulative junior college GPA, and the cumulative four-year average of the transfers was .2 grade points lower than their cumulative junior college GPA. Thus, after an initial drop the transfer students' GPA increased in succeeding semesters at the four-year institution. When compared to the native students, the transfers had a higher lower-division GPA and a lower upper-division GPA. The attrition and efficiency of the two groups in the upper-division was not significantly different overall. The study also examined the transfer students' performance as a function of the type of four-year institution which receives the transfer. This indicated that transfer students are less likely to raise their grade point if they transfer to a major state university and that the graduation rate of transfer students is lower at state universities.

In another study by Grover (2), junior college transfer students' GPAs were evaluated and compared to a matched group of natives at the University of Wyoming. This study found that the junior college group dropped about .4 grade points average after transfer. However, the transfers' grade point tended to rise in succeeding semesters.

In a study of junior college transfer students alone, Lee (7) found that: 1. the GPA of the transfer student generally drops at the end of the first semester after transfer, 2. an inordinately high number of transfer students are placed on academic probation at the end of the first semester after transfer, however there is a high probability of success for those who are subsequently re-admitted,

3. a relatively low percentage of transfer students graduate in the normal two years after transfer, and 4. a change of major makes no difference in success probability.

Some of the more recent studies done concerning Oklahoma State University include that of Zimmerman (13). This study found that the cumulative GPA of the transfer students studied dropped an average of .5 grade points at the end of the first semester after transfer. However, their final, four-year cumulative GPA was only .1 grade points lower than their junior college GPA. Therefore, on the average, a transfer student's GPA should drop during the first semester after transfer but should rise during subsequent semesters.

In a study by Hoemann (3), it was found that: 1. junior college transfer students' cumulative GPA earned at the junior college was significantly higher than the cumulative lower-division GPA of the natives, 2. junior college students experience some drop in GPA after transferring, 3. both transfer and native students in the various majors in the College of Arts and Sciences had about the same success in academic performance. In addition, Hoemann found that there was no significant difference between the transfers and natives as to the number who graduated in the normal four years and those who graduated with a degree. Also, there was no significant difference in academic performance of the transfer students on the basis of the junior college previously attended. In all comparisons involving transfer students and natives, the groups were matched on the basis of five standard, easily defined variables.

In a similar study done by Zweiacker (14) in the College of Agriculture at Oklahoma State University, the cumulative junior college

GPA of the transfer students was significantly higher than the lower-division GPA of the natives. This study found no significant difference in the final total cumulative average of the two groups. Zweiacker also found that the natives showed a greater persistency to graduate in four years.

Another recent study concerning students transferring into the College of Engineering at Oklahoma State University was accomplished by Mouser (12). This prediction study found that the grade point average earned the first semester after transfer will be about one point lower than the cumulative GPA prior to transfer for students transferring from both two and four-year colleges. Mouser also found that the greatest predictor of academic success for the junior college transfers was prior academic performance.

The most recent work cited here was done concerning transfers into the Associate Degree program of Oklahoma State University's School of Technology by McNeill (10). Concerning only junior college students, McNeill found that the greatest variance in cumulative GPA of the students' technology courses existed between junior college transferees and those from other colleges. McNeill also found that there was an unusually high attrition of junior college transfers compared to transfer students from other colleges.

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative investigations into the characteristics, either academic or non-academic, of junior college transfer students are not nearly as numerous as the quantitative studies. However, some of the more relevant conclusions and findings are now considered.

Libby (8) found, on the basis of the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, that junior college students as a whole showed no outstanding personality traits compared to regular four-year college freshman entrants. Libby states these findings indicate that by the practice of efficient methods of learning, the majority of junior college students may be expected to achieve at least an average scholastic record. In the scholastic realm, Libby noted an over-abundance of "incompleteness" indicated by I grades on the junior college transfers' academic records. Libby felt that this indicated initial poor study habits of the transfer students and stresses the need for more concern with study habits in orientation courses.

In the study cited by Knoell and Medsker (6), questionnaires were sent to the sample of junior college transfer students involved in this study. The results of this questionnaire indicated several characteristics of the transfer students which, for clarify, are enumerated following.

1. Overall, transfer students tend to have difficulty in choosing educational and vocational goals.
2. Most transfer students indicated the main reason for attending their respective junior colleges was decreased cost and increased convenience.
3. The junior college was the initial "preferred" choice of only 25 percent of the transfer students.
4. Most of the transfer students, on retrospect, were generally satisfied with the education received at the attended junior college.
5. A very small percentage of those who withdrew from their third or fourth year said they did so for academic reasons.
6. By those transfers who withdrew from the four-year colleges, financial hardships and inadequate motivation were the most prominent reasons given.

In the area of general characteristics, the results of the questionnaire showed the following.

1. The junior college transfers resemble "typical freshmen" at the start of their academic careers.
2. A higher percentage of transfer students' parents did not graduate from high school than did those of regular freshman entrants.
3. The transfers' generally favored state universities to transfer into.
4. Compared to regular freshman entrants, a very small percentage received loans or scholarships before or after transfer.
5. Over 60 percent of the transfer students received less than half their financial assistance from parents.

Concerning "educational planning" by the transfer students, the questionnaire indicated the following.

1. Over 80 percent of the transfer students were intent on the decision to transfer when they entered the junior college.
2. About 75 percent had made no career choice by the time they entered the junior college.
3. About 25 percent of the transfers indicated the junior college as the first choice for an education.
4. The major reason for attending the junior college was decreased cost and increased convenience.
5. A very small percentage had "academic reasons" for attending a junior college.
6. A large percentage of the transfers' parents were negative in attitude with regard to the education received at junior colleges.

The last section of the questionnaire dealt with the transfer students' evaluation of their junior college after transfer and their problems with the transfer process in general. These results pointed up some very interesting items.

1. After transfer, over 90 percent were satisfied with their junior college experience and would again choose a junior college if their education process were to be repeated.

This first item indicates a drastic reversal in attitude regarding the junior college by the transfer students.

2. The most favorable ratings given to the junior college by the transfers was the area of the instruction received. The least favorable ratings went to advisement and counseling. However, they rated advisement and counseling higher for the junior college than that of their four-year institutions.
3. The most important concern upon transferring, was the increased cost of the four-year institution. The least important concern was the loss of credits upon transferring.
4. Most transfer students expressed discouragement at the orientation programs at the four-year institutions being designed mainly for freshmen and at the increased academic pressure.

These are the majority of results obtained from the Knoell and Medsker questionnaire. Although somewhat lengthy, their inclusion here is important since they, more so than the quantitative findings, pertain to the ultimate purpose of this study.

Summary

Obviously, many more research studies exist in this area. However, it is felt that the few cited here are typical and represent the large body of work concerning the junior college transfer student.

Most of the studies which deal with GPA analyses to compare junior college transfers to natives yield three basic conclusions.

1. Generally, transfer students' junior college GPA is higher than natives' lower division GPA.

2. After transfer, the transfers' may experience an initial GPA drop but their GPA should rise during succeeding semesters.

3. The most academically difficult semester for the transfer student is the first after transfer. At the end of this semester, their GPA is lowest and their attrition is highest.

Studies dealing with non-academic variables are much less abundant than those dealing only with grades. However the inclusion in this chapter of the general results of Knoell and Medsker's questionnaire represents a consensus in this realm.

In light of this review, it seems appropriate to undertake the purpose previously stated in Chapter I.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As the major objective of this study was to survey the opinions expressed by Associate degree junior college transfer students in the School of Technology, the first problem was to identify the students to be studied. The second problem was then to devise an interview schedule which would cover the purpose of the study as much as possible.

Selection of the Interviewees

The selection of the interviewees for this study was made by a careful analysis of the student personnel records of the School of Technology at Oklahoma State University. The students to be interviewed were selected by the following criteria:

1. The student received an Associate degree in an area of occupational or technical education at a junior college.
2. The student enrolled in the Baccalaureate degree program of the School of Technology at Oklahoma State University.

Twenty students were selected on this basis. Each student was then contacted individually and, in a strictly informal atmosphere at the student's convenience, interviewed according to the schedule given. The answers and responses to the interview were recorded as clearly and with as little bias as possible.

Development of the Instrument

After a review of the literature and discussions with faculty at Oklahoma State University, the areas to be covered by this interview were developed. The interview schedule shown covers those items felt and reasoned to be pertinent to each area and those which are of most concern to the transfer student.

Interview Schedule

Specific Questions

Name	Junior College	O.S.U. Class
------	----------------	--------------

1. What is your marital status?
2. Do you live in Stillwater or commute?
 - A. If in Stillwater, where?
3. Did you encounter any housing problems when you transferred?
 - A. If so, what?
4. Do you have or have you had any loans or scholarships at Oklahoma State University?
5. Do you have or have you had a part-time job while at Oklahoma State University?
6. How is your education at Oklahoma State University being mainly financed?
7. Did you encounter any financial problems when you transferred?
 - A. If so, what?
8. Have you encountered any social problems with fellow students after transfer?
 - A. If so, in what ways?

9. When you transferred, did you experience any concern or apprehension at the size of Oklahoma State University?
 - A. If so, in what ways?
10. What were your general feelings about Oklahoma State University after you transferred?
11. Did you receive any formal counseling at your junior college on what to expect when you transferred?
 - A. If so, from whom?
12. Did you receive any informal advice or suggestions at your junior college concerning transfer to Oklahoma State University?
 - A. If so, from whom?
13. When did you make the decision to transfer?
14. Do you feel the overall academic preparation you received at your junior college was sufficient for your transfer to Oklahoma State University?
 - A. If not, in what way?
15. Are you currently studying in the same major area as you studied at your junior college?
 - A. If not, why?
16. Do you feel the preparation you received in your specialty or major area was sufficient for your transfer?
 - A. If not, why?
17. Why did you attend the junior college first?
18. What are your general feelings about your junior college experience?
19. If you were starting over, would you again attend a junior college?
20. What are your feelings regarding your academic performance since you transferred?
21. Why did you transfer to Oklahoma State University?
22. How do you rate or feel about any advice or counseling received at Oklahoma State University since you transferred?
23. How do you rate or feel about your instructors at Oklahoma State University compared to those you had at the junior college?

24. Have you encountered any specific or general course problems at Oklahoma State University?
 - A. If so, in what area?
25. Did you encounter any specific or general transfer problems when you came to Oklahoma State University?
 - A. If so, what?
26. Do you have any concerns, opinions, or suggestions regarding anything pertaining to your junior college, transferring to Oklahoma State University, or to Oklahoma State University in general?

The interview schedule was initially pretested with three transfer students with whom this author had prior experience. A minimum of interpretation was required for either interviewer or interviewee and therefore this interview, it was felt satisfied the purpose of this study.

Although the preceding interview schedule appears as a specific questionnaire, it was not used as such. It was these particular questions to which answers and opinions were primarily desired. Each question was asked of the interviewee, not necessarily in the order shown, during a very informal directed discussion. Responses were recorded in the form of notes taken during the interview. Complete anonymity was guaranteed each student.

The information received from the interviews is discussed item by item in Chapter IV. The information was analyzed to determine any correlation of responses from one item to another.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A total of sixteen students were interviewed. A target number of twenty was aimed at but several students had to be contacted two or three times before an interview could be established. Four students who were contacted repeatedly failed to arrive and with the advent of six-weeks exams, the difficulty of setting up the interviews became worse. Therefore the responses listed are for only sixteen students.

The data is presented as an item-by-item response. Each item or question is listed in the order shown on the interview schedule given in Chapter III. However, for brevity, only the major topic of the item is shown beside the item number.

In several cases, the percentage of students shown will add to be greater than 100 percent. This is because several students made more than one comment.

Item: subject area

1. : Marital status

62.5% single

37.5% married

2. : Present residence

43.7% apartment

31.2% dorm

18.7% married student housing

06.2% commute

3. : Housing problems

100% stated they had no significant problems in obtaining housing.

12.4% stated they had friends or contacts at Oklahoma State University prior to transferring.

06.2% expressed concern with the high rent rates of non-college housing.

12.5% expressed dissatisfaction with the regulations prohibiting new dorm rooms for transfer students for their first year.

None of the students living in non-college housing desired college housing. However, some of the dorm residents would prefer off-campus housing except for the expense involved.

4. : Loans or scholarships

81.3% stated they had no loans or scholarships with Oklahoma State University.

06.2% had scholarships.

06.2% had loans.

06.2% were applying for a scholarship.

5. : Part-time job

68.7% stated they had no part-time job while at Oklahoma State University

25.0% stated they had a current part-time job.

06.2% stated they were looking for a part-time job.

6. : Financing of education at Oklahoma State University

37.5% stated their education was mainly financed by summer jobs.

25.5% stated their education was mainly

18.7% stated their parents were mainly financing their education.

12.5% stated a combination of parents and summer jobs were financing their education.

06.2% stated their wife was mainly financing their education.

7. : Financial problems when transferred
- 68.7% stated they encountered no financial problems when they transferred. All in this group stated they were prepared for the increased cost of attending Oklahoma State University.
- 25.0% stated they had some initial difficulty with non-tuition or "outside" expenses such as food, supplies, clothes, rent or bills and "inflation" related items.
- 18.7% expressed dissatisfaction with the pay scale of part-time jobs in relation to the cost of living.
8. : Social problems
- 43.7% expressed some difficulty in making friends with the natives. Most of this group stated they initially felt like an "outsider". All of this group stated the students at Oklahoma State University were cooler or less friendly than at their junior colleges.
- 06.2% stated the difficulty in making friends was due to an age barrier.
- 37.5% expressed no difficulty in making friends after transfer.
- 12.5% stated they already had good friends attending Oklahoma State University and thus had no difficulty in making new friends.
9. : Concern of apprehension of size of Oklahoma State University
- 50.0% stated they initially felt lost and insignificant. Most stated they felt part of a gigantic impersonal "machine". All this group stated this feeling lasted only a few weeks, however. Most of this group expressed no great concern with locating classes.
- 31.2% expressed no concern or apprehension whatsoever. All of this group stated great anticipation at attending Oklahoma State University and were prepared for any difficulty encountered due to the size of the university.
- 12.5% expressed a high degree of frustration in locating classes and offices.
- 06.2% stated their only real concern was the large class size of their classes.
10. : General feelings about Oklahoma State University after transfer
- 37.5% stated they personally liked Oklahoma State University very much and highly enjoyed their stay.

12.5% stated they considered Oklahoma State University much more mature or adult than their junior college.

18.7% expressed a liking for Oklahoma State University academically but disliked the social life and atmosphere.

18.7% stated the students (natives) were too unfriendly.

25.0% stated they felt the faculty were not generally as involved or as friendly toward the students at Oklahoma State University as were the faculty at their junior colleges.

18.7% expressed frustration at the feeling of the School of Technology being "beneath everyone else".

43.7% expressed overall non-committal feelings about Oklahoma State University. Most of the responses in this group related dissatisfaction with the "red tape". Specific comments ranged around too many regulations such as dorm rules and parking. Most of this group stated Oklahoma State University was too money oriented.

11. : Formal counseling at the junior college

56.2% stated they had received no formal counseling on what to expect upon transfer to Oklahoma State University.

12.5% received formal counseling from an Oklahoma State University recruiter.

12.5% received formal counseling from a counselor at their junior college.

12.5% received formal counseling from instructors at their junior college

06.2% received formal counseling from division heads at their junior college.

12. : Informal advice or suggestions

62.5% stated they received most of their advice on what to expect upon transfer to Oklahoma State University from personal friends who had previously transferred.

18.7% received advice on an informal basis from instructors at their junior college.

06.2% received advice mostly from parents.

06.2% received most of their advice from correspondence with an advisor at Oklahoma State University.

06.2% received no informal advice.

13. : Decision to transfer

06.2% made their decision to transfer to Oklahoma State University after high school graduation.

06.2% made their decision to transfer during their first semester at the junior college.

06.2% made their decision during their second semester.

25.0% made their decision during their third semester.

37.5% made their decision during their fourth semester.

18.7% made their decision after graduation from the junior college.

14. : Overall academic preparation at the junior college

50.0% stated they felt the overall preparation received was sufficient for their transfer to Oklahoma State University.

31.2% stated their preparation in English was deficient. Their major reason was the loss of credit hours in this area.

37.5% felt their preparation in math at their junior college was not sufficient enough. All respondents in this group stated they had to repeat at least one math course at Oklahoma State University.

15. : Same major area

75.0% stated they were currently studying in the same major area at Oklahoma State University as they did at the junior college.

12.5% answered no. These stated they desired advanced work in a different major.

06.2% stated their major at Oklahoma State University was not offered at their junior college.

06.2% stated their major at the junior college was not offered at Oklahoma State University on the B.S. level.

16. : Specialty or major area preparation at the junior college

50.0% felt the preparation received in their major area was sufficient for transfer to Oklahoma State University.

18.7% felt the preparation received at their junior college was at too low a level and the coverage was not thorough enough.

12.5% felt the preparation received at the junior college was outdated.

17. : Reasons for attending the junior college
- 75.0% stated they attended the junior college first because of cost and convenience.
- 31.2% felt the junior college was easier than Oklahoma State University
- 18.7% stated they desired to start at a small school first.
- 06.2% stated they had no high school diploma.
18. : General feelings about junior college experience
- 68.7% stated that overall they enjoyed their junior college experience due to the very friendly teachers and students.
- 12.5% liked the highly congenial atmosphere at their junior college.
- 25.0% liked their junior college experience but felt there was very limited opportunity there.
- 25.0% felt the junior college was run too much like a high school insofar as strictness and regulations were concerned.
19. : Would again attend a junior college
- 25.0% answered yes completely.
- 43.7% answered yes but only for basics or fundamental lower division general requirements. This group would not take their technical courses, or pursue the Associate Degree, at the junior college. The major reason was the difference of treatment of the technical courses between Oklahoma State University and the junior college.
- 31.2% answered no because there was not enough continuity or correlation between the junior college and Oklahoma State University.
20. : Feelings regarding academic performance since transfer
- 43.7% felt their academic performance was about the same. Most agreed, however, they were working much harder now than at the junior college.
- 18.7% felt their performance was better since they were working and studying more.
- 31.2% felt their performance had decreased but that they were working harder.

06.2% felt their performance had decreased due to too many extracurricular activities.

21. : Reason for transfer

100% stated they transferred to obtain the Baccalaureate Degree in Technology in order to gain more education and experience and thus obtain a better job.

22. : Feelings about advice or counseling at Oklahoma State University

87.5% felt the advice or counseling given by their advisors was good.

18.7% felt the advice from their advisors was initially poor due to the students being enrolled in wrong courses or the wrong major. However, all subsequent advice has been generally good.

18.7% felt their advisor was too impersonal.

06.2% felt the advice and counseling received was inadequate.

None of the students in this group sought advice from someone other than their advisor.

23. : Comparison of instructors

50.0% felt the instructors at the junior college were friendlier or more personable than those at Oklahoma State University.

18.7% felt the instructors at the junior college were easier on course work and more lax on grades than those at Oklahoma State University.

43.7% felt the instructors at the junior college and Oklahoma State University are about equal academically.

43.7% felt the instructors at Oklahoma State University were better academically and professionally than those at the junior college.

12.5% felt the instructors at Oklahoma State University were more personable than at the junior college.

24. : Specific or general course problems at Oklahoma State University

25.0% stated they had some initial difficulty with their major courses due to an insufficient background from their junior college work.

18.7% stated they were having difficulty in a related technical area.

25.0% stated they were having some difficulty with English and humanities.

12.5% stated they were having difficulty with physics.

06.2% stated they were having difficulty with math.

18.7% stated they were having no more difficulty than expected with any course.

25. : Specific or general transfer problems

06.2% stated they had no major transfer problems at all.

12.5% stated they thought transfer day was hectic and confusing.

12.5% stated they had the wrong advisor at first.

12.5% experienced difficulty with the "red tape".

75.0% lost some credit hours in transferring but this was not viewed as serious.

31.2% viewed the non-substitution of 2000 level junior college courses for 3000 level Oklahoma State University courses as unfair and resulting in an unjustified loss of credit hours in upper division work.

26. : General concerns, opinions, suggestions, or comments

For this item, the general grouping of comments by percentage is as follows:

50.0% stated more information was needed at the junior college level regarding transfer and substitution credits and the increased living expenses involved in transfer.

43.7% stated a short, non-required orientation session to acquaint the transfer student with Oklahoma State University would be very helpful in order to prohibit the "lost" feeling of the first few weeks.

37.5% stated there needs to be more conformity and continuity of courses and curriculum between Oklahoma State University and the junior college.

25.0% stated the desire for more co-ordination between Oklahoma State University and the junior college.

18.7% stated more counseling was needed during the first semester after transfer.

12.5% suggested the transfer student should ensure he has the correct advisor initially.

12.5% advised that a student from a small high school take the first year at a junior college due to the less drastic transitions involved.

06.2% suggested a transfer student visit the university before transfer.

Of the 16 students interviewed, 7 were seniors and 9 were juniors. The students transferred from 8 different junior colleges, 4 of which were out of the state of Oklahoma. The students represented a total of 6 majors in the School of Technology.

No response correlation was observed as a function of either Oklahoma State University classification or junior college. The majors represented by percentage are as follows.

37.50%	Electronics Technology
31.25%	Drafting and Design Technology
12.50%	Mechanical Technology
06.25%	Petroleum Technology
06.25%	Fire Protection Technology
06.25%	Aeronautical Technology

Considering only the two predominant majors:

66.6% of the Electronics Technology majors felt the preparation received at their junior college in their major area was at too low a level, not thorough enough, or outdated.

00.0% of the Drafting and Design majors felt their junior college preparation was deficient in any way.

83.3% of the Electronics Technology majors felt the preparation received in math was deficient.

00.0% of the Drafting and Design majors felt their preparation in math was deficient.

Only these two majors are considered because they represent the widest variance of opinion on these two questions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to gather, in a strictly informal manner, and summarize the opinions expressed by Associate degree junior college transfer students in the School of Technology at Oklahoma State University. These opinions were to cover certain academic and non-academic areas as outlined in the interview schedule in Chapter III.

The objective of this study was to discover what these students' own impressions, concerns, or thoughts were concerning their junior college, Oklahoma State University, and the transfer process in general.

The total number of interviewees was 16. The only requirements for each interviewee were that he must have an Associate degree from a junior college and that he be presently enrolled in the Baccalaureate degree program of the School of Technology at Oklahoma State University. No hypothesis was tested in this study. Each interview was recorded as accurately as possible and tabulated according to the percentage of subjects making a certain response to each interview item.

The data collected revealed that none of the subjects encountered any difficulty in obtaining housing. A minor dissatisfaction was expressed with dorm regulations and high non-college rents.

Over half of the subjects stated they had either no loans or scholarships or no part-time jobs. However, a majority also stated the major financing of their education at Oklahoma State University was by part-time jobs or summer jobs with the majority of these respondents stating summer jobs. Over 60 percent encountered no major financial problems upon transfer, although 25 percent were having, or had, some difficulty with outside expenses.

In the social area, 50 percent expressed no difficulty in making friends with only 12.5 percent stating they had friends at Oklahoma State University prior to transfer. The other 50 percent expressed some difficulty in making friends and stated they initially felt like an outsider.

Half of the subjects interviewed expressed a great deal of apprehension about the size of Oklahoma State University. All stated they initially felt lost and insignificant. Only 31.2 percent had no concern in this area.

Over half of the subjects expressed general satisfaction with Oklahoma State University as a whole. Most of the dislikes centered around rules and regulations and a preponderance of red tape. One-fourth stated the faculty were not as personable as were those at the junior college.

Over half (56.2 percent) received no formal counseling at the junior college on what to expect upon transfer. Those that did, received counseling from recruiters, counselors and instructors with equal percentages for each source.

Most of the respondents indicated their main source of information and advice about Oklahoma State University and transferring was received

from personal friends who previously transferred. Almost all received some sort of informal advice from one source or another.

Approximately 62.5 percent made their actual decision to transfer to Oklahoma State University during their second year at the junior college. Over half this group made the decision during their fourth semester.

Half the respondents indicated general satisfaction with the overall academic preparation received at the junior college. The rest stated that the preparation they received was deficient in math, English, or both. Of the two majors with the greatest representation, the electronics students expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with their math preparation.

Most of the subjects (75 percent) were currently studying in the same major area as they did at the junior college. However, only half felt the preparation received at the junior college in their major was sufficient. Again, the greatest dissatisfaction was expressed by the electronics students.

The majority (75 percent) of the interviewees stated the major reason for attending the junior college was cost and convenience. Other reasons cited were personal desire and the junior college was reputedly easier.

Over half (68.7 percent) liked their overall junior college experience. Some dissatisfaction was expressed at the overly strict rules and limited opportunity felt at the junior college.

When asked whether they would again attend a junior college, 74.9 percent replied negatively. Only 31.2 percent of this group replied an unequivocal no while the rest stated they would only take

their lower division non-technical courses at the junior college instead of pursuing the Associate Degree.

Over half (62.4 percent) felt their academic performance since transfer was either about the same as before transfer or had become better. All in this group stated they were working and studying much more than they were at the junior college.

When asked their reason for transfer, all subjects agreed to obtain the Baccalaureate Degree.

Concerning any advice or counseling received at Oklahoma State University, the majority agreed that the advice from their advisors had been good. Some initial dissatisfaction was expressed but this state was only temporary.

Regarding the comparison of instructors at Oklahoma State University with their peers at the junior college, 87.4 percent felt the instructors at Oklahoma State University either equal to or better than the instructors at the junior college on an academic and professional basis. Half of the students stated they felt the instructors at the junior college were friendlier and more personable than those at Oklahoma State University.

Concerning course problems, 25 percent stated some difficulty with their major area courses due to insufficient background attained at the junior college. Only 18.7 percent stated they were having or had had no difficulty with any course or area more than what was expected.

Of all students interviewed, 75 percent lost some credit hours upon transferring to Oklahoma State University. However, none of this group viewed this loss as serious or more than expected. The major

criticism or dissatisfaction regarding this area was the non-substitution of 2000 level junior college courses for 3000 level Oklahoma State University courses.

The last item was an open-ended item asking for any pertinent comments, opinions, or suggestions each student may have. Half of the students stated more information regarding transfer credits, substitutions, and living expenses was needed at the junior college level. Slightly less than half stated a short non-required orientation session peculiar to transfer students would be helpful to acquaint them with Oklahoma State University. Most of the subsequent comments centered around the need for more conformity and co-ordination between Oklahoma State University and the junior college. Another frequently mentioned comment was that the junior college courses need updating.

Conclusions

This section is devoted to reporting conclusions which may be drawn on the basis of the collected data. These conclusions are primarily inferred from the responses listed in Chapter III.

1. There are apparently no major housing or financial problems encountered by these transfer students upon transfer. Most are prepared ahead of time. The only financial problems of note are outside living expenses.

2. A large percentage of transfer students have some difficulty in becoming involved socially with native students. Relating to this, many transfer students feel frustrated at the sheer size of Oklahoma State University and experience some initial disorientation and confusion.

3. The major complaints about Oklahoma State University voiced by the transfer students are similar to those of any student at Oklahoma State University. A large percentage of the transfers are generally satisfied with Oklahoma State University as a whole.

4. A large percentage of these transfer students receive no formal counseling at the junior college level regarding transfer to Oklahoma State University. Most of the information received by this group is from personal friends or associates.

5. Most of the students made their formal decision to transfer during their second year at the junior college. Also, most of these students continue their study at Oklahoma State University in the same area as they studied at the junior college.

6. Approximately half of the transfer students feel the preparation received at the junior college was sufficient for their transfer to Oklahoma State University in both the general and specialty areas. Most of the students who voice dissatisfaction with this preparation are students of a highly mathematical and rapidly changing major such as electronics.

7. Most of these students initially attend the junior college for reasons of cost and convenience.

8. Overall, most of these students enjoyed their junior college experience. However, a large majority would not again attend a junior college for the complete two years due to the lack of continuity or difference of treatment between the technical courses of Oklahoma State University and the junior college.

9. The unanimous reason for transfer was to attain the B.S. degree. Most of these students feel their performance is equal to or

better than their junior college performance. Almost all these students have to study and work harder at Oklahoma State University than at the junior college.

10. Generally, the students are satisfied with their advisors at Oklahoma State University.

11. The instructors at the junior colleges appear to be more friendly than those of Oklahoma State University but are rated equal to or slightly inferior to those of Oklahoma State University academically or professionally.

12. The transfers who have difficulty with their technical subjects do so due to an apparent insufficient background attained at the junior college. These students are predominantly those majoring in electronics or a similar rapidly changing technology. The areas of English and humanities also offer some difficulty to the transfer student.

13. Most of these students lose some credit hours upon transfer. However, this loss is not viewed as serious. The greatest concern is in repeating courses for upper-division credit which were previously taken at the junior college.

14. Two major things are needed for these students. The first is more information should be introduced at the junior college level regarding transfer and substitution credits. The second is more conformity and co-ordination between the technical curricula of the junior college and Oklahoma State University should be established.

Recommendations

After concluding this study, the author felt the following recommendations were in order.

1. It is highly recommended that better and more thorough counseling be established at the junior colleges to help the occupational or technical transfer student make the transition more easily.
2. Increased counseling and advice on transfer and substitution credits should be given these students from the start of their programs should they decide to transfer after attaining the Associate degree.
3. The junior colleges should make a continuing effort to upgrade and update their technical courses especially in those areas most rapidly changing. The instructors themselves should constantly strive to remain updated both in their technology and in their methods of teaching.
4. More continuity needs to be established between the technical curricula of the junior college and that of Oklahoma State University in order to allow a smoother transition for these students from lower-division to upper-division course work.
5. The related areas such as mathematics needs to be revised in order for the transfer student to feel adequate in this area when upper-division work is undertaken.
6. It is highly recommended the advisors at Oklahoma State University become more familiar with the transfer student and realize the peculiar problems, other than academic, this student may face upon entering Oklahoma State University as a junior. They should also continually familiarize themselves with course requirements so the transfer and substitution of credits will be easier.

7. It is recommended that those 2000 level courses at the junior college which are equal to 3000 level courses at Oklahoma State University be allowed to substitute.

8. It is also recommended that an orientation session of perhaps a few hours in length be established to acquaint the transfer student with such things as the library and location of campus buildings, offices, and services.

Regarding this study, this author wishes to make the following additional recommendations.

1. This study should be re-done but allowing for a much longer time frame, say one academic year. This will allow for a larger number of interviews to be undertaken.

2. A similar study should be done for those transfer students who do not attain the B.S. degree. The results of a study of this sort may prevent some from dropping out or withdrawing due to problems peculiar to the technical or occupational transfer student.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Cowley, O. E. "Relative Performance of Students from Junior Colleges to That of Native Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College Students." (Unpub. M. S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1938.)
- (2) Grover, A. L. "A Comparative Study of Wyoming Community College Students Who Transferred to the University of Wyoming." College and University, 42 (1967), 204-208.
- (3) Hoemann, V. H. "A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement and Persistence to Graduates of Junior College Transfer Students and Native Students in the College of Arts and Sciences at O.S.U." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967.)
- (4) Hoyt, D. P. "Junior College Performance and Its Relationship to Success at Kansas State University." College and University, 35 (1960), 281-291.
- (5) Junior College Education in Oklahoma. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 1970.
- (6) Knoell, D. M., and Medsker, L. L. "Factor Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from 2 to 4-year Colleges with Implications for Coordination and Articulation." Berkeley: California University, CRP 1113, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1964.
- (7) Lee, Donald. "A Differential Study of California Junior College Transfer Students at the University of California, Berkeley." Berkeley: University of California, Office of Institutional Research, 1966.
- (8) Libby, P. A. "A Personnel Study of Junior College Students." The University of Southern California Studies - Education Series, 10 (1936), 64 pp.
- (9) Martorana, S. V., and L. L. Williams. "Academic Success of Junior College Transfers at the State College of Washington." Junior College Journal, XXIV (1954), 402-415.
- (10) McNeill, P. R. "Academic Success Patterns of Native and Transfer Students in Selected Associate Degree Technology Programs." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1973.)

- (11) Medsker, L. L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- (12) Mouser, E. C. "A Prediction Study of Students Transferring from Oklahoma Colleges as Juniors into the College of Engineering at Oklahoma State University." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)
- (13) Zimmerman, B. A. "A Study of Academic Achievements and Persistence of Murray State Agricultural College Students Transferring to Four-Year Colleges and Universities." (Unpub. Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967.)
- (14) Zweiacker, L. L. "A Comparison of the Scholastic Achievement of Transfer and Native Students in the College of Agriculture at Oklahoma State University." (Unpub. M. S. thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1971.)

VITA²

Raymond Francis Davidson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: AN OPINION SURVEY OF PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS IN CERTAIN ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC AREAS BY ASSOCIATE DEGREE TRANSFER STUDENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Major Field: Technical Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Stillwater, Oklahoma, March 8, 1943, the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Davidson.

Education: Attended grade school and high school at Stillwater, Oklahoma; graduated C. E. Donart High School in 1961; received Associate of Science degree in electronics technology from Oklahoma State University in 1963; received Bachelor of Science degree in physics from Oklahoma State University in 1967; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in Technical Education at Oklahoma State University in May, 1974.

Professional Experiences: Electronic Technician, Texas Instruments, Inc., 1963-64; Electronic Instructor, Electronic Officers School, SSC, USNTC, 1967-69; Electronic Instructor, Adult Evening School, Waukegan Township High School, 1968-69; Electronics and Applied Physics Instructor, Avionics Officers School, NATTC, NAS, 1969 (4 mos.); Electronics Instructor, School of Technology, Oklahoma State University, 1970-71; Electro-mechanical Technology Instructor, Northern Oklahoma College, 1971-73.

Publications: Unified Physics-Optics, Delmar Publishers; Customer Service Equipment, Oklahoma Postal Training Operations; Self Service Postal Centers, Oklahoma Postal Training Operations.