1970

The Community College Environment; A Comparative Study of Perceptions and Expectations of Liberal Arts Students in Two Community Colleges

Vann Leonzia Anane
Central Washington University

2

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF LIBERAL ARTS STUDENTS IN TWO COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Vann Leonzia Anane

July, 1970

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

_____

William Jack Peterson, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

_____

James M. Alexander III

_____

Arley L. Vancil

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Sincere appreciation goes to Mr. William Jack Peterson for his assistance and guidance in the writing of this thesis, and to Mr. James M. Alexander III and Mr. Arley L. Vancil for serving on the committee.

The writer wishes to acknowledge an indebtedness to Dr. Virgil J. Olson, whose initial contributions and advice helped to make this thesis possible.

An expression of appreciation goes to Mr. Donald F. McLarney, Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences at Highline Community College, for providing the secretarial help that was necessary for the preparation of the questionnaire for administration to students.

Also, an acknowledgement of appreciation and indebtedness goes to Mr. Robert M. Kintner and his staff of student help at Seattle Community College for their devotion of time and energy in processing the data collected for this thesis study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

1. THE PROBLEM AND SETTING. 1

I. THE PROBLEM. 2

Statement of the Problem 2

Importance of the Study. 4

Limitations. 4

II. THE SETTING 5

Highline Community College 5

Seattle Community College. 6

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 10

A RESEARCH DESCRIPTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS 10

Introduction 10

Academic Characteristics 13

Socioeconomic Background 18

Finances 20

Self-Concepts. 25

Interests and Personality Characteristics. 27

Chapter Page

Reasons for Attending the Junior College 29

Choice of Vocation and Major Field of Study 30

Educational and Occupational Aspirations. 30

REVIEW OF STUDIES UNDERTAKEN AT THE FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE LEVEL. 33

Introduction 33

The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-1968 34

Differences in Selected Attitudes and College Orientations Between Students Attending Traditionally Negro and Traditionally White Institutions 41

College Freshmen Attitudes Toward Cheating 49

On the Interpretation of Student Perceptions of Their College Environment . 56

3. PROCEDURES AND METHODS USED. 68

4. THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES AND THE HYPOTHESES. 71

PREDICTIONS. 71

RESULTS. 76

SUMMARY OF RESULTS 85

5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 89

SUMMARY. 89

RECOMMENDATIONS. 90

Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDIXES 98

A. Perception Tables. 99

B. Expectation Tables 105

C. Questionnaires 111

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Ability Levels of Students Entering College 1953 and 1960 (In Percentages) . . .	16
2.	Freshmen Attitudes Toward Cheating	53
3.	Zero-Order Correlations Between Conrol Variables and CUES Scales.	64
4.	Community Size for Colleges with Large Positive or Large Negative Deviations from Predicted Values on the Practicality Scale.	65
5.	Multiple Correlations and Standard Regression Weights for Predicting CUES Scale Scores.	66
6.	Geographical Location of States with Large Negative Deviations from Predicted Values on the Scholarship Scales	67

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND SETTING

Much has been written and discussed about student disruptions on various college campuses throughout the country in the last few years. Questions have been raised as to whether colleges and universities are fulfilling the needs of their students. Students are demanding more participation in the formulating of the policies of their host institutions. College and university administrations are attempting to make rapid preparations to respond to the increasing demands of their growing, politically aware, and discontented students.

In considering the above, administrators and even faculty personnel could benefit a great deal from any survey, questionnaire, or other field studies of their student bodies. The college or university administration may benefit in a number of ways, including restructuring of administrative procedures commensurate with the changing attitudes, needs, and expectations of today's college students, as well as assessing the legitimacies or illegitimacies of increased student participation in the administrative and instructional affairs of their institution(s). The college or university faculty may benefit by adopting or adjusting its instructional methods or procedures to meet the changing needs of their students. Furthermore, teachers in institutions of higher

education, by knowing or having access to up-to-date information on student attitudes and expectations, may be more able to determine whether some of the new and revolutionary methods in education, which have been recently developed, will be effective, relevant, useful, and acceptable to their students.

There has been a great deal of research done on the attitudes of students at four-year institutions, but very little, if any, has been done in the way of attitudinal studies at the two-year or community college level. As a result, it became the interest of the author, while an instructor at two community colleges in the Seattle area, to compare the student attitudes toward the two colleges to see if there are certain generalized attitudes which typify community college students regardless of differences in their college environments.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there are any significant differences in the perceptions of two groups of liberal arts students or at two colleges concerning the administration of their college, curriculum, instruction, course offerings, student role in college affairss, and other questions of importance to the college student. Also, an attempt will be made to determine if there is any relationship between a group of students' perceptions of the policies and offerings of their host environment and their expectations of the environment.

The author's assumption that differences exist between the student bodies of Highline Community College and Seattle Community College is based upon the following independent variables:

1. The prime independent variable would be that which results from the urban versus suburban situation of the two schools.

a. Expect urban students to be more aware of the issues than suburban students.

b. Expect urban students to be more receptive to new ideas and revolutionary innovations in education.

c. Primarily middle class and higher income group status of the students at Highline as opposed to the lower income family status of the students at Seattle Community College, creates difference in the student bodies of the two schools. An individual's family background may have an enormous influence on how he or she perceives the issures.

2. Seattle is much more diverse in its course offerings than Highline, having a larger vocational section or division than college transfer division.

3. Seattle has a much more heterogeneous population, while Highline is much more homogeneous in the composition of its student body.

4. Seattle does not have one main location or campus like Highline; it has about ten main branches and a number of smaller ones in various parts of the city. Highline is located on a campus site, and has one night school branch at Highline High School.

The writer's own personal observations as an instructor at both schools, as well as that of some faculty members of the two colleges, suggests that diffeences do exist between the student bodies of the two institutions.

Importance of the Study

The mounting (continuous) disruptions and discontent exhibited by students of various colleges and universities may be averted if more is known about the causes and conditions which lead students to confront school administrators with such problems. Studies of this kind may offer solutions to these and other institutional problems by supplying or making available to administrators information on student attitudes or perceptions and student expectations.

Although certain identical conditions which exist on various college campuses may be the basic causes for campus unrest, by no means are they the only reasons why students become discontented and rebellious. The social class and economic backgrounds of the young people that make up a student body may amplify or ignite the powder keg of emerging discontent. By studying a student body of comparatively upper income background with one of comparative lower income background, or a comparatively more homogeneous student body with a more heterogeneous student body, more light may be cast upon the varying needs and motivations of students at the community college level.

Limitations

The writer limited the study to two community colleges in the Seattle area. One of the Colleges has branches

located in various parts of the city area, and, thereby, it supposedly serves a predominantly urban populace. The other college is located in Midway, a surburb of Seattle, and serving a predominantly suburban populace. Secondly, the study will be confined to liberal arts students, those who are in academic programs leading to entrance into four-year institutions. Thirdly, the study will include students taking social science classes at Highline and Seattle Community Colleges.

II. THE SETTING

Highline Comminity College

Highline College is situated on an eighty-acre campus overlooking Puget Sound, approximately fifteen miles south of Seattle. The first phase of campus development, completed in 1964, is comprised of sixteen structures designed to house a complete community college program. In addition to general classrooms, instructional areas include specially designed space for the sciences, the arts, physical education, business and secretarial programs, and technical programs such as data processing, nursing and other health technologies, engineering technology, and others. Service areas include those for administration, counseling and guidance, student government and activities, a bookstore, a student lounge, food services, and faculty offices.

Eleven structures in a second major building program, completed in 1967, house additional general classroom space and specialized spaces for instruction in the performing arts

(drama, speech, music, group development); graphic arts; civil, machanical, and metallurgical technologies; undersea technical programs; homemaking; computer technology; aquatics; stewardess training; and other educational specialties. Approximately half of Highline's present faculty were added to the college teaching or instructional staff during the big expansion program of 1967. The College is served by its own library and library staff. Advisers and counselors who understand some of the needs of college students are available to all students.

The total enrollment at Highline at the time the writer's study began (Spring, 1969), was close to 5000 students. The kind of people that attend Highline are generally suburban and live within the area in which the college serves. The residents within the Highline College area vary in income levels from the working class to Boeing executives, having somewhat of a higher income level than do residents within the central urban area that is served by Seattle Community College.

Highline Community College is accredited by the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, its nursing program by the Washington State Board of Nursing, and the National League for Nursing. Before Highline College became a state institution in 1967, it was under the control of the Highline School District.

Seattle Community College

Seattle Community College was authorized by the 1965 Washington State Legislature upon the petition of the Seattle

School Board. A planning staff was hired by the School Board and the College was established officially on July 1, 1966.

Seattle Community College absorbed the long-established Edison Technical School and other programs of the Seattle Public School Adult Vocational Division. In September of 1966 the first college transfer classes started. July 1, 1967, signaled another important change for the new College. Action by the State Legislature, through the Community College Act (SHB 548) brought about separation of the state's community colleges from local school boards. District boundaries were defined with Seattle Community College in District Six, encompassing the boundaries of the Seattle School District and Vashon Island. The governor appointed Boards of Trustees for each of the twenty-two college districts and the State Board of Community College Education.

The most striking changes for the College are sure to come in the years ahead, making higher education accessible throughout the city. In the next few years the College is scheduled to open new north, central and south campus facilities. Each will contain a comprehensive curriculum.

During the construction of the three major campuses, the College will continue in its strong metropolitan setting, without an actual campus. It will also continue in certain satellite locations including Gompers and Duwamish Branches.

Until the new campuses open, Seattle Community College utilizes many temporary facilities (including the above) within the city to make higher education easily accessible to all. Altogether, there are some ten major facilities or branches, and six minor facilities now in use by the College.

Responding to the changing needs of the city and its population has led to the development of numerous new programs including thirty degree and numerous certificate and diploma programs designed to prepare persons for career entry, to presentation of a number of television classes, and to community service programs as varied as sensitivity seminars for supervisors of "hard-core unemployed," jazz band, and seashore seminars conducted at the water's edge.

Seattle Community College carries on a strong guidance program through counselors, an advisory system and the college exploratory program. These programs receive particular attention from the College.

Seattle Community College programs of study are divided into three broad divisions: Technical, Community Services, and the Institute of Liberal Studies. The Technical division handles instructional programs for technical careers or occupations. The Community Service division holds instructions in high school level courses, as well as English courses for the foreign speaker. The Institute of Liberal Studies is the division which holds instructions in college level or college transfer courses. The Institute of Liberal Studies occupies the Summit and Edison South Branches of Seattle Community College. The questionnaire was administered to students that attended social science classes at the Summit Branch.

The students enrolled in courses in the Insitute of Liberal Studies comprised only about 17 percent of the total College enrollment of a little over twelve thousand students, as of the Spring quarter of 1969. Most of the students enrolled at the College come from within the Seattle urban

area. The students at Seattle Community College come from highly varied social, economic, and ethnic backgrounds. The small, but noticeable, number of foreign students at the College contribute significantly to the diversity and heterogeneity of the student population.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A RESEARCH DESCRIPTION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Introduction

Until very recently, within the last ten or more years, there has been very little research done on junior college students. Most of the major research work done on students at the junior or community college level has been undertaken since the early and middle sixties--the greater part of this research work is dated from 1965 until the present.

A major descriptive study of the characteristics of junior college students was undertaken at the request of the advisory committee for the Junior College Occupational Measurement Project, sponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges and Educational Testing Service. The results of the research findings were published in 1968 under the combined title: The Junior College Student.

Specifically, the committee asked Educational Testing Service, with the cooperation of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley to "undertake a descriptive survey of the junior college student population . . . in terms of its uniqueness

or difference from traditional student population." The survey was guided by two basic purposes: (1) to synthesize the findings of past research; and (2) to identify areas in which further research is needed.

The survey shows that the quality and quantity of research on junior college students has reached a point where some generalizations are both possible and desirable. Essentially, it attempts to present a generalized research picture that may serve as a framework against which to test hypotheses. The picture that emerges is a statistical or mythical junior college devoid of infinite variety present in any of the more than eight hundred junior colleges throughout the country.

Some of the criteria used in the survey are stated explicitly below:

1. Research on the junior college student is a new phenomenon; emphasis in this survey, therefore, was placed on recent research. Almost half the references cited bear the date of 1966 or 1967, and no attempt was made to conduct any systematic search of the literature prior to 1960.

2. Emphasis was also placed on research that used samples from broad geographical areas. For the most part, the research findings or studies forming the core of the report or survey are national in scope. Some use was made of regional and statewide data, and occasionally, data from an individual college were used for illustration.

3. Interpretation of data cannot be made in a vacuum; some points of reference must be established. To state that half of the students entering junior colleges receive encouragement from their fathers to attend college is only part of the story. The statement takes on greater

significance when we learn that only one-fourth of the students who fail to enter college and almost two-thirds of those entering four-year colleges receive similar parental encouragement. For the most part, then, this review was confined to studies that report appropriate comparative data.

4. Although problems in educating the culturally different are reflected in this analysis, a review of the vast amount of research now existing on that subject was beyond its purview. The characteristics of so-called minority groups and culturally different and educationally disadvantaged youth were included only insofar as they constituted a portion of the junior college student population.

5. While most of the research on which this survey or report is based is published and available, much of the interpretation of data presented in its tables has been made by the author. The scope (school to college: opportunities for postsecondary education) data on junior college students was analyzed specifically for this report. The longitudinal scope study, under the direction of Dale Tillery of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, and sponsored by the College Entrance Examination Board, follows nearly ninety thousand high school students as they move from high school into the world of work, marriage, and various forms of postsecondary education.

The characteristics of the junior college student described in this report are necessarily influenced by the philosophy, purposes and image of today's junior colleges. Primary importance was placed on understanding students presently enrolled in the various junior college curricula, but it was emphasized that this population is rapidly changing.

Therefore, research on the characteristics of junior college students was stated to be an effort that should not be discontinued.

As Gleazer (1967) has pointed out:

> The philosophy of the junior college has evolved over the little more than half centrury that the junior college has existed in this country. Some of its early supporters . . . saw the role of the junior college as limited to providing the first two years of a baccalaureate program, thus relieving the universities of the responsibilities of offering the freshman and sophomore years. Many things have happened, however, to alter the nature and aims of a majority of the country's junior colleges. The population has grown rapidly, and the demand for college opportunity has increased in the face of new social and economic needs. Aspirations of Americans have risen as society has become more complex, and as the advantages of education in terms of employment and advancement on the job have become more evident. While the conventional liberal arts and general education programs leading to transfer are still a vital part of the two-year college endeavor, most of the institutions now also emphasize courses of study that will prepare men and women to fill positions immediately in business and industry, government, social service, and other areas essential to the development of the nation. The importance of education to the fulfillment of the individual has also been recognized in the changing pattern of junior college education (14:3-4).

Academic Characteristics

The academic ability of students is one of the best researched areas in higher education. Much is known about the comparative performance of various groups of young people on the "traditional" tests of academic ability. It has been clearly demonstrated that performance on these tests tend to typify or characterize certain groups of young people of the college age category. For example, it can be stated

with considerable confidence that the mean score for students attending four-year colleges excels that of students in two-year colleges and that two-year college students score higher as a group than high school graduates who do not go to college. The research demonstrating these facts is national in scope, it is unanimous in findings, and it is based upon a staggering array of traditional measures of academic aptitude and achievement.

Perhaps the results are best illustrated by the broadly representative sample of high school students in the longitudinal studies of Project Talent. In one study involving a 5 percent nationwide sample consisting of some four hundred thousand students, clear and highly significant differences in ability were found between high school graduates who did not go to college, those who entered junior college, and those who entered four-year colleges. On every one of fourteen measures of ability, ranging from reading comprehension, mathematics ability, and biology to vocabulary information, creativity, and abstract reasoning, the junior college group fell between four-year college and noncollege groups. They appeared somewhat more academically able than students who did not go to college but distinctly less able than the four-year college froups. Cooley and Becker (1966) concluded that there was a tendency for junior college students to be more like noncollege youth than like four-year college students in terms of ability.

Other studies of national scope verify the Project Talent findings. The superior academic ability of the student entering a four-year institution over the student entering the two-year college has been demonstrated over the past decade on national samples using the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude

Test, the English, mathematics, social studies, and natural science tests, as well as the composite of the American College Testing Program, the school and college ability tests or equivalent, the College Qualification Test, a rank-in-high-school-class index and reported high school grades. Even for those presumably more academically able junior college students who plan to transfer later to four-year colleges, the record of high school achievement falls somewhat below that of the freshmen entering four-year institutions. According to the findings of Medsker and Trent, four-year colleges draw approximately three-fourths of their freshmen from the upper forty percent of the high school graduating class, whereas about half of the junior college transfer students were in the upper forty percent of their high school graduating class.

In considering the great variety of intellectually endowed young people that attend our nation's two-year colleges in various parts of the country, and the varying scholastic standings of the colleges themselves, it should be recognized that there is a great variability of academic ability within each junior college, and from college to college. For example, according to Hoyt and Munday, some junior colleges have student bodies who are academically superior to the entering classes of the typical four-year college, and virtually all junior colleges have individual students as academically able as any to be found in four-year colleges.

Tillery (1963) found that eighteen percent of the high ability high school graduates in California who are eligible to enter the state university, roughly the upper fifteen percent of high school graduating classes, entered

a two-year college instead. He estimated that this very high performance group consitututed about five percent of the junior college freshmen in 1961.

The new needs in testing are nowhere better described than in a paper by William Turnbull (1967). He compares the proportion of high school graduates at various levels of ability entering college in 1953 and 1960, as indicated by Project Talent data, based on researches at the two different times (1953 and 1960) (see Table 1).

Table 1

Ability Levels of Students Entering College 1953 and 1960 (In Percentages)

Ability Levels	Wolfe 1953	Talent 1960
Lowest quarter	20%	19%
Third quarter	32	32
Second quarter	38	54
Top quarter	48	80

Even though the samples are somewhat different, it is obvious that enormous changes have taken place in the percentage of top quarter students going to college. The student new to higher education--the student now entering the two-year college--is of necessity going to come increasingly from the second, third, and lowest quartiles. According to Turnbull:

> To look at the student body along the narrow dimensions of academic talent is, of course, grossly inadequate. For the students newly represented on college rolls, skills and aptitudes of quite different orders are probably the pertinent dimensions of comparison. It is symptomatic of our own problem that we do not have the data to show systematically the way in which the college-going population is changing with respect to dimensions other than scholastic aptitude. . . . Clearly, in education we are moving away from the relatively uniform academic program of earlier decades to a much more diversified assortment of offerings. At the higher education level, the community college in particular offers a ready example of an institution that has accepted just this responsibility.

In short, it is Turnbull's observation that education is unstable and in a rapid state of change, therefore, he feels that it is necessary that testing programs must change to meet the needs of a new education program designed to meet the needs of new students. Otherwise, traditional testing programs designed to meet the needs of the traditional academic student and a stable and unchanging education program are no longer reliable in assessing the needs of today's college students.

Another category of student, new to higher education, and for whom there are also few adequate tests of abilities and learning capacities is the older student. According to A. W. Astin, 15 percent of the entering full-time students at four-year institutions are nineteen or older, whereas, almost one-third of the junior college full-time students are in this older age group, and if part-time students were considered, the difference would be even greater. For example, in one of the author's sociology classes at Highline Community College in the summer of 1969, well over 50 percent of his students were nineteen and over. A few

of these students were in their late twenties and some in their thirties and forties. In all of the classes which were taught by the author (especially the night classes), a person nineteen or older was always enrolled. The need for research and for development of appropriate measuring instruments for the nineteen and older age group is becoming more and more urgent.

Socioeconomic Background

Research findings are virtually unanimous in demonstrating a rank ordering of types of colleges on the basis of student soioeconomic background variables such as father's occupation, income and education. The 1966 ACE study of 250,000 college freshmen shows a socioeconomic order very similar to that found in a 1959 study of 10,000 high school graduates. Both studies reveal that while private universities were attracting predominantly the children of high income, high occupational level, college educated parents, the two-year colleges and public four-year colleges tended to attract much smaller proportions of students from high socioeconomic backgrounds.

In analyzing Project Talent data, Cooley and Becker (1966) found that the junior college group fell between the noncollege and senior college group on every one of seven indices of socioeconomic status, including mother's and father's education, father's occupation, number of books in the home, whether or not the students had a room, desk, and typewriter of his own at home, and so on. Junior college students were, however, more similar to the four-year college group on these indices than they were to the noncollege group.

Although there are difficulties in attempting to determine the relative influences of ability and environmental factors, Shoenfeldt (1966), in his analysis of Project Talent data, concluded that the ability of the student had more influence on whether or not he could go to college than did the socioeconomic status of his family. The data of Medsker and Trent (1965), however, indicated that the occupation of the father showed somewhat more relationship to college attendance than did the ability of the student. While in both of these studies the education of the mother was more significant in predicting college attendance than the education of the father, the scope data showed little difference between them as predictors. As might be expected, the educational levels of the mothers were slightly lower than, and parallel to, those of the fathers.

Research studies have shown that the attitudes of parents regarding college attendance has a profound effect upon whether students go to college, what type of college they attend and even how long they stay. For example, responses on a scope questionnaire showed that students who entered four-year colleges were much more likely to receive parental encouragement than either those who did not enter college or those who entered junior college. Not only were parents of college students more definitely interested in further education, but they were also more likely to have expressed an opinion to their children.

Adding the percentages of high school seniors who were unaware of any strong parental opinion on the issue (leaves it up to me, don't know, and no response), shows that almost half (47 percent) of the young people who did not enter college perceived no particular parental concern.

Twenty percent of the junior college group and only 14 percent of the four-year college students reported this type of parental indifference.

Parental attitudes toward college also bear a strong relationship to persistence in college. Trent and Medsker (1967) found that 70 percent of the college students who persisted in college during the four-year period covered by their study had stated, as high school seniors, that their parents definitely wanted them to attend college. Only 48 percent of the students dropping out during the four-year period felt that college was important to their parents; among high school seniors (upper 30 percent of their high school class) who did not attend college, only 15 percent reported having received parental encouragement.

Because the child-parent relationship seems so obviously related to college attendance and persistence, it is of interest to note that there are statistically significant differences among the descriptions of parents given by college persisters, college dropouts, and nonattenders. According to Trent and Ruyle (1965), the persisters were most likely, and the nonattenders least likely, to describe their parents as loving, energetic, ambitious, orderly, and intellectual.

Given the preceding information and the very high dropout rate for two-year colleges, it appears that parental attitudes as perceived by students are a highly important variable in understanding student motivations for college.

Finances

In a survey of the characteristics of junior or two-year college students, the question of financial assistance

ranks as one of the key features or factors in the understanding or characterizing of students at this level of educational endeavor. Such students generally come from lower socioeconomic homes compared to those who generally start at the four-year colleges, and particularly the big universities. They give a high priority to the low cost of the junior or two-year college, and are concerned with upward mobility. Many see the potential of increased income as the primary reason for college attendance.

Few students appear deterred from going to college because of cost. ACE data has revealed that roughly one-third of both junior and senior college freshmen said they had no concern about finances; only about ten percent of each group confessed to having a major concern about financing a college education. Judging from the ACE questionnaire responses, about the same proportion of junior as senior college students worry about money for higher education.

Although few students reject college on the basis of cost alone, many give cost major consideration in their selection of a college. On a scope questionnaire, almost half (46 percent) of the junior college students surveyed, stated that low cost was a major consideration in their choice of a college. On the same questionnaire, the percentages of noncollege youth and senior college students who indicated low cost as a major consideration were 40 percent and 35 percent, respectively.

The sources of money for college are quite obviously different for the two-year and four-year college freshmen in the ACE study (Astin, et al. 1967). Two-year college students tend to lead four-year college students in the

percentages obtaining money through employment during college, summer employment, and personal savings. Larger percentages of four-year college students reported receiving scholarships, parental aid, federal government assistance, and loans. Scholarships, loans, and parental aid are more likely to be available to the senior college student, whereas the junior college student is forced to rely more heavily on his own resources.

Jencks and Riesman (1969) in the discussion of the second major group said to attend the community college--that group which comes from families that cannot affort to support a child away from home--give information which contradicts or at least challenges what has been stated previously about the financial capabilities of the families of two-year college students. They state that the group of students attending the two-year college who come from families that cannot afford to support a child away from home is not as large as one might imagine. They give evidence for their position in the following paragraph:

> The parents of students who enroll at community colleges are slightly <u>richer</u> than the parents of students at four-year institutions. Only 22 percent of the men who entered public junior colleges full time in the fall of 1966 came from families earning less than $6,000 a year, compared to 27 percent of the men entering public four-year colleges. The median parental income of the public junior college entrants was about $9,000 compared to about $8,000 in the public four-year college and $6,900 for all American families. This means that most students of community colleges could, in principle, have gotten as much financial help from their families as those in four-year colleges did. What seems to have distinguished them was not that their parents couldn't contribute very much,

> but that they didn't. Whether this was because the community college students were older and more reluctant to ask, or simply because their parents put less of a premium on college, we do not know (2:485-486).

Whether the incomes of the families of two-year public students are higher, on the average, than the families of students at four-year public colleges, or not, the two-year college certainly makes it possible for those students, who otherwise could not afford to attend college, to gain entrance into higher education. When one examines or compares the tuition costs of the average two-year public college with that of a four-year college or university one can see what difference in expenses exist between the two, and why cost advantages are greater at the two-year school, not to mention the cost advantages that result from not having to leave home and pay for resident expenses at a four-year institution out of the student's home community.

Since one of the major costs of college is frequently board and room, it is pertinent to look at how the availability of college opportunities in the home communities affects the college-age population. Medsker and Trent (1965a) compared college attendance rates in sixteen cities that were similar in demographic and industrial features but different in the type of public college available in the community. Five of the communities had public junior or community colleges, four had relatively unselective state colleges, and two had no public colleges at all. One was a community that offered multiple college opportunities.

Communities with junior colleges had the highest proportion of students going on to college, while those with state colleges were next in order. The extension centers made the least impact on the local communities; communities

in which they existed showed about the same rate of college attendance as did the communities with no college at all. Fifty-three percent of the high school seniors from communities with a junior college entered college. For communities with other, or no, facilities for higher education the figures were: state colleges, 47 percent; multiple colleges, 44 percent; extension centers, 34 percent; and no college, 33 percent.

The type of college present in the community made the least difference to bright students (upper 40 percent of their high school class in ability) of high socioeconomic status. They went to college anyway; averaging across all sixteen communities, 82 percent of this group entered college. The impact of local opportunities for college was most vivid for students of high academic ability from lower socioeconomic levels. While 80 percent of the bright youth from high socioeconomic backgrounds went to college even if there were none in the local community, only 22 percent of the lower socioeconomic group of the same level of ability entered college when there were no local colleges. The presence of a two-year college more than doubled the opportunity for bright students whose fathers were employed at the lower occupational levels. In two-year college communities, 53 percent of the bright students from lower socioeconomic levels entered college, but in communities with no public college facilities, only 22 percent of the group entered college. Between these extremes are multiple-college communities serving 49 percent of bright, low socioeconomic youth, state college towns serving 41 percent, and extension center localities serving 35 percent.

Bashaw (1965) reported similar results in a comparison of Florida counties with and without public community junior colleges. He discovered that a new public junior college in an area resulted in a statistically significant increase in the proportion of the total population attending college. The median increase was .63 percent two years after the founding and 199 percent after four years from the establishment of the junior college.

Research on the availability of college in the community seems to indicate that accessibility of college has a particular impact upon students from lower socioeconomic levels. Thus, two-year colleges are demonstrating considerable effectiveness in the increase of greater opportunities for higher education for all classes and strata of our society. One can argue that the existence of a college in a local community attracts new students to higher education because of the reduced cost, because of the educational awareness brought to the community, or because less intense motivation is required for continuing college in the same community. Perhaps all three factors are usually involved. We may safely conclude that the junior college probably makes the greatest impact on the youth from middle and lower socioeconomic levels because it usually has lower costs than the extension center, or perhaps the image and goals of the junior college have greater relevance for young people of this background.

Self-Concepts

Research indicates that many students attend junior colleges because they are uncertain of their interests and

motivation for a four-year degree program. In a study of junior college students who transferred to four-year colleges and universities, Knoell and Medsker (1965) found that almost one-fourth of the transfer students said that uncertainty about their plans for a major or career field was a factor of considerable importance in their decision to attend a junior college. Nearly one-third said that a feeling of not being prepared for senior college work was of at least some importance in their decison. Interviews with students one year after their transfer revealed that many had not wanted to risk their academic future in four-year colleges until they were somewhat more sure of themselves academically.

These observations are borne out by scope data, which sampled a population of high school seniors. When asked of their self-estimates of their ability to do college work, 57 percent of those who later entered four-year colleges felt "definitely able," compared with only 29 percent of those entering junior colleges. This ratio of 57 to 29 percent is almost the same as the ratio of senior college to junior college students in the top third of Academic Test distribution. Both the data from the scope and ACE studies contribute an interesting perspective to the hypothesis that, in general, junior college students feel they are academically inadequate; and, as a group, they do not possess nearly the academic self-confidence of the university freshmen. Furthermore, both the ACE and scope data suggest that the more academically oriented senior college students feel confidence in academic and verbal pursuits, while the junior

college students appear to perceive their strengths in non-academic tasks (artistic ability, mechanics, handicrafts, athletics, etc.).

Interests and Personality Characteristics

On a scope intellectual-predisposition test, it was clearly shown that those students entering four-year colleges tended to score higher in intellectual pursuits than those entering junior colleges. The junior college students showed more interest in intellectual attitudes or endeavors than those not entering college.

Behaviors as students report them, follow interests. It was found that high school students who later enter college reported the most time devoted to study, those who did not enter college reported the least. Percentage figures for more than two hours per day of study time are listed in the scope study as follows: four-year college students, 39 percent; junior college, 22 percent; and non-college, 16 percent.

Very little is known about personality characteristics that differentiates junior college students from those attending other types of colleges, but what is known appears consistent across research studies and with those characteristics related to interests and self-concepts of students described previously.

In general, it has been found that junior college students are more conventional, less independent, less attracted to reflective thought and less tolerant than their peers in four-year institutions. They are also more vocationally oriented than are four-year college students.

On the average, the student that attends the junior college has a specific occupation in mind. He or she prepares for a specific job, and will enter the labor market within a much shorter period of time than will be true of the four-year college student. Therefore, the junior college students tend to be inclined toward more practical rather than idealistic matters.

Differences, where they exist, between the personal objectives of students in junior and senior colleges appear to form a pattern that is considered to merit further investigation. Senior college students seem somewhat more likely to express an interest in humanitarian concerns, whereas junior college students seem to be somewhat more concerned about business and financial matters (as indicated in the above paragraph).

On the scope business-practical orientation questionnaire, it was indicated that junior college students tend to be more concerned about being well-off financially and to succeed in business as goals. Senior college freshmen, on the other hand, tended to attribute importance to objectives such as helping others in difficulty, joining the Peace Corps or VISTA, becoming community leaders and keeping up with political affairs.

Generalized conclusions regarding personality differences cannot be drawn from a study carried on by J. R. Warren involving only three colleges: a public junior college, a four-year state college, and a private college; but his findings on measures of personality fit the picture that seems to be emerging. Warrne found that on all his measures junior college students fell below state and private college. Students at the private college were the

most venturesome, impulsive, ready to commit themselves to courses of action in a variety of situations, and more involved with other students. Junior college students were the most cautious, prudent, and controlled, most apprehensive and rigid in their concerns over grades and academic standing.

Reasons for Attending the Junior College

It is known that students who choose junior colleges base their selection on a set of variables quite different from those students entering four-year institutions.

1. Most research is in agreement that students entering a junior college are influenced more by practical considerations and less by intellectual interests than are their peers in four-year colleges.

2. Academic reputation is the most common reason for the selection of a university, whereas low cost and closeness to home frequently lead all other reasons given for attending a junior college.

3. In the biographical inventory data of the Comparative-Guidance and Placement Program, the two leading reasons given for attending the junior college in which the students were enrolled were "inexpensive" (22 percent) and "close to home" (22 percent).

4. The ACT profile (1966) showed a larger percentage of students in four-year colleges giving consideration to intellectual atmosphere, good faculty, and high scholastic standing; junior college students were more likely to place emphasis upon location, low cost, and nearness to home.

Choice of Vocation and Major Field of Study

Knoell and Medsker (1964a) found that 27 percent of junior college transfer students had not made a firm occupational choice by the time they entered junior college and 36 percent changed their minds during the first two years.

As for occupational choice, two-year college men tend to be interested in business (22 percent) and engineering (17 percent), but the largest category for four-year college men was business (18 percent) and for university freshman men, engineering (20 percent). For women, the only field that ammassed a sizeable number of candidates was teaching. Twenty-five percent of junior college women and 41 percent of four-year college women said, as college freshmen, that they planned to go into elementary or secondary education (Astin, 1967).

Knoell and Medsker (1964a) found that one-fourth of the students who later transferred to four-year colleges had not committed themselves to majors at the time they completed work in junior college. Another one-fourth had changed their majors before transferring, but only 16 percent changed their majors after entering a four-year college. Liberal arts majors combined, attracted thirty-two percent, but over half the junior college transfers majored in one of the applied fields (business administration, engineering, and education).

Educational and Occupational Aspirations

Generally speaking, junior college students have lower educational and occupational aspirations than their

peers who begin their education in four-year colleges. However, it has been found that between 70 and 75 percent of the junior college students say, as freshmen, that they intend to attain a bacherlor's degree or more (Astin, 1967 and Act, 1966).

It has been found, of course, that the educational aspirations of both junior and senior college students are, unrealistically, high. For example, in a longitudinal study of 10,000 high school graduates, it was found that only about ten percent of those who began their college careers in junior colleges in 1959 had obtained bachelor's degrees by June, 1963, compared with 27 percent for state college entrants, 36 percent for those entering public universities (Trent and Ruyle, 1965). However, it must also be noted that it is no longer the norm for college students to make an orderly progression through college in four years. At the end of four years, 28 percent of the students entering colleges of all types have obtained degrees, but almost as many (24 percent) are still in college and have not yet qualified for their degree (Cross, 1967).

Investigation has shown that there is a close relationship between the aspirations of students and their parents. Students tend to perceive that their parents have even higher educational aspirations for them than they do themselves.

There are a number of indications that the educational aspirations of young people are influenced at an early age. Ninety percent of the four-year college group in the scope study had taken the college preparatory course in high school; sixty-two percent of junior college entrants had, but only 25 percent of the noncollege group had the necessary

educational requirements for college work. Almost a third of the junior college group probably lacked the courses necessary for college admission; 20 percent took a "general" course (required course plus others they liked), and 10 percent were enrolled in a commercial or business curriculum. As a matter of fact, 16 percent of the students who had planned as late as the spring of their senior year in high school to go to four-year colleges started in junior colleges instead. Some of these students certainly entered junior colleges because they lacked the necessary prerequisites for senior college.

Four-year college students tend to be more satisfied with the courses they had taken in high school. The students in junior college tend to be less satisfied with their course work in high school than is true of those at four-year colleges, but more satisfied than those young people, who do not attend college at all, who go into the labor market upon completion of high school. It is estimated that approximately fifty-three percent of the young people who do go into the labor market upon finishing high school, were dissatisfied with the courses they had taken during the course of their high school years.

According to Cross, about one-third of junior college students come from managerial and professional homes, but about two-thirds of them aspire to these occupational levels. The American desire for upward mobility is apparent here, but, equally apparent, is the fact that the aspirations of a large proportion of students seeking managerial and professional occupations are destined to be frustrated. Burton Clark (1960) speaks of the "cooling-out" function of higher education and notes that the state university is

likely to perform this function with the "hard" response, while the junior college may use the "soft" response. The university, having bowed to pressure for broad admission, frequently adjusts its student load by forcing a heavy drop-out of freshmen. The "soft" response used by most junior colleges is to offer students alternative paths rather than dropping them.

Clark says:

> The junior college may be viewed as a place where all high school graduates have the opportunity to explore possible careers and find the type of education appropriate to their individual ability; in short, as a place where everyone is admitted and everyone succeeds (10:576).

The effect of the soft response is to let down hopes gently and unexplosively. Through it, students who are failing or barely passing find their occupational and academic future being redefined (10:574). Thus, many students who aspire to the managerial and professional careers will gradually find their niche in the skilled and semiprofessional occupations instead. In operational terms, it means moving students out of transfer majors into terminal programs of vocational, business, or semiprofessional training.

REVIEW OF STUDIES UNDERTAKEN AT THE FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE LEVEL

Introduction

Most of the studies that have been made thus far of the college student or the college environment, have been at four-year institutions. In fact, mostly all of the litera-

ture of various kinds of studies that have been made at institutions of higher education, have been limited primarily to four-year institutions. There is still not much material or literature of studies made at the two-year college available, even today. Therefore, a review of some of the many interesting studies that have been undertaken at many of the four-year colleges is applicable in any review of literature involving any aspect of the two-year college student or the two-year college environment for that matter.

With the above in mind, the author researched out several interesting studies of various kinds that have been recently made available in educational journals, books, and pamphlets. Because of the vast reservoir of literature now available on studies that have been made at the four-year college level, and the limitation of time and space allowed for a thesis project, and also because of the lack of necessity of covering a wide range of studies, the author has been very selective and has, therefore, limited himself to a review of only four studies dealing with senior college students. The studies are presented in summarized form in the following pages.

The first in a series of reviews of four studies which are being covered in this section is entitled The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-1968. The opening paragraph to the introductory part of this study reads as follows:

> College student unrest has escalated to the point where most officials responsible for the higher learning in America would very likely consider it their number one problem. Many people outside the university, in an election year when law and order are much on their minds, are outraged at the prospect of affluent youth openly in opposition to all manner

> of institutionalized practice and authority. The significance of the student activist movement can hardly be minimized.

Keeping in mind the rapidity of protest movements that have occurred on American college campuses, as is indicated in the introductory paragraph, above, and the importance of understanding and keeping such protests in check, the author has selected to review this study.

To begin, the first of two general purposes for this study dealt with a description of the extent of organized college student protest in regard to specific issues during the academic year 1967-1968, giving special attention to numbers of institutions experiencing protest and the proportion of student bodies involved. The second broad purpose had to do with an examination of the trends in student activism between 1965 and 1968 by contrasting the present data with comparable information gathered in 1965 (reported in the monograph entitled The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-1965).

In late May of 1968, a questionnaire was sent to the dean of students or other official at all 1,000 accredited four-year colleges in the country. Respondents indicated for each of twenty-seven issues on the questionnaire (student participation in campus governance, the draft, military recruiters, etc.) if there had been protest, and if so, its extent and the proportion of the student body involved. Certain other information about the college (type, size, location, etc.) was also elicited. Eighty-six percent of the questionnaires were returned.

Three limitations on the findings were made explicit: (1) results represent perceptions of deans of students, (2) for the teachers' colleges there could be bias due to a somewhat lower return rate, and (3) the results apply only to the situation (the dean's view of it) as of the period of September, 1967-June, 1968.

When responses from all the colleges were combined to form a national picture, it was observed that (1) issues pertaining to instruction, faculty, and freedom of expression rarely evoked organized student activism; (2) issues bearing on personal freedoms and student participation in the governance of the college somewhat more often generated protest; and (3) the Vietnam War was the single issue most frequently cited by the deans (38 percent of them) as having triggered student activism. Some illustrative examples from the overall (national) tabulation: curriculum inflexibility, protests reported by 15 percent of the deans; acadmeic freedom for faculty, 4 percent; rules regarding controversial visitors, 8 percent; living-group regulations, 34 percent; student participation in campus policy-making, 27 percent; military recruiters, 25 percent; recruiters from organizations such as Dow Chemical and the CIA, 20 percent; and the Vietnam War per se, 38 percent.

The only significant variation by geographical region was with regard to the off-campus issues (civil rights, the war, etc.), for which about one-third fewer colleges in the Southern accrediting region reported organized activism.

Factor analysis produced an empirical structure of protested issues in the form of seven factors that were labeled Unconcern with Teaching, Instruction and Curriculum,

Faculty Affairs, Political Extremist Visitors, Administrative Paternalism, Student Power, and Student Radicalism.

Prior to discussing various institutional characteristics associated with protest, attention was drawn to the notion of a "critical mass" that inheres in large aggregation of individuals. The factor of size (gross enrollment) in and of itself is likely to account for a good deal of the variation by type of institution, proportion of faculty doctorates, and other institutional characteristics.

In general, this study showed that the incidence of reported protest varied considerably among different types of institutions (public universities, independent liberal arts colleges, Catholic institutions, etc.). As is to be expected, class size and nonteaching on the part of senior professors were issues for protest at the public universities slightly more often than elsewhere. By small margin, public universities also most often experienced protests stemming from alleged infringements on academic freedom for faculty, censorship of student publications, and rules regarding controversial speakers, at the public universities to a greater extent than elsewhere, one may expect to find critical masses of radical students and faculty in conflict with essentially conservative interests and pressures from off the campus (Herbert Marcuse Versus the American Legion in San Diego, was used as the prime example).

Among the issues in the student administrative category, substantial differences by institutional type were recorded on the issues of dormitory rules, dress regulations (most frequently protested at Catholic institutions), and radical issues (agitation occurring chiefly at the independent and public universities).

Student activism in regard to the Vietnam War and related campus issues was much more prevalent at the independent colleges and public institutions than in the sectarian and career oriented colleges. Draft protests took place at 55 percent of the independent universities, and at 20 percent or fewer of the Catholic, teacher-training and technical institutions. Protests over the war itself occurred at proportionally twice as many independent universities as at public colleges or sectarian or vocationally specialized institutions. In part, the explanation was shown to lie in the differing functions of the different types of institutions (for example, Dow Chemical recruiters visit big universities rather than teachers' colleges or Catholic women's colleges); in part the variation in protest is due to differing value systems of students attending the various kinds of institutions.

Analysis of the fifty largest public universities in the sample produced a profile falling above the national "norm" on twenty-one of the twenty-seven issues. Differences for the war-related issues were particularly large (more frequently at the large universities).

Three additional characteristics were looked at by means of correlation coefficients: (1) institutional quality, defined as the proportion of faculty doctorates, was significantly correlated only with protests over the Vietnam War; (2) extent to which a college is residential or commuter generally had little or no relationship to the incidence of student protest; and (3) presence on campus of student Left groups was by comparison more strongly correlated with protests over both on-campus and off-campus issues.

With regard to the proportions of student bodies involved in protesting the various issues, it was generally the issues involving controls over the personal lives of students that the deans judged to have stirred the largest numbers of students. Relatively few students were engaged in protesting matters dealing with instruction, faculty, and freedom of expression (at relatively few colleges where such protests were in fact reported). Proportions of student bodies protesting the draft and war-related recruiters were quite small (such incidents were, however, shown to be frequently occurring on large campuses). Generally speaking, the study indicates that student activists constituted small minorities of their respective student bodies, ranging from about nine percent actively protesting dormitory, dress and drinking regulations down to roughly four percent demonstrating against Dow, CIA, etc. recruiters and classified research on campus.

Conclusions about trends in the student movement based on the results of this and the earlier study was stated to be tentative, the reason given was that the samples of institutions in the two studies are not identical (though they are quite similar in that 85 percent of the population is included in both studies or surveys). Nonetheless, the following assertions were considered to be warranted:

1. Campuses experiencing organized student protest of the Vietnam War almost doubled in the interval between 1965 and 1968.

2. Activism toward a larger student role in campus governance (including curriculum development) has increased substantially.

3. Civil rights activism among white college students has declined significantly. White students are leaving prosecution of the on-going human rights revolution to black activists.

4. From no such insistence in 1965, black college students are now insisting that their college provide educational experiences consistent with their new self-conception.

5. Proportions of activists within student bodies on campuses around the country have not increased (according to deans of students). (Substantially larger proportions of protesting students were reported only in relation to the dress regulation issue.) This is not to say that the absolute number of activist students has not increased, according to the information given in the study.

6. The number of colleges reporting student Left groups (these were indicated to be mainly SDS chapters) has almost doubled, from 26 percent in 1965 to 46 percent in 1968.

In conclusion, it was stated in the study that the student movement is still a minority phenomenon, and that "members" of the student Left amount to something on the order of two percent of the national student population. It was also stated that an additional eight to ten percent are strongly sympathetic with the movement for social change and are capable of temporary activation depending on the issues. The numbers of activist students, while not increasing spectacularly, are nevertheless rising steadily.

One should keep in mind, however, that despite its minority status, the radical student movement is having a very substantial impact, most importantly in the recent year

or so, on the nature of campus governance. It appears more and more that perhaps a majority of college and university officials around the country have come to acknowledge the legitimacy of most of the student demands.

The second in a series of four studies which are being reviewed in this section is entitled, Differences in Selected Attitudes and College Orientations Between Students Attending Traditionally Negro and Traditionally White Institutions. The purpose of this study had to do with determining what educationally relevant differences exist, if any, between two groups of black collegians--those who enter traditionally Negro colleges and those who enter integrated ones.

On the basis of data collected from the College Student Questionnaire (Part I) and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (Verbal), the study revealed that black students entering integrated institutions were found to have higher SAT-V scores, to be more independent, liberal and concerned with social injustice, and to aspire to more years of formal education. Many of the differences between the two groups, however, were found to be highly correlated with SAT scores. Thus, it would appear that to the extent integrated institutions are attracting the higher ability (as measured by SAT) black students, they are also attracting those with a quite different set of attitudes, background characteristics, and orientations toward college. (All of the above information given in this paragraph will be discussed in greater detail later in the study.)

One of the apparent outcomes of the host of protests, demonstrations, and demands for reform which have been so

prevalent among black college students during the past two years has been a dramatic alteration in the admission policies and procedures of large numbers of integrated colleges and universities. Recently, in fact, many predominantly white institutions have been going out of their way to search for "qualified" black students, with the result that the percentage of blacks in the freshman classes of integrated institutions around the country appears to be rising steadily. Now, in view of these recent efforts on the part of integrated institutions, such facts as were stated in the preceding paragraph are important to recognize and consider, for the practice of focusing on students with higher SAT scores is also bringing about a redistribution of behavior styles and personality characteristics that contributes critically to campus environments.

It was clearly pointed out, that the increase in the number of black students at integrated colleges and universities simply reflects the increased number of black youths desiring a college education. Although, it should be kept in mind that the vast recruiting on the part of many predominantly white schools, particularly in the north to get promising young black people remains the principle reason for the recent sharp increase of black youth at the integrated institutions of higher education.

The recruiting practices on the part of integrated institutions of higher education has met with mixed feelings by some observers, however, who are concerned that siphoning off talented and able black students will only hurt the quality of the Negro schools. As one prominent black educator points out, this practice may be "robbing the black communities of those painfully developed strengths which

grew there in spite of . . . America's shameful treatment" (Harding, 1968) Dyer (1967) asserts:

> The nub of the problem is this: the predominently white colleges of the north, all well-heeled and many of them anxious to make a reputation for themselves as liberal, color-blind institutions, have been moving into the South with ample scholarship funds during the last five or six years and are creaming off the most highly qualified Negro students who would normally have gone to the Negro colleges of the South (13:218).

In spite of these reservations, however, there is no sign that this recruiting will diminish and every likelihood that it will increase. Furthermore, it has been indicated that the recruitment of promising black students is just one of the many approaches currently being used by predominantly white institutions to facilitate college entry or further academic success by the socially disadvantaged student. A publication from the Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged (Wilkerson, 1966) points out that, besides special recruitment methods, other "compensatory practices" that promising black students might benefit from include easier access to financial aid (such as National Merit's National Achievement Scholarship Program), modification of admission criteria, pre-admission preparation, and freshman year remedial studies.

This should not lead one to conclude that these are universally used practices. They are not. In fact, it is probably safe to say that these techniques are being used by relatively few of the nation's colleges and universities. Nevertheless, it seems likely that these compensatory practices, or others like them, will spread to more schools

and play a major role in gradually attracting proportionately more black students to integrated institutions of higher learning.

Given these circumstances, one is forced to consider the validity of the argument offered by those who feel that this practice, if continued, will in the long run have a damaging effect on the already widely criticized Negro colleges. In the words of Christopher Jencks and David Riesman:

> What kinds of students will the Negro colleges get, now that the opportunities and incentives for Negroes to attend predominantly white colleges are expanding (21:436).

The purpose of this study was to seek at least a practical answer to this question. By comparing two groups of black collegians--those who enter traditionally Negro colleges and those who enter integrated ones--we should get some idea of what might be expected to be a long term impact of the enrollment trend just mentioned. The focus was on attitudes, academic aptitude and their relationships; the research questions were presented as follows:

1. Are there differences between these two groups in terms of certain educationally relevant attitudes or orientations?

2. Is there a difference between these two groups in terms of such background factors as sex, socioeconomic status, place of home residence, and academic aptitude?

3. Is there a positive relationship between these two sets of variables for Negro college students such that selecting students on the basis of one (aptitude) will result in a selected group of students on the other variables as well?

As has been mentioned earlier, the data for this study was obtained by means of the College Student Questionnaires, Part I and the verbal section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT-V). Particular attention was focused on six scales CSQ-I, which can be briefly defined as follows:

Family Independence (FE) - a generalized student autonomy in relation to parents and parental family.

Peer Independence (PI) - a generalized autonomy in relation to a student's peers.

Liberalism (L) - a political-social-economic value dimension, with high scores supporting an ideology of change, of welfare statism, and the like.

Social Conscience (SC) - a moral concern about perceived social injustice and what might be called "institutional wrongdoing."

Cultural Sophistication (CS) - a sensibility and interest in ideas and art forms.

Motivation for Grades (MG) - a retrospectively reported desire and value in earning good marks in secondary school.

Each of the above scales consists of ten Likert-type items, with keying balanced to reduce acquiescent responding. The score range for each scale is ten through forty. While the scales are too brief for individual assessment, they are said to be sufficiently reliable for satisfactory assessment of groups.

CSQ-I data was obtained from 3104 students at nine traditionally Negro institutions and 323 students at twenty-one integrated institutions.

All black students entering each of the traditional Negro institutions were included. The same technique was employed for integrated institutions, except for two, where random samples were drawn owing to the relatively large numbers of black students entering these universities. All of the data for traditionally Negro institutions came from students entering college in the fall of 1967, whereas the data for integrated institutions were taken from students entering either fall, 1966 or fall, 1967. Because the data were not collected specifically for this study but, instead, were taken from a larger data pool, neither randomness nor precise "representativeness" was claimed. Nevertheless, both groups consist of diverse institutions and would not appear to be slanted or biased in any way that would place severe restrictions on the generality of the findings.

So, by comparing the two samples of black collegians--one in attendance at traditionally Negro colleges, the other at integrated institutions--it was possible to answer the three research questions presented earlier in the review of this study. These questions are again presented with their resulting findings in the following paragraphs.

Are there differences between these two groups in terms of certain educationally relevant attitudes or orientations? The answer to this question is yes. Black students entering the integrated institutions were found to be more independent, liberal and concerned with social injustice. Further, they reported less interest in college as a means of vocational preparation, and a correspondingly stronger identification with a collegiate point of view, having somewhat different interests in college extra-curricular

activities, and being more likely to plan graduate school. Finally, they apparently experienced less parental pressure to attend college, indicating that it was much less important to their parents that they attend their present institution.

Is there a difference between these two groups in terms of such background factors as sex, socioeconomic status, place of home residence, and academic aptitude? The answer is again to the affirmative, except for sex. For each of the other three variables there was shown a clear distinction between the two groups, with those who enter integrated institutions characterized by relatively higher family status backgrounds, family residence in parts of the country other than the South, and considerably higher aptitude scores.

Is there a positive relationship between these two sets of variables for Negro college students such that selecting students on the basis of one (aptitude) will result in selected groups of students on the other variables as well? Generally the answer is again yes. The correlations between SAT-V and the attitudinal scales was indicated to be enough that the attitude differences between the groups disappear on three of the four scales where originally significant when control made for SAT-V scores. Other correlations were not so obvious but, in general, it was clear that the differences in the attitudes and orientations of these two college-going groups are associated with certain background factors.

Thus, it would appear that to the extent integrated institutions are attracting the higher ability (as measured by SAT) black students, they are also attracting those with

a quite different set of attitudes, background characteristics, and orientation toward college than those who attend traditionally Negro colleges. This last point is said to be an important one. It has been obvious for some time that black students entering integrated institutions were those with higher academic aptitude scores. Blumenfeld (1968) has already shown that finalists in the 1966 National Scholarship Program (for black students) had strong preferences for prestigious integrated colleges. But that this, therefore, meant differences on the other educationally relevant variables is a fact either not recognized, or known but ignored. It was stated in the study that only a recent survey of characteristics of freshmen at a large group of representative colleges and universities provides the hint that important non-cognitive differences exist between these two groups of black collegians.

It was clearly emphasized in this study that such facts are not meant to argue either for or against the continued existence of the Negro colleges. The sentiments in this debate are said to run deep, and the recent "black mood" make it seem highly unlikely that Negro colleges will either become integrated or close down altogether. Increasing demand for the conversion of Negro colleges into black institutions or the establishment of black universities either complementary or in opposition to the existing Negro colleges may, in fact, modify the enrollment trend mentioned earlier. The present emphasis on "blackness," and a curriculum relevant to the lives of black people in this society and the role the black man has played in the historical development of this country, may give the predominantly

black institution a new lease on life. Furthermore, it was stated in this study that the scanty empirical evidence available suggests that students' academic growth in predominantly black colleges is no worse (or better) than that which occurs at integrated institutions.

It was further emphasized in this study that the point being argued here is simply that the various differences between these two groups are important enough to examine more carefully if we are to understand what is happening in this important area and make reasonable plans for the future. For in seeking to attract more black students, the integrated colleges' practices of focusing almost exclusively on the most intelligent blacks is doing more than creating a "brain drain." It is bringing about a redistribution of behavior styles and personality characteristics that contributes cirtically to campus environments. For the integrated colleges such an occurrence might be viewed with favor. But for the Negro college, this study takes the position that it is difficult to see anything but negative consequences resulting from this practice. It can be analyzed most clearly from such a situation that if the deprivation of the traditional Negro colleges of the very students who could contribute most positively to the campus climate is the price to be paid for "integration" at predominantly white institutions, then one must question the bargain.

The third, in a series of review of four studies in this section, is entitled College Freshmen Attitudes Toward Cheating. The purpose of this study was to study the characteristics of students with lenient attitudes toward cheating

and to identify the types of colleges that tend to enroll these students.

It was stated in this study that previous research has indicated that attitudes toward cheating are highly related to cheating behavior in that students who are less critical of cheating are more likely to cheat. Therefore, the present study used the strategy of studying cheaters indirectly by studying the attitudes toward cheating.

Specifically, this study was directed at two questions: (1) What are further characteristics of students with lenient attitudes toward cheating? and (2) Do different types of colleges enroll students who are more likely to cheat? Regarding the latter question, it was mentioned that another study by Bowers (1964), in particular, has identified types of colleges with varying degrees of cheating. Are cheating incidences at these types of colleges related entirely to students who enroll, or are there climates at some that discourage cheating?

Two samples were used in this study to investigate the two questions above. The first was a sample of students: 1,500 entering freshmen from thirty-seven institutions. The students were stratified by sex, type of institution attended (liberal arts college, university, etc.), and type of institutional control (private versus public). The second sample was one of institutions: 119 four-year colleges and universities, for which all entering freshmen (or randum samples) were used to compile institutional measures. The 119 included colleges from each of nine institutional types, for example, independent women's colleges, Catholic men's colleges, etc.

The entering freshmen for these samples had responded to the College Student Questionnaires (CSQ), Part I. The sample of 1,500 students had responded to CSQ-I during fall, 1965 and has been used as comparison data for CSQ-I (ETS, 1966); the sample of 119 institutions had given CSQ-I to entering freshmen in 1965, 1966, 1967, or 1968.

Among the background and attitudinal characteristics assessed in CSQ-I was each student's reaction to cheating. Specifically the question was: "If you were to discover a student at this college cheating, what would your probable reaction be?" Six responses, ranging from "do nothing" to "report the student," were included.

CSQ-I also contains seven scales and several additional questions that were used as variables in this study. Six of the scales have already been described in the review of the previous study, they include: Family Independence, Peer Independence, Liberalism, Social Conscience, Cultural Sophistication, and Motivation for Grades. (For a definition of these scales, the reader should refer to the study preceding the present study now in review.) The scale which is added in this study is: Family Social Status (FS) - meaning a measure of the socioeconomic status of the respondent's parental family.

Each of the scales (as mentioned in the previous study) except FS consists of ten Likert-type items, with balanced keying to reduce acquiescent responding. It was indicated in the study that details of the developmental history and psychometric properties of the seven CSQ-I scales may be found in the technical manual (Peterson, 1965).

Reactions to cheating by the stratified sample of 1,500 students were presented in table form. Twelve percent of the sample indicated they would not be disturbed and would do nothing if they were to discover a student cheating. This response was more prevalent among men (14 percent) than among women (9 percent). The response most often given (by 34 percent of the freshmen) was (second question in the table): "I would be distrubed but would do nothing," with women more likely to give this response. Thus, a total of 46 percent (responses one and two) would not take action if they discovered a student cheating at their college. Thirty-seven percent of the sample would definitely take some action (responses four, five, and six), while an additional 12 percent might take action depending on who the student was. Even if these 12 percent were included in the "take action" group, bringing the total to 49 percent, it would be less than the 65 percent of Bowers' (1964) sample who disapproved of cheating and would take action to express their disapproval. Since Bowers' sample included many upper-class students, it may be that freshmen with lenient attitudes toward cheating are more likely to leave college or that students become more disapproving of cheating as they proceed through college. (See Table 2 next page).

The students in this study who said they were not disturbed and would do nothing about another student's cheating were stated to have some unique characteristics. Compared to other students, they were discovered to have less academic motivation, fewer artistic literacy interests and tend to be more accepting of unethical practices in the broader society. Males and commuters were slightly more

Table 2

Freshmen Attitudes Toward Cheating

If you were to discover a student at this college cheating, what would be your probable reaction?

N = 1500	Percentage Responding		
	Total	Men	Women
1. I would not be disturbed and would do nothing.	12%	14%	09%
2. I would be disturbed but would do nothing.	34	32	37
3. I would be disturbed, but whether I took action would depend on who the student was.	12	11	13
4. I would express my concern only to the student I discovered cheating.	25	25	25
5. I would speak to the appropriate teacher or other authority without naming names.	07	06	08
6. I would report the student to the appropriate teacher or other authority.	05	06	03
No Response	05	06	05
Total	100	100	100

prevalent among these repondents; and their families, from which they are somewhat independent, are generally of lower socioeconomic status.

In the second part of this study, differences in attitudes toward cheating by freshmen who are enrolled in various types of institutions were investigated. The focus, therefore, was on the institutional type rather than the individual student.

Selective institutions as well as all-female institutions were found to enroll the fewest freshmen who were undisturbed by cheating, a finding which was stated to be consistent with those in the first part of the study. In addition to their being all-male, lenient cheating attitudes among many freshmen at seven of the eight Catholic men's colleges may in part be explained by generally lower selectivity at these colleges and by the lower socioeconomic backgrounds of many of their students.

In sum, this study identified additional characteristics of students with a lenient attitude toward cheating and types of institutions where these students enroll. While there is a relationship between an individual's attitude toward cheating and his subsequent behavior, as well as between student's personal characteristics and academic cheating, of more importance may be the collective attitudes, or climate for cheating, on a campus. For example, it was cited in the study that Bowers (1964) found that cheating was most prevalent at colleges where student peer disapproval of cheating was weak; that two other authorities (Bonjean and McGee, 1965) concluded that such "situational characteristics" as perception of friends' attitudes

were more closely associated with deviation than were certain student background characteristics. In view of the importance of collective peer attitudes in deterring academic dishonesty, colleges may well want to be more aware of these attitudes among entering freshmen as a group. The kind of student who enrolls in an institution, this study would suggest, is an important determinant of the peer climate. More specifically (as mentioned before), small, all-women, or selective institutions enrolled students with stronger attitudes against cheating; these types of institutions were stated also as having lower reported cheating rates. The study concludes that while attracting abler students is one obvious implication, further research might better investigate other ways in which institutions could change an undesirable peer climate.

In reviewing other literature on cheating at the college level, one can see that the prevalence of cheating among college students seems evident from a number of survey studies. Goldsen, Fosenberg, Williams, and Suchman (1960) reported 37 percent of the students polled at ten colleges and universities admitted copying from another student or using crib notes during an examination and in an extensive study of over 5,000 students at ninety-nine colleges, Bowers (1964) found that 50 percent of the sample had cheated on an exam, plagiarized, or turned in papers done wholly or in part by another student. Because both studies relied on voluntary self-reports, they are probably conservative estimates of deviant student behavior.

For many undergraduates, cheating practices had already been established by the time they entered college. A 1966

ACE survey of 254,480 entering freshmen at 307 institutions revealed that 20 percent of the students admitted that they had "cribbed on an examination" during the past year. Of this ACE sample, 24 percent of the men and 16 percent of the women had cheated. Bowers' (1964) survey also revealed that college males were more likely to cheat than college females, and that students who had cheated in high school were more likely to continue cheating in college.

Because of the apparent amount of academic cheating among students, and the presumed importance to college officials, literature on the subject is extensive. The Russel B. Sterns Center (for research and dissemination in social values and behavior of youth) has compiled a bibliography of over four hundred articles on academic dishonesty (Shurtleff, 1966). Many of the studies have identified personal characteristics of cheaters, while others have indicated college settings where deviant behavior most often occurs. Cheaters, for example, in comparison to non-cheaters, tend to be more vocationally or socially oriented and to be fraternity or sorority members (Bonjean and McGee, 1965, and Bowers, 1964); they also have lower grades and are more often from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Bowers, 1964). Bowers (1964) found that colleges with higher cheating rates tend to be large, coeducational and not very selective.

The fourth in a series of reviews of four studies in this section is entitled: <u>On the Interpretation of Student Perceptions of Their College Environment</u>. The purpose of this study was to explore further the relationships between the student perceived college environment as measured by

Pace's College and University Scales (Cues) and objective institutional characteristics.

In addition to zero-order correlations, it seemed desirable to consider multiple correlations for each of the Cues scales with selected institutional characteristics to see what extent Cues scores could be predicted from data already available. It was also hoped that additional relevant environmental information might be discovered by plotting the deviations of the observed Cues scores about their predicted values. Colleges with a Cues score much higher than predicted would be compared to colleges with a Cues score much lower than predicted to see if systematic differences in institutional characteristics existed between the two groups of colleges.

For colleges with 1965 scores on file at Educational Testing Service, mean scores of 1964 entering freshmen on the verbal and math sections of the Scholastic Aptitude Test of the College Entrance Examination Board (SAT-V and SAT-M) were obtained from Cass and Birnbaum (1965) or the Manual of Freshmen Class Profiles (CEEB, 1965). Complete data were available for a total of seventy-five colleges and universities. Although the sample was neither very large nor truly representative, it included all types of four-year institutions and was considered adequate for the purposes of this study. In addition to SAT-V and SAT-M, each of the seventy-five colleges was coded according to sex, S (male = 1, coeducation = 2, and female = 3), religious affiliation, R (no religious affiliation = 0, and religious affiliation = 1), and size of entering class (N).

Pace's college and university Environment Scale consists of five scales in number. They include Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety, and Scholarship. A description of the nature of these scales in Cues used in this study are given in Chapter 4.

This study, thus included ten variables in all: the five Cues scales, and the five predictor or control variables (SAT-V, SAT-M, S, R, and N). The intercorrelations among these variables where used as predictors in a stepwise regression analysis for predicting each of the five Cues scales. The stepwise analysis was stopped if the addition of another predictor variable resulted in an increment in the multiple correlation less than .01.

In addition, it was stated that for each Cues scale the deviations from the regression surface determined by the stepwise regression analysis were computed for all seventy-five colleges. Colleges with large positive deviations for a given scale were then compared with colleges having large negative deviations.

Zero-order correlations among the five selected predictor variables and Cues scales were generally consistent with previous results and expectations. Academic aptitude correlated positively with Scholarship and Awareness and negatively with Practicality, while size of the entering freshmen class correlated negatively with Community and Propriety. In addition, women's colleges tended to have higher Community and Propriety scores than did co-ed colleges, which in turn tended to have higher scores on these scales than men's colleges. Finally, colleges with a religious affiliation also tended to have higher Community

and Propriety scores than did colleges with no religious affiliation.

Multiple correlations were high for all five scales. Highest was the .80 multiple correlations of the Propriety scale with institutional size, sex, and religion, which suggests that knowledge of these three institutional characteristics provides much of the same information available in the Propriety scale. More specifically, small, female, religious affiliated colleges tended to have polite, cautious, environments where group standards of decorum were important; with large, male, secular institutions tending to be more assertive and convention-flouting.

Possibly the most interesting finding of the study resulted from comparing colleges with large positive deviations to colleges with large negative deviations in the stepwise regression analysis. Systematic differences between high and low groups of colleges were observed on two Cues scales: Scholarship and Practicality. On the Scholarship scale, for which SAT-V, SAT-M, the sex correlated .70, colleges with a large negative deviation tended to be located in the Northeast, primarily in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. That is, colleges with lower Scholarship scale scores that predicted were predominantly located in the Northeast, and particularly the three states mentioned. On the other hand, colleges with higher Scholarship scale scores than predicted, those with large positive deviations from the regression surface, tended to be located in states outside the Northeast (particularly the Midwest and South). The two groups of twenty colleges, it may be

noted, were similar in type of control (private versus public) and in proportion of church-related institutions in each.

Only tentative explanation can be offered for these geographical differences on the Scholarship scale. One explanation is that students at Northeastern colleges perceive their institutions as less "scholarly" because these institutions, relative to the academic aptitude of students who attend, were judged as probably being less academically competitive and less involved in intellectual speculation than other institutions. But the question then is what "other" institutions, and this suggested a second possible explanation for college differences on the Scholarship scale. It may have been that students at these Northeastern colleges down-graded the Scholarship environment of their own institution because they compared it with the reputed environment of more prestigious institutions, many of which were located nearby and thus fairly apparent to these students. A much different frame of reference in respond-in to items on the Scholarship scale, then, was judged to have existed for students at these Northeastern colleges. In fact, although highly rated Northeastern institutions were among the seventy-five in this study, it was stated that none was among the twenty colleges with large negative deviations on the Scholarship scale.

The "frame of reference" explanation of systematic differences on the Scholaship scale could not, of course, be proven in the study since the actual student frame of reference was not known. But at least one other researcher had proposed a similar explanation. Greeley (1967), in his

study of several Catholic institutions, used Cues scores as well as other data and found extreme differences between the student perceived intellectual environment and other institutional academic measures:

> The explanation of this peculiar phenomenon seems to be that students at the poorest Catholic colleges had no readily available referent by which to judge their faculty or the atmosphere in their institution. Thus, an overwhelming proportion of the women at a small and stagnant Catholic women's college believe that their faculty is of the highest competence and that the intellectual atmosphere of the school is quite intense. At the same time, the students at one of the best of the Catholic universities with a reasonably impressive faculty and fairly intense intellectual concern among the students compare themselves to one of the nation's great non-Catholic universities located in the vicinity and judge their atmosphere in scholarship and awareness to be very poor (16:103).

Turning to the Practicality scale, the multiple correlation involving the size of a college's entering class, whether or not the institution was religiously affiliated, and verbal aptitude of freshmen with the Practicality scale was .69. The first two college variables, designated as N and R, correlated positively with the Practicality score and the last variable, SAT-V, negatively. Thus, it was found that institutions which were large and religiously affiliated and with lower student SAT-V scores tended to emphasize "practical, instrumental" benefits in their environments. Scores on the Practicality scale differed systematically in that colleges with large positive deviations tended to be located in cities of less than 200,000 and had a median of 70 percent of their students who live on campus. Colleges with large negative deviations,

on the other hand, were located in cities of greater than 200,000 and had a median of 35 percent of their students living on campus.

A possible explanation for these differences was said to emerge upon closer examination of item content of the Practicality scale. One aspect of the environment measured by the scale was the extent that "good fun," "school spirit," and, in general, a college emphasis exist at an institution. Twelve of the thirty items in the Practicality scale reflected this content; for example, "The big college events draw a lot of student enthusiasm and support," and, "Student rooms are more likely to be decorated with pennants and pin-ups than with paintings, carvings, mobiles, fabrics, etc." On the basis of this aspect of the Practicality scale, it was considered that colleges with large percentages of students living on campus would tend to be more collegiate and thus have a higher Practicality score. Moreover, the study concluded that commuter and off-campus students, especially those in large cities, possibly have less to do with whatever social life exists at their institution, and would be less likely to perceive a collegiate environment even if it were emphasized. Thus the students' frame of reference, in this case their off-campus environment, was thought to have once again tended to color their perceptions.

What might one conclude from the systematic differences found among students in their college perception? Although interpretations of the data in this study was stated to be only tentative, it appears that college environments, measured only through what students perceive

as general characteristics, could be misrepresented. If college environments are to be better understood, it was the position advocated in the study, that researchers should not only be aware of the possible differences in the students' phenomenal views, but should consider assessing the environment through other approaches as well. For example, if paper-and-pencil measures are used, then one might include student self-reports of behavior, attitudes, or interests, in addition to their perceptions of the behavior of others. Furthermore, other groups on campus, especially faculty members and administrators, would have perceptions and individual behavior patterns worth noting. In short, the several groups that are part of the college setting, and other measurement procedures might augment and clarify the results based on student perceptions.

Table 3

Zero-Order Correlations Between Control Variables and CUES Scales

Number of Colleges = 75

Control Variable	CUES Scales				
	Scholarship	Awareness	Practicality	Propriety	Community
SAT-V	.67	.52	-.62	-.01	.09
SAT-M	.55	.32	-.51	-.31	-.23
log N	-.22	-.03	.34	-.57	-.55
S	.10	.20	.00	.61	.45
R	-.15	-.12	.19	.49	.54

Table 4

Community Size for Colleges with Large Positive or Large Negative Deviations from Predicted Values on the Practicality Scale

	Deviation		
Size of City	Positive	Negative	Phi
200,000 or more	1	9	.72
less than 200,000	9	2	

Table 5

Multiple Correlations and Standard Regression Weights for Predicting CUES Scale Scores

CUES Scales	Variables Included in Equation and Standard Regression Weights				Multiple Correlation	Highest Zero-Order Correlation
Scholarship	SAT-V .49	SAT-M .25	S .27		.70	SAT-V .67
Awareness	SAT-V .87	SAT-M -.33	log N .20	S .18	.62	SAT-V .52
Practicality	SAT-V -.50	log N .32	R .26		.69	SAT-V -.62
Propriety	log N -.39	S .50	R .22		.80	S .61
Community	log N -.37	S .33	R .31		.72	log N -.55

Table 6

Geographical Location of States with Large Positive or Large Negative Deviations from Predicted Values on the Scholarship Scale

3a

New York, New Jersey or Pennsylvania

Location	Deviation		
	Positive	Negative	Phi
N.Y., N.J., or Pa.	1	12	.58
Other States	19	8	

3b

New England States, N.Y., N.J. or Pennsylvania

Location	Deviation		
	Positive	Negative	Phi
N.E., N.Y., N.J. or Pa.	2	15	.66
Other States	18	5	

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES AND METHODS USED

One of the most widely used approaches to the assessment of college environments has been through the perceptions of students. According to this approach, the environment is defined by what students generally perceive as characteristic of their college, their instructors, and their classmates. While Stern's (1958) College Characteristics Index and Pace's (1963) College and University Environment Scales (Cues) are the two best known instruments which use student perceptions as measures of college environments, other researchers (such as, Thistlethwaites, 1963) have also relied on this approach.

Pace's Cues, in particular, has been widely used in recent years. Its five scales: Practicality, Community, Awareness, Propriety and Scholarship, were formulated through factor analysis to describe education differences among four-year institutions in the United States.

To determine whether there are any significant differences in the perceptions or attitudes of two groups of liberal arts students or at two community colleges concerning such matters as the administration of their college, curriculum, instruction, course offerings, student role in college affairs, and, mainly to determine whether a group of students' perceptions of the policies and offerings of their host environment were generally lower than their

expectations or higher than their expectations, the questionnaire for Pace's College and University Environment scales were adapted for the two-year or community college environment. There is no information or record found that indicates any previous use of the College and University Environment Scales at any of the two-year colleges in the country. As far as is known, the scales are being used to study the two-year college environment for the first time in this study.

The items in the College and University Environment Scales which were relevant only to four-year institutions and did not apply to two-year or community colleges were eliminated.

The revised questionnaire was administered to liberal arts students during the Spring and Summer quarters of 1969. The major portion of the questionnaire survey was administered in the three Sociology and two Antropology classes (at both Highline Community College and Seattle Community College) in which the author was the instructor. The questionnaire was also administered to other classes at both community Colleges. Because accurate or reliable personal data were not obtained in all liberal arts classes in which the questionnaire was administered, the use of such data (although important in a study such as this one) was discarded. Besides, this study is concerned with groups or college environments, and not individuals, as such. Therefore, the use of personal data was not absolutely necessary.

Although over one hundred students participated in answering the questionnaire, the questionnaires of 50 students from each community College were utilized (for the purpose of computing and gathering data), adding up to a total of 100 questionnaires being analyzed or used in the study.

The processed data which were obtained by computer programming at Seattle Community College, were tabulated for the perception and expectation scales for Practicality, Community, Propriety, Awareness, and Scholarship. First, raw scores for the scales were obtained by simply adding up the total number of items in which students answered all of the items or questions either true or false (based upon the keyed direction or scoring key given for the scales). Second, scores for the various percentage levels on the scales were obtained by simply adding up the total number of times in which 40, 50 or 66 percent of the students correctly answered each item (either true or false) in the various scales. Otherwise, the principle or primary means by which the data in this study were analyzed was by the "66 plus" method. In order that an institution's score be obtained by this method, one simply must count the number of items in the keyed direction by 66% or more of the students.

In analyzing the data, predictions or hypothesis will be stated. Based upon the scores on the various scales, a hypothesis will be supported or it will not be supported. If the data given in the various scales supports any one of the hypotheses it is assumed that the one with the supporting evidence has some measure of truth, and is, therefore, not dealt with any further. If the data do not support one of the hypothesis, then an effort is made or attempted to explain why the hypothesis did not have adequate support.

Chapter 4

THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES AND THE HYPOTHESES

PREDICTIONS

In the following paragraphs, some predictions or hypotheses are stated concerning the rating or ranking of Highline Community College and Seattle Community College on each of the five College and University Environment Scales described below. Essentially, each College is rated as to where it stands on each scale in relation to the other College on the same scale.

Practicality Scale - The combination of items in this scale suggest a practical, instrumental emphasis in college environment. Procedures, personal status, and practical benefits are important. Status is gained by knowing the right people, being in the right groups and doing what is expected. Order and supervision are characteristic of the administration and of classwork. Good fun, school spirit, and student leadership in campus social activities are evident. Finally, the atmosphere described by this scale appears to have an interesting mixture of entrepreneurial and bureaucratic features.

Highline College will be the institution which will score the highest on the practicality scale. Highline is somewhat of a longer established College than Seattle Community College. At the same time, the experiencing of

less change and instability gives Highline the stability to formulate definite procedures, order and supervision in administration and classwork than would be true at Seattle Community College. Furthermore, Highline Community College has a campus, while Seattle Community College does not--making communications, coordination, and administration at Highline less difficult than at Seattle.

Seattle Community College appeared to be in a state of anarchy during part of the spring quarter as a result of student riots and demonstrations resulting from a confrontation of the Black Student Union and the Students for a Democratic Society with the school administration over the failure to appoint a Black man on the school's Board of Trustees. At about the time the questionnaires were administered at Seattle Community College, the school's administration appeared to be undergoing some crisis, and seemed to be loosing some popularity and confidence among its students. With the exception of a relatively small incident at Highline during the fall quarter of the same academic year (1968-1969), the College remained stable and conservative without any incidence of major proportions among students protesting some administrative policy or action. The students at Highline appear to be rather indifferent and uninvolved with the issues raised by students at various colleges and universities around the country. Student activism at Highline was generally at a very low key during the academic year 1968-1969.

Community Scale - The combination of items in this scale describes a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. The environment is supportive and sympathetic. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyalty which encompasses

the college as a whole. The campus is community. It is a congenial atmosphere.

The small college in a small town immediately comes to mind as a prototype--with friendly and helping relationships among the students and between the students and the faculty. Some large universities, however, manage to have a strong sense of community; and some small colleges have an atmosphere that is better characterized by privacy, personal autonomy, and cool detachment than by a strong sense of togetherness. On the whole, however, bigness tends to beget diffusiveness rather than cohesion; it also tends to beget impersonality but not necessarily unfriendliness.

If the organizational counterpart of "practicality" was the bureaucracy, perhaps the counterpart to "community" is the family.

In considering the above, Highline will score higher than Seattle on the Community Scale. Contrary to Seattle Community College, Highline has a campus located on one designated site of land. Unlike Highline, Seattle does not have a campus, the College has a number of branches throughout the urban area of Seattle, creating a situation whereby very little college community life, like that found at Highline, can exist. Furthermore, the heterogeneity of the student body of Seattle in an urban setting, compared with the homogeneous student body at Highline in a suburban setting, would tend to give Highline more of an advantage in developing the kind of situation or condition necessary for the kind of community life on a college campus described in the Community Scale.

Awareness Scale - The items in this scale seem to reflect a concern and emphasis upon three sorts of meaning--

personal, poetic, and political. An emphasis upon self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity suggest the search for personal meaning. A wide range of opportunities for creative and appreciative relationships to painting, music, drama, poetry, sculpture, architecture, etc., suggest the search for poetic meaning. A concern about events around the world, the welfare of mankind, and the present and future condition of man suggest the search for political meaning and idealistic commitment. What seems to be evident in this sort of environment is a stress on awareness, an awareness of self, of society, and of esthetic stimuli.

Perhaps in another sense, these features of a college atmosphere can be seen as a push toward expansion and enrichment of personality, of societal horizons, and of expressiveness.

On this scale, it is expected that Seattle Community College will score higher than Highline Community College. The reason for such expectation is based upon the belief that urban students tend to be more aware and concerned about both domestic and international issues than are suburban students. As an instructor at Seattle Community College and Highline Community College, the author discovered that students at the former institution tended to be more willing to discuss and deal with ideas and issues, much more readily than those students at the latter institution. The same experience has been reported by other instructors who were on the faculty at both institutions. Also, it is believed that urban students are more exposed and receptive to new ideas and innovations, in such areas as education, than are suburban students.

Propriety Scale - The items in this scale suggest an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important. On the negative side, one can describe propriety as the absence of demonstative, assertive, rebellious, risk-taking, inconsiderate, convention-flouting behavior.

Conventionality, in the sense of generally accepted and abiding by group standards, is in some respects a good term for the items in this scale, although so-called rebellious groups, beatniks or hippies, for example, have strong conventions to distinguish them from what they think is conventional in others. Perhaps, then, propriety is a better term than conventionality. In any event, the atmosphere on some campuses is more mannerly, considerate, and proper than it is on others.

On this scale, dealing with propriety, Highline College will score or rate higher than Seattle Community College. There has been very little absence, if any, of demonstrative, assertive, rebellious, risk-taking, inconsiderate, convention-flouting behavior at Seattle Community College. During the spring quarter, 1969, the college was experiencing a great deal of disruption and crisis as a result of the militant action of such student organizations as the Black Student Union and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Highline College up to the time of this study, had no real effective student radical organizations. The atmosphere at Highline seemed to be characterized by conventionality and conservatism. The students, as a whole, tend to be satisfied with the way things are run and their behavior exhibited no rebellious tendencies toward administrative policies or teaching practices.

Scholarship Scale - The items in this scale describe an academic scholarly environment. The emphasis is on competitively high academic achievement and a serious interest in scholarship. The pursuit of knowledge and theories, scientific or philosophical, is carried on rigorously and vigorously. Intellectual speculation, an interst in ideas as ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline--all these are characteristic of the environment.

Seattle Community College will score or rate higher on this scale for scholarship, based on a number of reasons. The student body tends to take a stronger interest in ideas as ideas and knowledge for its own sake. Highline College students tend to be more concerned about getting a good grade rather than about getting actually engaged in a learning experience through discussion and a serious concern for ideas as ideas. The students at Highline seem to be particularly apathetic about engaging in serious intellectual pursuits as ends in themselves. Seattle Community College students seem to be more interested in learning as an end in itself.

RESULTS

The following paragraphs are concerned with analyzing the data which have been gathered and tabulated for the College and University Environment Scales. The data will be analyzed to determine whether or not it supports the hypothesis. Each hypothesis is briefly restated for each scale before the data for the scale are analyzed. The data will be analyzed

on the basis of raw scores and the number of items in the scale that are answered in the keyed direction (scoring key for Cues items) by 66 percent, 50 percent, and 40 percent, or more of the students. These scores, which are found at the various percentage levels designated by the above percentages, are considered to be of greater importance than the raw scores in analyzing data collected and tabulated for this study.

Practicality Scale - It was hypothesized that Highline will score higher than Seattle on this scale. As indicated from the raw scores and percentages scores for both colleges, it appears that the data in the scale below support the hypothesis. Therefore, the prediction for this scale may be considered as having adequate support. Highline has a higher raw score than Seattle, and also, it scores higher on all percentage levels.

Perception Scale for Practicality

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
200	1	2	4	100	0	1	3

Because of the fact that the hypothesis, which states that Highline Community College will score higher than Seattle Community College, is supported by the data in the above scale, it may be assumed that the reasons stated in justification of the hypothesis or prediction made, support or adequately describe the situations of the two colleges in terms of their degree of conservatism, institutional stability, and the differing student reaction and activism on the two community College campuses.

On the expectation scale for Practicality, Highline has a higher raw score than Seattle, and it also scores twice as high as Seattle on the 66 percent level. It appears that the expectations of the two groups of liberal arts students, based upon the data below, are not different. Their expectations do not vary, in an overall sense. Therefore, it may be concluded that no real difference exists in the expectations on the Practicality scale of students at Highline and Seattle.

Expectation Scale for Practicality

Highline				Seattle			
Raw Score	66	50	40	Raw Score	66	50	40
276	4	6	7	251	2	6	7

In examining the two scales for Practicality, the perception scale and the expectation scale, it appears that both the students at Highline and Seattle tend to see or perceive less than what they actually expect or expected from their respective institutions.

Community Scale - Again, it was hypothesized that Highline will score higher than Seattle on the Community scale. As can be seen from the perception scale for Community, Highline has a higher raw score than Seattle. More importantly, Highline scores higher than Seattle on all percentage levels. The data in the scales below seem to adequately support the hypothesis.

Perception Scale for Community

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
240	2	5	8	216	0	3	7

In considering that there does not seem to be any discrepancy between the hypothesis stated for community and the information obtained from an analysis of the perception scale for Community, it may be concluded that the reasons given as support for such an hypothesis are adequate. Therefore, it appears that there is somewhat more community life at Highline than there is at Seattle. The reason for such a belief is that Highline has a campus (buildings located on one site of land), and Seattle does not. The community life of a college is centered around the layout of its campus. It is highly likely that a college which is spread out throughout an urban area, utilizing buildings in various locations, does not have the kind of setting for the development of any high degree of college community life which characterizes that of a college whose buildings are situated in one location only.

The scores for the two colleges on the expectation scale for Community are only different in raw score and only on one percentage level. Seattle has a higher column or raw score than Highline. Highline scores higher than Seattle on the 66 percent level. Both institutions score equally on the 50 percent and 40 percent levels. Therefore, it may be concluded that there are no differences in the expectations of liberal arts students at Highline Community

College and Seattle Community College on the expectation scales for Community.

Expectation Scale for Community

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
350	7	10	10	355	6	10	10

In perusing the two scales for Community, we can see that the scores for expectation are generally much higher than are those for perception. Therefore, such may be interpreted (as stated above) as an indication that the students of both Colleges tend to perceive or see much less than what they expected or expect from their host institution, considering that the scores for expectation are generally higher for both Colleges. The scores on all percentage levels for expectation are about equal, therefore, it may be concluded that expectations are the same for both schools.

Awareness Scale - On this scale, it was predicted or hypothesized that Seattle Community College will score higher than Highline Community College. The difference in the scores of the two institutions are so small, that it can be estimated that no real difference of any importance exists. Seattle scores only slightly higher than Highline, if at all, on this scale. In column or raw score, Seattle scores higher than Highline by a mere four points. The two colleges do not score at all on the 66 percent level. Seattle scores higher than Highline on the 50 percent level, but lower on the 40 percent level by the same number of

points. In other words, Highline and Seattle score approximately equal on all percentage levels, when looked at from an overall perspective. The data, in the scale below, does not support the hypothesis that the students at Seattle are more aware than are the students at Highline.

Perception Scale for Awareness

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
147	0	2	4	151	0	3	3

There are no demonstrable differences between the two Colleges on the Awareness scale for perception.

On the expectation scale for Awareness, Seattle has a raw score of only one point higher than that for Highline. Highline scores higher than Seattle on both the 66 percent level and the 50 percent level, each by one greater than the other. Both colleges score equally on the 40 percent level. From all indications there is no difference in the expectations of the two groups of liberal arts students of Highline and Seattle.

Expectation Scale for Awareness

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
342	7	8	8	343	6	7	8

The scores on the expectation scale are much higher than are the scores on the perception scale (for Awareness). Such indicates that the students at both Seattle Community College and Highline Community College expect much more from their institutions on Awareness than what they actually see or perceive.

Propriety Scale - It was predicted or hypothesized that Highline will rate higher than Seattle on this scale. The data tend to support the hypothesis. Highline scores higher than Seattle on this scale.

In raw or column score, Highline seems to score much higher than Seattle. Also, Highline scores higher than Seattle on all three percentage levels. Looking at all of the percentage levels, from a general overall perspective, it seems or appears that somewhat of a difference exists between the ratings of the two colleges on this scale.

Perception Scale for Propriety

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
151	1	4	5	122	0	2	4

Because of the fact that the data in the above scale appears to support the hypothesis, stated for the Propriety scale, it may be assumed that the atmosphere at Highline is more mannerly, considerate and proper than it is at Seattle. Apparently, the students at Highline are either more apathetic or more satisfied with the way things are run on their campus.

The raw score for Highline on the expectation scale for Propriety is higher than the raw score for Seattle on the same scale. On the 66 percent and 40 percent levels, the two colleges score equally, but on the 50 percent level, Highline scores higher than Seattle. Based upon the raw score, it seems to indicate or infer that the expectations of students at Highline are higher on the Propriety scale than are those for Seattle students. But, the fact that the two Colleges score about equally on all percentage levels may, therefore, be considered to mean that the expectations of the students at the two institutions seem to be of the same degree.

Expectation Scale for Propriety

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
218	2	5	6	188	2	4	6

It can be seen as before that both Colleges score higher on the expectation scales (for Propriety) than on the perception scales. Such indicates that the students at both community Colleges have higher expectations than perceptions.

Scholarship Scale - On this scale, it was hypothesized that Seattle Community College will score or rate higher than Highline. The difference in the raw score of the two community Colleges appears insignificant. Both institutions score equally on the 66 and 50 percent levels.

It is only on the 40 percent level that Seattle scores higher than Highline. The data do not support the hypothesis that the students at Seattle see their college atmosphere or environment as more stimulating than do the students at Highline. Therefore, it may be interpreted that the students at both Colleges tend to see their scholarly and academic situations or envioronments similarly.

Perception Scale for Scholarship

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
278	0	4	6	291	0	4	9

In looking at the scale above one would have to conclude that the belief that students at Seattle see their environment as intellectually and academically more stimulating than do the students at Highline, does not seem to have any real sufficient support. Based upon the statistical findings, it is highly likely that the students at Seattle do not see their environment as any more stimulating than the students at Highline see or perceive their environment.

On the scale for expectation, Highline has a little higher raw score than Seattle. Seattle scores higher than Highline on the 66 percent level, but lower on the 50 percent level. The two schools score equally on the 40 percent level. From all indications, it seems that the expectations of the students at the two Colleges are about the same. One community College does not seem to have any higher expectations than does the other.

Expectation Scale for Scholarship

Highline				Seattle			
Raw score	66	50	40	Raw score	66	50	40
576	10	14	15	563	13	13	15

It appears from an examination of the scales for Scholarship that the expectations of students of both community Colleges are much higher than what they perceive or see in them. The scores on the expectation scales, for both institutions, are much higher than are those for perception. The expectations for both Colleges appear to be about the same.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In summarizing the results, there are several interesting findings which may be considered as significant in this study. They are presented and discussed in the following paragraphs below:

First, there are scales which do not support some of the hypotheses presented in this study. The two hypotheses which do not have adequate support (as the reader will recall) have to do with predicting the rating of the two Colleges on the two scales dealing with Awareness and Scholarships. It was predicted that Seattle Community College would rate higher on Awareness and Scholarship than Highline. But the evidence presented by the data seemed to indicate that the students at Highline and Seattle do not differ, generally speaking, in their perceptions of their respective campus environments.

There may be a number of reasons why the hypotheses were not supported. It may be that liberal arts students at the community college become concerned about matters dealing with Scholarship, while at the same time, they may vary their interests or concerns about other things or activities on campus. Students, generally, are preoccupied with finding out about course offerings, professors, and other matters pertinent to academic work. They are more involved (generally) in finding out about what they can get out of their college, academically, while they tend to be less or differentially involved when it comes to extra-curricula matters. In the case of Awareness, it could be that the students of both institutions, simply by chance, and by virtue of similar interests and concerns, as liberal arts students, happen to see or perceive their environments as being similarly endowed. Lack of information or knowledge of the two Colleges, and possibly too much guesswork or bias in the development of the hypotheses, could have lead to the wrong conclusions, and, thereby, effected or reflected on the accuracy or validity of either of the hypotheses. It may be that some invalid conclusions or conditions were considered which had a negative influence in making up or developing the two hypotheses for the Scholarship and the Awareness scales.

Second, expectations between the two Colleges are found to be similar, if not the same. It is possible that such may be due to the fact that liberal arts students tend to expect generally the same kind of college environments. Furthermore, community college students may have generally the same kind of needs. That is, there are people who

typically enter the two-year college for the express purpose of having certain general needs met (particularly academic and instructional needs) which could not be met at most four-year colleges. People who go to the community colleges are usually avoiding strong competition, large classes, lack of special instructional attention and other less personal associations found at the typical four-year college or university.

Third, expectations seem to greatly exceed perceptions. That is, students tend to expect more than they think is provided by their college. Otherwise, the reality of the situations, in the eyes of both groups of liberal arts students at Highline and Seattle, appear to fall somewhat short of what they expect from their respective institutions.

The reasons for the above, may result from misconceptions or idealist notions on the part of students as to what a college or community college offers or is able to offer its students. The perceptions of students at the community college may be affected by the fact that they are highly transient, they do not stay at the community college long enough to become seriously involved with it. They have a tendency, on the whole, to spend a much shorter period of time at such colleges, and during the time they are in attendance, they are generally on campus just for the purpose of attending their classes. Community college students divide their time between college and neighborhood or home affairs. They tend to maintain involvement with their home and neighborhood life, much more so, than is generally true of students at four-year institutions. Many students at four-year institutions do not have any involvement with home

or neighborhood upon entering college, thereby, they tend to become more fully involved with the college or university in which they are in attendance. Most, if not all, of the social life of students at two-year colleges, generally, takes place off campus. Therefore, in considering the above, we can see why students at Highline and Seattle could perceive their College environments as offering less than what they expect from colleges. Community colleges generally function for the purpose of meeting only the academic or vocational needs of their students. Unlike four-year institutions they are not equipped or set up to satisfy many of the desires of their students for the kind of college atmosphere or setting which is generally typical of the four-year college.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND RECOMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

It was the purpose of this study to determine whether there were any significant differences in the perceptions and expectations of two groups of liberal arts students concerning such matters as the administration of their respective colleges, curriculum, instruction, course offerings, student role in college affairs, and the overall environment of their host institution(s). The above were dealt with within the context of the College and University Environment Scales. For example, in order that one may get some idea of how one group of students perceive the curriculum or instruction at their college, one would have to see how that group scored on the Scholarship scale. Both groups of students at Highline Community College and Seattle Community College tended to see their scholarly and academic environments similarly. Therefore, one would conclude that the students at Highline and Seattle tend to see or perceive their college curriculum and instruction similarly.

The data, on the perception scales for Awareness and Scholarship, tend to show no demonstrable differences between the two institutions on both of the scales. The predictions that Seattle would rate higher than Highline on both the perception scales for Awareness and Scholarship were not supported by the data.

On the perception scale for Practicality, Community, and Propriety, the data revealed differences between the two institutions. Highline scored higher than Seattle on all three scales. On all five College and University Environment Scales for expectation, no significant differences were found to exist between the students at Seattle Community College and those at Highline Community College. The expectations between the two Colleges were found to be similar, if not the same. Also, it was found that the expectations of both groups of students greatly exceed their perception scores. Both groups of students at Highline and Seattle seem to expect more from their College environments than what they think or perceive that these environments provide or offer them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The author recommends that further research, using more up-to-date and revised College and University Environment Scales for two-year colleges, be continued over a more extended period of time--at least an entire academic year, if not longer.

Background or personal data schould be obtained for all future studies of this kind, so as to determine what influence if any, such may have or can have on how students perceive their college environments, and also, what influence such data may have on what students expect from these environments.

A larger sample, numbering at least one hundred students from each institution, should be included in all future studies of this kind, so as to get a more valid and

more reliable survey or picture of perceptions and expectations of the students at each institution.

Finally, it is recommended that administrators utilize and undertake studies such as this one for the purpose of finding out what students expect from their college. If administrators have adequate knowledge of their students' expectations and perceptions of the college environment, they are more able to effectively restructure curriculums, and offer more of the things that students desire, as well as creating the kind of situation or atmosphere which students expect that their college should have or develop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American College Testing Program, College Student Profiles: Norms for the ACT Assessment, Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1966.

2. Astin, A. W., Panos, R. J. and Creager, J. A., "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen - Fall, 1966," ACE Research Reports, Washington: American Council on Education, 1967. p. 2 (1).

3. Bashaw, W. L., "The Effects of the Community Junior Colleges on the Proportions of the Local Population Who Seek Higher Education," Journal of Educational Research, 58(7):327-329, March, 1965.

4. Bayer, A. E., and Boruch, R. F., The Black Student in American Colleges, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

5. Blumenfeld, W. S., "College Preferences of Able Negro Students: A Comparison of Those Naming Predominantly Negro Institutions and Those Naming Predominantly White Institutions," College and University, 330-341, Spring, 1968.

6. Bonjean, C. M. and McGee, R., "Scholastic Dishonesty Among Undergraduates in Differing Systems of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38:127-137, 1965.

7. Bowers, W. J., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964.

8. Centra, John A., "College Freshmen Attitudes Towards Cheating," Research Bulletin, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, April, 1969.

9. Centra, John A., and Linn, Robert L., "On the Interpretation of Student Perceptions of Their College Environment," Research Bulletin, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, August, 1968.

10. Clark, B. R., "The 'Cooling-out' Function in Higher Education," The American Journal of Sociology, 65(6): 569-576.

11. Cooley, W. W., and Becker, S. J., "The Junior College Student," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 44(5): 464-469, January, 1966.

12. Cross, K. P., "Beyond Ability," The Research Reporter, 2(1):1-4, 1967. (Reprinted by Journal of the Association of College Admission Counselors, 12(3): 9-11, 1967, in a slightly abbreviated version.)

13. Dyer, H. S., "Toward More Effective Recruitment and Selection of Negroes for College," Journal of Negro Education, 36(3), 1967.

14. Gleazer, E. J., Jr., An Introduction to Junior Colleges, Seventh Edition, Washington: American Council on Education, 1967. pp. 3-60.

15. Goldsen, R. K., Rosenberg, M., Williams, R. M., Jr., and Suchman, E., What College Students Think, Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1960.

16. Greeley, A. M., The Changing Catholic College, Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

17. Harding, V., "Black Brain Drain," Columbia Forum, II(4): 38, 1968.

18. Hartnett, Rodney T., "Differences in Selected Attitudes and College Orientations Between Black Students Attending Traditional Negro and Traditional White Institutions," Research Bulletin, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, July, 1969.

19. Hoyt, D. P., and Munday, L., "Academic Description and Prediction in Junior Colleges," ACT Research Reports, Iowa City: American College Testing Program, February, 1966. p. 10.

20. Hunter, C., "Black Colleges and the Black Mood," Southern Education Report, 4(9), 1969.

21. Jencks, C., and Riesman, D., The Academic Revolution, Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

22. Knoell, D. M., and Medsker, L. L., From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education (for Joint Committee on Junior and Senior Colleges), 1965.

23. Medsker, L. L., "The Junior College Student," Paper presented at the Junior College Personnel Conference, Chicago, April, 1964.

24. Medsker, L. L., and Trent, J. W., Factors Affecting College Attendance of High School Graduates from Varying Socioeconomic and Ability Levels, USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 438, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1965.

25. Pace, C. R., "College and University Environment Scales," Preliminary Technical Manual, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

26. Panos, R. J., "Some Characteristics of Junior College Students," ACE Research Reports, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966. p. 1(2).

27. Panos, R. J., and Astin, A. W., "A Profile of Entering 1965 College Freshmen: Some Behavioral and Biographical Characteristics of the Class of 1969," College and University, 42:160-174, Winter, 1967.

28. Peterson, R. E., Technical Manual: College Student Questionnaires, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

29. Peterson, R. E., The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-1968, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

30. Schoenfeldt, L. F., Post-High-School Education, In Flanagan, J. C. and Cooley, W. W., Project Talent: One Year Follow-up Studies, USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 2333. Pittsburgh: School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 1966. pp. 91-129.

31. School to College: Opportunities for Postsecondary Education (SCOPE). Unpublished data from Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

32. Seashore, H., "Academic Abilities of Junior College Students," Junior College Journal, 29(2):74-80, 1958.

33. Shurtleff, R. F., Academic Dishonesty, a Bibliography, Boston: Northeastern University, 1966.

34. Stern, G. G., Preliminary Manual: Activities Index--College Characteristics Index, Syracuse: Syracuse University Research Institute, Psychological Research Center, 1958.

35. Thistlethwaite, D. L., "Diversities in College Environments: Implications for Student Selection," In K. M. Wilson (Ed.), Research Related to College Admission, Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

36. Tillery, H. D., Differential Characteristics of Entering Freshmen at the University of California and Their Peers at California Junior Colleges. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1963.

37. Trent, J. W., and Medsker, L. L., Beyond High School: A Study of 10,000 High School Graduates, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1967.

38. Trent, J. W., and Ruyle, J. H., "Variations, Flow and Patterns of College Attendance: The High School Graduate Study," College and University, 4(1):61-76, Fall, 1965.

39. Turnbull, W. W., "Relevance in Testing," Paper prepared for presentation at meeting of Commission on Tests of the College Entrance Examination Board, New York, October, 17-18, 1967.

40. Warren, J. R., Patterns of College Experience, USOE Cooperative Research Project 5-327, Claremont: College Student Personnel Institute and Claremont Graduate School and University Center, October, 1966.

41. Wolfle, D., "America's Resources of Specialized Talent: A Current Appraisal and a Look Ahead," Report prepared by . . . director, Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, New York: Harper, 1954.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Perception Tables

Practicality

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	T	F	66%	50%	40%	T	F	66%	50%	40%
1.	16	16	0	0	0	17	14	0	0	0
2.	0	45	0	0	0	0	46	0	0	0
3.	10	25	0	1	1	20	19	0	0	0
4.	7	16	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0
5.	4	25	0	0	0	2	36	0	0	0
6.	11	29	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0
7.	30	12	0	0	1	23	15	0	0	1
8.	4	28	0	0	0	4	23	0	0	0
9.	22	17	0	0	1	22	13	0	0	1
10.	14	30	0	0	0	15	24	0	0	0
11.	11	26	0	0	0	9	31	0	0	0
12.	14	10	0	0	0	7	19	0	0	0
13.	34	1	1	1	1	26	6	0	1	1
14.	25	8	0	0	0	30	4	0	0	0

Community

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	T	F	66%	50%	40%	T	F	66%	50%	40%
1.	28	5	0	1	1	22	10	0	0	1
2.	26	9	0	1	1	30	9	0	1	1
3.	21	13	0	0	0	16	19	0	0	0
4.	24	5	0	0	1	20	6	0	0	1
5.	35	8	1	1	1	24	14	0	0	1
6.	37	5	1	1	1	25	9	0	1	1
7.	6	27	0	0	0	9	22	0	0	0
8.	27	6	0	1	1	27	8	0	1	1
9.	22	22	0	0	1	21	21	0	0	1
10.	9	22	0	0	1	13	19	0	0	0

Awareness

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	T	F	66%	50%	40%	T	F	66%	50%	40%
1.	3	25	0	0	0	9	21	0	0	0
2.	20	10	0	0	1	11	15	0	0	0
3.	20	13	0	0	1	17	7	0	0	0
4.	31	8	0	1	1	29	8	0	1	1
5.	31	6	0	1	1	32	7	0	1	1
6.	18	12	0	0	0	27	5	0	1	1
7.	12	23	0	0	0	8	26	0	0	0
8.	12	18	0	0	0	18	10	0	0	0

Propriety

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	T	F	66%	50%	40%	T	F	66%	50%	40%
1.	11	24	0	0	1	8	22	0	0	1
2.	5	25	0	1	1	19	11	0	0	0
3.	26	15	0	1	1	30	13	0	1	1
4.	2	37	1	1	1	12	22	0	0	1
5.	25	21	0	1	1	26	17	0	1	1
6.	6	15	0	0	0	7	21	0	0	0
7.	8	12	0	0	0	4	21	0	0	0

Scholarship

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	T	F	66%	50%	40%	T	F	66%	50%	40%
1.	14	30	0	1	1	11	32	0	1	1
2.	25	10	0	1	1	27	9	0	1	1
3.	24	21	0	0	1	19	22	0	0	1
4.	16	13	0	0	0	13	16	0	0	0
5.	3	34	0	0	0	4	29	0	0	0
6.	10	29	0	0	0	21	16	0	0	1
7.	14	19	0	0	0	12	22	0	0	1
8.	14	23	0	0	0	19	14	0	0	0
9.	14	24	0	0	1	16	21	0	0	1
10.	24	13	0	0	0	16	18	0	0	0
11.	28	9	0	1	1	27	5	0	1	1
12.	30	14	0	1	1	27	12	0	1	1
13.	15	4	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0
14.	18	4	0	0	0	20	4	0	0	1
15.	12	31	0	0	0	11	28	0	0	0

APPENDIX B

Expectation Tables

Practicality

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	A	D	66%	50%	40%	A	D	66%	50%	40%
1.	29	8	0	1	1	26	13	0	1	1
2.	0	49	0	0	0	4	48	0	0	0
3.	23	9	0	0	0	39	5	0	0	0
4.	9	29	0	0	0	5	32	0	0	0
5.	2	48	0	0	0	2	45	0	0	0
6.	16	27	0	0	0	18	26	0	0	0
7.	2	46	0	0	0	1	44	0	0	0
8.	38	4	1	1	1	28	9	0	1	1
9.	32	7	0	1	1	26	12	0	1	1
10.	1	42	0	0	0	9	32	0	0	0
11.	36	4	1	1	1	30	7	0	1	1
12.	34	5	1	1	1	35	5	1	1	1
13.	46	1	1	1	1	42	3	1	1	1
14.	22	22	0	0	1	17	20	0	0	1

Community

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	A	D	66%	50%	40%	A	D	66%	50%	40%
1.	31	4	0	1	1	32	5	0	1	1
2.	42	5	1	1	1	41	1	1	1	1
3.	8	29	0	1	1	27	27	0	1	1
4.	35	1	1	1	1	39	2	1	1	1
5.	46	5	1	1	1	41	4	1	1	1
6.	38	5	1	1	1	37	2	1	1	1
7.	45	0	1	1	1	42	4	1	1	1
8.	41	5	1	1	1	39	4	1	1	1
9.	16	29	0	1	1	16	27	0	1	1
10.	7	35	1	1	1	9	30	0	1	1

Awareness

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	A	D	66%	50%	40%	A	D	66%	50%	40%
1.	40	4	1	1	1	41	0	1	1	1
2.	47	1	1	1	1	48	0	1	1	1
3.	50	1	1	1	1	45	1	1	1	1
4.	45	0	1	1	1	45	1	1	1	1
5.	42	2	1	1	1	44	1	1	1	1
6.	44	1	1	1	1	43	1	0	0	1
7.	47	0	1	1	1	45	1	1	1	1
8.	27	8	0	1	1	32	6	0	1	1

Propriety

	Highline					Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores			Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	A	D	66%	50%	40%	A	D	66%	50%	40%
1.	10	28	0	1	1	9	31	0	1	1
2.	12	27	0	1	1	10	24	0	1	1
3.	49	0	1	1	1	48	0	1	1	1
4.	9	24	0	0	1	15	16	0	0	1
5.	48	1	1	1	1	43	3	1	1	1
6.	26	12	0	1	1	20	15	0	0	1
7.	16	20	0	0	0	6	26	0	0	0

Scholarship

	Highline						Seattle				
	Raw Score		Tabulated Scores				Raw Score		Tabulated Scores		
	A	D	66%	50%	40%		A	D	66%	50%	40%
1.	1	42	1	1	1	1.	8	37	1	1	1
2.	47	1	1	1	1	2.	45	2	1	1	1
3.	9	38	1	1	1	3.	9	35	1	1	1
4.	41	6	1	1	1	4.	37	3	0	1	1
5.	24	15	0	0	1	5.	20	16	1	0	1
6.	46	1	1	1	1	6.	45	2	1	1	1
7.	3	29	0	1	1	7.	8	34	1	1	1
8.	32	1	0	1	1	8.	39	1	1	1	1
9.	1	46	1	1	1	9.	4	42	1	1	1
10.	12	27	0	1	1	10.	15	24	0	0	1
11.	46	3	1	1	1	11.	41	2	1	1	1
12.	29	14	0	1	1	12.	31	8	1	1	1
13.	49	0	1	1	1	13.	45	1	1	1	1
14.	41	3	1	1	1	14.	43	1	1	1	1
15.	39	5	1	1	1	15.	45	1	1	1	1

APPENDIX C

Questionnaires

PERCEPTION

Practicality Scale

1. Students quickly learn what is done and not done on this campus. (T)

2. Students must have a written excuse from class. (T)

3. Students are encouraged to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices. (F)

4. Student organizations are closely supervised to guard against mistakes. (T)

5. It's important socially here to be in the right club or group. (T)

6. The professors regularly check up on the students to make sure that assignments are being carried out properly and on time. (T)

7. Some professors react to questions in class as if the students were criticizing them personally. (T)

8. The big college events draw a lot of student enthusiasm and support. (T)

9. Frequent tests are given in most courses. (T)

10. In many classes students have an assigned seat. (T)

11. Student elections generate a lot of intense campaigning and strong feeling. (T)

12. There is an extensive program of intramural sports and informal athletic activities. (T)

13. The college offers many practical courses such as typing, report writing, etc. (T)

14. Student pep rallies, parades, dances, carnivals or demonstrations occur very rarely. (F)

Community Scale

1. Students commonly share their problems. (T)
2. The professors go out of their way to help you. (T)
3. Most students respond to ideas and events in a pretty cool and detached way. (F)
4. There are frequent informal social gatherings. (T)
5. Most people here seem to be especially considerate of others. (T)
6. Students should have many opportunities to develop skill in organizing and directing the work of others. (T)
7. When students run a project or put on a show everybody knows about it. (T)
8. The college regards training people for service to the community as one of its major responsibilities. (T)
9. Students are expected to work out the details of their own program in their own way. (F)
10. Most of the faculty are not interested in students' personal problems. (F)

Awareness Scale

1. Public debates are held frequently. (T)
2. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily accessible. (T)
3. Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences are outstanding. (T)

4. Students are actively concerned about national and international affairs. (T)

5. A controversial speaker always stirs up a lot of student discussion. (T)

6. Many students here develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life. (T)

7. Many famous people are brought to the campus for lectures, concerts, student discussions, etc. (T)

8. There are a good many colorful and controversial figures on the faculty. (T)

Propriety Scale

1. Nearly all students expect to achieve future fame or wealth. (F)

2. Students pay very little attention to rules and regulations. (F)

3. Instructors clearly explain the goals and purpose of their courses. (T)

4. Spontaneous student rallies and demonstrations occur frequently. (F)

5. It is easy to take clear notes in most classes. (T)

6. Students ask permission before deviating from common policies or practices. (T)

7. Students are expected to report any violation of rules and regulations. (T)

Scholarship Scale

1. It is fairly easy to pass most courses without working very hard. (F)

2. Most of the professors are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of their subjects. (T)

3. Learning what is in the textbook is enough to pass most courses. (F)

4. Students set high standards of achievement for themselves. (T)

5. The professors really push students' capacities to the limit. (T)

6. Class discussions are typically vigorous and intense. (T)

7. Everyone knows the "snap" courses to take and the tough ones to avoid. (F)

8. Long serious intellectual discussions are common among students. (T)

9. Personality, pull, and bluff gets students through many courses. (F)

10. Standards set by the professors are not particularly hard to achieve. (F)

11. Careful reasoning and clear logic are valued most highly in grading students' papers, reports, or discussions. (T)

12. Most courses require intensive study and preparation out of class. (T)

13. Course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences are outstanding. (T)

14. Courses, examinations, and readings are frequently revised. (T)

15. Examinations provide a genuine measure of a student's achievement and understanding. (T)

EXPECTATION

Practicality Scale

1. A college should have students who quickly learn what is done and what is not done. (T)

2. A college should require a written excuse for absence from class. (T)

3. A college should encourage students to criticize administrative policies and teaching practices. (F)

4. A college should closely supervise student organizations as a means of guarding against mistakes. (T)

5. A college should view membership in the right club or group as important socially. (T)

6. A college should have professors who regularly check up on the students to make sure that assignments are being carried out properly and on time. (T)

7. A college should have professors who react in a way (to questions) as if the students were criticizing them. (T)

8. A college should have a lot of enthusiasm and support. (T)

9. A college should have a practice of assigning seats to its students in many classes. (T)

10. A college should have frequent tests given in most classes. (T)

11. A college should have students' elections generate a lot of campaigning and strong feeling. (T)

12. A college should have an extensive program of intramural sports and informal athletic activities. (T)

13. A college should offer many practical courses such as typing, report writing, etc. (T)

14. A college should have student pep rallies, parades, etc. very rarely. (F)

Community Scale

1. A college should have students who commonly share their problems. (T)

2. A college should have professors who go out of their way to help you. (T)

3. A college should have most people who respond to ideas and events in a pretty cool and detached way. (F)

4. A college should have frequent informal social gatherings. (T)

5. A college should have people who are especially considerate of others. (T)

6. A college should provide opportunities for students to develop skill in organizing and directing the work of other. (T)

7. A college should be a place in which everyone knows about a student-run project. (T)

8. A college should regard training people for service to the community as one of its major responsibilities. (T)

9. A college should expect students to work out the details of their own program in their own way. (F)

10. A college should have faculty who are not interested in students' personal problems. (F)

Awareness Scale

1. A college should have frequent public debates. (T)

2. A college should have readily accessible channels for expressing students' complaints. (T)

3. Course offerings and faculty in the social sciences should be outstanding. (T)

4. A college should have a student population which is actively concerned about national and international affairs. (T)

5. A college should have a lot of student discussion after a controversial speaker. (T)

6. A college should have many students who develop a strong sense of responsibility about their role in contemporary social and political life. (T)

7. A college should bring many famous people to the campus for lectures, concerts, student discussion, etc. (T)

8. A college should have a good many colorful and controversial figures on the faculty. (T)

Propriety Scale

1. A college should have nearly all of its students expecting to achieve fame or wealth. (F)

2. A college should have students who plot some sort of escapade or rebellion. (F)

3. A college should have instructors who clearly explain the goals and pruposes of their courses. (T)

4. A college should frequently have student rallies and demonstrations. (F)

5. A college should have courses in which it is easy to take clear notes. (T)

6. A college should have students who ask permission before deviating from common policies and practices. (T)

7. A college should expect students to report any violation of rules and regulations. (T)

Scholarship Scale

1. A college should have most courses in which it is fairly easy to pass without working too hard. (F)

2. A college should have most professors who are very thorough teachers and really probe into the fundamentals of their subjects. (T)

3. A college should have courses in which learning what is in the textbook is enough to pass. (F)

4. A college should have students who set high achievements for themselves. (T)

5. A college should have professors who really push students' capacities to the limit. (T)

6. A college should have class discussions which are typically vigorous and intense. (T)

7. A college should have students who know the "snap" courses to take and the tough ones to avoid. (F)

8. A college should have students who commonly have long, serious discussions. (T)

9. A college should have students who use personality, pull, and bluff to get through many classes. (F)

10. A college should have standards set by professors which are not particularly hard to achieve. (F)

11. A college should value careful reasoning and clear logic most highly in grading student papers, reports, or discussions. (T)

12. A college should have most courses require intense study and preparation out of class. (T)

13. A college should have outstanding course offerings and faculty in the natural sciences. (T)

14. A college should have frequent revision of courses, examinations, and readings. (T)

15. A college should have examinations which provide a genuine measure of students' achievement and understanding. (T)