

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES OF HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS
IN METROPOLITAN CENTERS OF TEXAS
TOWARD THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
James J. Lewis
May, 1973

690991

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the members of the committee that supervised the dissertation: Dr. Stewart North, chairman, Dr. Stanley Sanders, Dr. LaVerne Carmical, and Dr. Frank Stovall.

To my fellow students, too numerous to name here, I thank you for the many impromptu discussions which contributed so much to attending graduate school. Among this group I would be remiss not to give thanks to Ras Friend who helped with the design of this study.

My appreciation is extended to the counselors who took time from their busy schedules to complete the questionnaires. The percentage of responses, within the short time span, gave me further evidence that counselors are truly a professional group.

I give special thanks for the understanding, support, and patience of my wife, Raymo and children, Natalie and Roger.

My most humble thanks I give to my Lord and Saviour for granting me the strength to complete this work.

A STUDY OF ATTITUDES OF HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELORS
IN METROPOLITAN CENTERS OF TEXAS
TOWARD THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

An Abstract of a Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
James J. Lewis
May, 1973

ABSTRACT

Lewis, James J. "A Study of Attitudes of High School Counselors in Metropolitan Centers of Texas Toward The Junior College." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Houston, 1973.

Committee Chairman: Dr. Stewart D. North

The purpose of this study was to determine whether senior high school counselors held favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward junior colleges, and to decide whether certain factors relate to the attitudes held. The investigation involved a review of literature relative to the meaning of attitude, methods for measuring attitude, research of attitudes various groups hold toward junior colleges, and the influence high school counselors have upon college plans of students.

Population for this study was all high school counselors serving in the public schools of Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties of Texas. The Junior College Attitude Survey, a Likert-type instrument, was mailed to twenty-five percent of these counselors, selected by a random technique. From the counselors selected and mailed questionnaires, 64 percent returned usable answer sheets. The t-test and analysis of variance was applied in order to test the hypotheses.

A mean score of 3.86, from a possible 5.00, for the total group provided evidence that counselors from the four counties hold favorable attitudes toward junior colleges. The hypotheses tested reveal that none of the following factors have any significant influence on attitude: whether a counselor is male or female, when a counselor was last enrolled in a degree program, or whether a counselor who has worked outside the field of education holds an attitude different than one who has worked only in education. Visits to a junior college by counselors and visits by college representatives to the high schools apparently have no measurable affect on the attitudes held toward junior colleges. While location of the high school within a junior college district appeared to influence counselor attitude the difference was not significant at the .05 level. Distance from a high school to the nearest junior college had no measurable influence upon the counselor's attitude.

High school counselors serving in the four most populous counties of Texas are an influential group of professionals who hold a favorable attitude toward junior colleges. Junior college officials should attempt to keep counselors informed about programs presently offered and solicit their cooperation in the development of new programs. This group of professionals serving the high school students of Texas would be expected to refer students to the junior

college when they feel the needs of the students may be served by a program provided there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables.....	x
Chapter	
1. THE NATURE OF THE STUDY.....	1
Background.....	3
The Problem.....	8
State of the Hypotheses.....	8
Procedure of the Study.....	12
Limitations of the Study.....	12
Definition of Terms.....	13
Overview.....	14
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	16
The Concept of Attitude.....	16
Definitions of attitude.....	17
Components of attitude.....	19
Dimensions of attitude.....	21
Measuring Attitude.....	23
Non-disguised techniques.....	23
Disguised techniques.....	28
Semantic differential technique.....	29
Group Attitudes Expressed Toward the Junior College.....	30

Chapter	Page
Opinion of voters.....	34
Opinion of organized groups.....	35
Opinion of high school seniors.....	37
Opinion of college students.....	38
Non-positive opinions.....	39
Negative opinions.....	41
Counselors' Influence on College Plans.....	42
Summary.....	45
3. CONDUCT OF THE STUDY.....	47
The Instrument.....	47
Population and Sampling Technique.....	49
Procedure.....	51
Treatment of the Data.....	52
Summary.....	53
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	54
Findings of the Study.....	54
Category one.....	55
Category two.....	61
Category three.....	66
Summary.....	70
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS....	71
Conclusions.....	76
Recommendations.....	77

	Page
REFERENCES.....	82
APPENDIXES.....	91
VITA.....	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS GROUPED BY MOST RECENT ENROLLMENT IN A DEGREE PROGRAM.....	56
2.	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES BY SEX.....	58
3.	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES FOR COUNSELORS WHO HAVE WORKED OUTSIDE EDUCATION WITH THOSE WHO HAVE WORKED IN EDUCATION ONLY.....	60
4.	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS GROUPED BY HIGH SCHOOL'S DISTANCE FROM A JUNIOR COLLEGE.....	63
5.	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS WHOSE SCHOOLS ARE LOCATED IN A JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT WITH THOSE WHO ARE NOT.....	64
6.	COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS WHOSE HIGH SCHOOL HAS BEEN VISITED BY JUNIOR COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES AND COUNSELORS WHOSE SCHOOL HAS NOT BEEN VISITED.....	68

7. COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS WHO HAVE VISITED JUNIOR COLLEGES WHERE GRADUATES OF THEIR HIGH SCHOOLS ATTEND AND THOSE WHO HAVE NOT VISITED.....	69
---	----

Chapter 1

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

The junior college has gained a significant position among institutions that provide post high school education in the United States. This position has been attained through the high growth rate experienced by junior colleges since the close of World War II. During the 1960's, the increase in new campuses was accelerated beyond any previous time period. These new campuses were established to accommodate an increasing number of students, as well as to provide a college program within commuting distance for students.

Even though the junior college is serving the post high school educational needs for a great number of persons, limited research exists with regard to attitudes held toward the institution. A review of the literature reveals work involving certain groups that would be expected to have cause for holding an attitude toward the junior college. Fryer (1968) investigated the opinion held by registered voters toward the junior college. Research by Smith (1969) dealt with the opinion held by high school seniors toward the junior college. This study is an assessment of the attitudes held by high school counselors toward the junior college.

Presence of an attitude about the junior college may indicate the way a counselor, or group of counselors, may act

toward the junior college. Findings from this investigation provide junior college administrators additional data as to the attitude held by this influential group. The astute administrator can use this information to strengthen the relationship between high schools and junior colleges.

The high school counselor is in a position to influence the college selected by high school graduates. Kerr's (1962) study provides evidence that sixty-four percent of the students decided whether to go to college between grades nine and twelve. The study further reports that ninety-seven percent of the students decided, while in high school, on the particular college they would attend. In a study by Graff and Peters (1969), fifty percent of the freshmen students involved identified their high school guidance counselor as being the most help in obtaining and discussing information about post high school education opportunities. Hoyt (1968) reports the high school counselor was a close-second to parents in influencing the college choice. The results of the Hoyt study were based upon data collected from classes of freshmen in seventy-nine junior colleges from all six of the college-accrediting associations of the United States.

Since high school guidance counselors are gaining more influence upon the selection of a college, this study has examined their attitudes toward junior colleges. Four

urban counties of Texas were selected for the project: Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant. These counties have experienced a high growth rate in junior college development since 1960. For example, the Dallas County Junior College District opened its first campus for the fall term of 1965 and in the fall of 1971 enrolled a total of 25,000 students on four campuses (Junior College Journal, March, 1972).

BACKGROUND

Junior colleges are an American institution. These colleges were developed to fulfill a variety of needs or proclaimed needs for post-secondary education. A possible reason for the diversity of program offerings in many junior colleges today may be the varied backgrounds from which the colleges have evolved. Their antecedent institutions have ranged from trade schools offering specific job training to liberal arts schools providing an academic program. This diversification of programs may have been responsible for the identity crisis the junior college has struggled with through the years.

The junior college idea was germinated by such university presidents as Folwell of Minnesota, Tappan of Michigan, and Harper of Chicago. These men advocated that the junior college be an extension of the secondary school, offering the work of the freshmen and sophomore years of

college work. This arrangement would allow university work to begin with the junior year. Of the three, William R. Harper made the most progress toward the establishment of schools for providing lower-division work. It is Harper who coined the term "junior college" to describe lower-division units (Eells, 1931).

Development of junior colleges has been accompanied by numerous problems. Some of the more difficult problems have been securing financial support, achieving legal status, and establishing an identity, or place, among educational institutions. While most states have taken steps to alleviate the first two issues, the third problem is unresolved.

In some states post high school programs were started without the benefit of definite enabling legislation. The movement to gain legal status was often opposed by other educational institutions due to concern over sharing the tax dollar. California provides an example of legislation passed permitting the establishment of junior colleges. Medsker (1960) states, "the first enabling legislation came in 1907 when the California Legislature authorized high school districts of the state to offer post graduate courses, but no financial aid was provided by the state [p. 210]." During the early years of junior college development the states often gave more aid to elementary and high schools. At the same time, the state supported in full the public four-year

colleges and universities, making the junior college the only segment of public education for which it assumed little, or no financial responsibility. Interest and support were often limited to those communities which operated a junior college.

But more pervasive than legal and financial problems has been the junior college's need for an identity. The functions of the junior college have been re-defined over the years by many writers (Koos, 1924; Eells, 1931; Griffith, 1945). Gleazer (1968) classifies junior college offerings in the following three categories: transfer, occupational, and comprehensive. Presumably the comprehensive group could include transfer, occupational, or courses not suited to either group.

Many two-year institutions claim to be comprehensive junior colleges; they provide college parallel work for students who plan to transfer to four-year or upper-division institutions and in addition offer occupational education programs directed toward specific jobs. Junior colleges which claim to offer a comprehensive program will usually stress the community service aspect, wherein courses of interest to citizens from the community will be made available: for example, courses in art, music, real estate, physical fitness, and courses of a compensatory nature to help students with educational deficiencies.

Two-year colleges offering a comprehensive program are often called "community colleges." During the past decade the title "community college" has replaced "junior college" in many parts of the United States. In Dallas, Texas, during the 1972 Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, delegates voted to change the name of that organization to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Junior College Journal, April, 1972). However, throughout this study the title junior college will be used.

In the decade of 1960 to 1970 the junior college has experienced phenomenal growth. This rapid development is evidenced by both higher overall enrollment and more numerous institutions throughout the United States. During the decade, junior college enrollment increased by three hundred percent (Educational Statistics, 1970). In the fall of 1969 more students enrolled as freshmen in junior colleges than in the four-year institutions in the United States (Jennings, 1970).

Much of the growth may be attributed to characteristics that tend to set the junior college apart from other institutions of higher education. Among these are: proximity to the student's home, lower cost, open-door admissions policies, and the great variety of programs offered. The

characteristics listed may be classified as conveniences, and thus may not reflect the attitude held toward junior colleges.

In conducting a program which to many may appear too diverse, the junior college has collected a measure of criticism. Garrison (1967) reports that some junior college faculty members consider a junior college a socially accepted place where lazy students come to spend their time. Some faculty members also feel junior college courses are not equal to those in four-year colleges.

Epperson (1967) indicates that facilities of many junior colleges are inadequate, and that faculties and administrators may lack sufficient skills and preparation. He feels that students are inappropriately prepared for transfer to four-year institutions. In his opinion, the student choosing to go to a junior college is going to be a second-class citizen in the eyes of his peers.

Despite the obstacles junior colleges have encountered, there are indications of an increasing acceptance of the two-year college. Hutchinson (1963) found both students and faculty of eight Florida junior colleges to hold a favorable image of their institutions. Freshmen students in the Florida colleges perceived the faculties to be competent, the counseling satisfactory, and the facilities excellent. Hickok (1964) indicates that parents of junior college students are among

the best supporters of the junior college. Many parents feel the junior college is a bridge which leads from youth to maturity, a place to learn to become a skilled craftsman, or an opportunity for groping adolescents to find themselves educationally and vocationally.

The image of junior college education held by various groups in society is an intangible which influences many administrative plans. This image, as perceived by some groups, may influence such factors as the number of students who wish to enroll, the facilities and equipment needs, and the personnel requirements of the colleges. More exact information about the attitudes held by pertinent groups toward the junior college should enable administrators to be more proficient in planning.

THE PROBLEM

Do high school counselors tend to hold a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward junior colleges? Can certain factors be identified which may relate to the favorable or unfavorable attitude held?

STATEMENT OF THE HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses tested in this study were categorized under three headings. Hypotheses one through three, all of which pertain to personal characteristics and professional experience of the counselors, make up Category I. Since the

most rapid growth period for junior colleges has occurred after 1960, hypothesis one provided a test to compare recent graduates from counseling programs with more experienced counselors. The attitudes of male and female counselors were compared by hypothesis two on an assumption that females may consider the junior college too much of a vocational center, rather than a college. In hypothesis three, counselors with six month's work experience outside the field of education were expected to be more favorable toward the junior college, considering the varied technical and vocational programs offered students.

1. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors who were last enrolled in a degree or certificate program: "In 1970 through 1972"; "In 1965 through 1969"; "In 1960 through 1964"; "In 1955 through 1959"; "In 1954 or earlier."

2. There is no significant difference between male high school counselors and female high school counselors in their attitude toward junior colleges.

3. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors who have been employed full time, for a minimum of six consecutive months, outside the education profession and those who have been employed only in education.

In Category Two, hypotheses four and five pertained to distance from the counselor's place of employment and also, whether the counselor's high school was in a junior college district. An assumption is made that part of the growth of junior colleges is due to commuter students. The proximity of a junior college, providing college work nearby for high school graduates, may influence their counselor's attitude. Where a junior college is nearby a counselor may also be more familiar with the offerings and hold a more favorable attitude. Hypothesis five questions whether counselors working within a college district hold a more favorable attitude toward the junior college. Counselors working within a college district may also live in, and pay taxes to the support of the college. A feeling of partnership may exist in this situation.

4. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose high school is: "Less than ten miles"; "Eleven to fifteen miles"; "Sixteen to twenty miles"; "Over twenty miles" away from the nearest junior college.

5. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose high schools are in a junior college district and those whose high schools are not in a junior college district.

Category Three, consisting of hypotheses six and seven, was based upon the assumption that when communications are open and counselors are informed, a more favorable attitude may result. Where junior college administrators attempt to show counselors facilities, have them meet faculty members, and visit with former students from their high schools a more positive attitude may exist. Visiting the high school counselor by junior college representatives is one acknowledgment of the important position the counselor holds. These visits may be used to keep the counselor informed of new programs, discuss the progress or problems of students, and seek inputs from the counselor.

6. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between high school counselors who have visited a junior college where their graduates attend and those who have not visited a junior college their graduates attend.

7. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose schools have been visited by junior college representatives and those whose schools have not been visited.

Each of the seven hypotheses were tested in null form and the results are reported in Chapter 4.

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

The population for the study consisted of all counselors serving in a senior high school located in Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties in the State of Texas. Identity and building assignment of counselors was established by their placement in the 1971-72 Directory of Public School Counselors in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 1972). The study instrument was mailed to a random sample of the stated population. A transmittal letter, a pre-paid return envelope, and an instruction sheet accompanied the instrument.

The completed instruments provided scores for statistical analysis, as well as personal information about the respondents. Statistical techniques used were the two-tailed t-test or a one-way analysis of variance. Tests for significance were made at the .05 level. The personal information allowed for grouping the scores of respondents in order to test the various hypotheses. Detailed explanation of the procedure is in Chapter 3.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was concerned with group assessments; no attempt was made to ascertain a particular individual's attitude.

Identification of a general attitude high school counselors hold toward the junior college, as measured by the Junior College Attitude Survey (JCAS), does not imply

that the same attitude is held toward all phases of junior college education.

Counselors participating in this study were from public senior high schools of selected urban counties in Texas. The findings of this investigation should not be construed as applicable to other areas of the state or to any year other than 1972.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms are defined to assist in the understanding of this study.

Attitude A predisposition of a person or group of persons to react to an object in a specific way. The instrument used in this study was designed to measure relatively favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward the junior college as shown by the respondent's favorable or unfavorable perceptions of various aspects of junior college programs.

Comprehensive Junior College Those junior colleges providing within a single institution transfer programs, vocational programs, technical programs, and adult-community programs.

Transfer of Parallel Programs A program designed to meet the needs of students planning to continue their education beyond the junior college in a four-year college or university.

Technical Programs A specialized area of junior college education within engineering and scientific fields where the student is expected to gain technical and manipulative skills.

Vocational Programs Junior college instruction that develops basic skills and applications sufficient to prepare students for full-time employment.

Open Door Policy The policy whereby a junior college will admit any graduate from high school. In some states junior colleges will admit persons who have not completed high school, subject to their meeting certain requirements.

High School Counselor Any person in the high school whose primary responsibility is defined by the school as one who advises students regarding college selection and is supportive of the academic, personal-social, and educational-vocational development of students. The population for this study consists of individuals listed as high school counselors serving Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties, in the 1971-72 Directory of Public School Counselors in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 1972).

OVERVIEW

The study determined the attitudes toward junior colleges held by high school counselors serving in selected urban counties in Texas. Since research appears to be

limited in this area, work of this nature should be of value to junior college personnel, counselor associations, and agencies concerned with coordinating educational programs for the State of Texas.

Chapter one presents the nature of the study; the problem, including background information; the hypotheses; and the definition of terms. Chapter two presents a review of related literature. Chapter three describes the methods and procedures of the study, while chapter four includes the results. Chapter five includes the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations from this study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a synopsis of the material pertinent to the investigation. The following organization was used: a survey of works on the concept of attitude; a survey of methods of measuring attitude; a section of methods of measuring attitude; a section on the attitude held toward the junior college by various groups in society; evidence that counselors are influential on the college plans of high school students.

THE CONCEPT OF ATTITUDE

The term attitude, like most abstract terms in the English language, has more than one meaning. Derived from the Latin aptus, it has, on the one hand the significance of fitness or adaptedness, and like its by-form, aptitude connotes a subjective or mental state of readiness or preparation for action.

A survey of the literature reveals voluminous works dealing with the concept of attitude. According to G. W. Allport (1935), "the concept of attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary American psychology. No other term appears more frequently in experimental and theoretical literature [p. 798]."

Books, journal articles, and dissertations have been written about attitude concept, attitude measurement, and attitude change. While much of the research pertaining to attitude has been conducted by psychologists, sociologists have also conducted extensive research in an attempt to gain further understanding of societal action (Bogardus, 1931; Festinger, 1950).

DEFINITIONS OF ATTITUDE

While general agreement exists as to the importance of the concept of attitude, there has been marked difference in the definitions. Nelson (1939) reported finding "a wide variety of meanings which are ascribed to this term [p. 367]." He cites twenty-three rather distinct characterizations given the term by psychologists or social scientists up to 1939, ranging from organic drives, neural, or trial responses to ways of conceiving objects, or sum totals of inclinations, feelings, notions, ideas, fears, prejudices, threats, and convictions about any specific topic.

Some studies treat attitude as readiness. Baldwin (1901) defined attitude as readiness for attention or action of a definite sort. Murphy, G., Murphy, L. B. and Newcomb (1937) declared, "An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's

response to all objects and situations with which it is related [p. 889]."

Several studies consider attitude as a tendency or predisposition. Chave (1928) defined an attitude as a complex of feelings, desires, fears, convictions, prejudices or other tendencies that have given a set or readiness to act to a person because of varied experiences. An attitude can also be considered tendency to act toward or against something in the environment which becomes thereby a positive or negative value (Bogardus, 1931). Katz (1960) defines an attitude as the predisposition of an individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of his world in a favourable or an unfavourable manner. He also refers to opinions as the verbal expressions of attitudes. Another researcher, Droba (1933), feels that an attitude is a mental disposition of the human individual to act for or against a definite object.

Other studies define attitude as a facet of individuality. Bernard (1930) believed social attitudes to be individual attitudes directed toward social objects. Collective attitudes are individual attitudes so strongly interconditioned by collective contact that they become highly standardized and uniform within the group. Fishbein (1962) proposes a theory that the attitude held about an object is a function of the strength of the individual's beliefs

about the object, and the evaluative aspects of those beliefs.

In the definitions cited above, it becomes evident that attitude is a predisposition to evaluate an object. This evaluation usually tends to be positive or negative and, furthermore, may determine the action one will take toward the object. The junior college is a social object, created to provide post-secondary educational opportunity. While these institutions have experienced phenomenal growth in recent years, limited research concerning the attitude held by groups toward these colleges has been conducted. High school counselors represent an influential group whose attitude should be determined.

COMPONENTS OF ATTITUDE

The three components of attitude have been identified as: cognitive, affective, and conative (Sherif and Cantril, 1945; Peak, 1955; Katz and Stotland, 1959; Rosenberg and Howland, 1960). These writers seem to agree that attitudes lead to action or provide evidence of potential behavior. Philosophers may consider these components as three existential stances of man: knowing, feeling, and acting.

Knowing, or the cognitive component of attitudes, is also called the informational, intellectual, or perceptual component. Counselors may have inadequate or insufficient

information about the programs offered by junior colleges. The image of the junior college, as perceived by the high school counselor, may also be influenced by visits to a campus where their former students are in attendance. Colleges may encourage counselors to develop a more positive attitude by sending representatives to visit the high schools to explain their program offerings.

The affective component of attitude, also called the feeling or the emotional component, deals with the person's feelings of liking or disliking toward the object of the attitude. Physiological arousal tests, such as pupil dilatation or heart rate, measure most directly this component of attitude. According to Suchman (1950), attempts to measure the intensity of attitude deal with the affective component.

The conative component of attitude refers to the person's behavior or action tendencies regarding the object. Bogardus' (1925) social-distance scale was designed to measure this component. A weakness of the scale for measuring the conative is that an inventory is taken of how a person says he would behave in a given situation. The analysis of this component would be based upon observing the behavior.

A view held by some psychologists (Katz and Stotland, 1959; Triandis, 1964) is that as the individual develops, his cognitions, feelings, and action tendencies about objects become organized into enduring systems. Within this unified

system, these three components become mutually interdependent and interrelated.

DIMENSIONS OF ATTITUDE

The components of attitudes--cognitive, affective and conative--may vary in a number of dimensions. These dimensions include direction, degree, intensity and salience (Halloran, 1967). Direction of an attitude refers to its for-or-against, like or dislike properties. Degree refers to whether the position is strongly held or not; for example, disagree or strongly disagree. Intensity is related to the depth of the conviction. The dimension of intensity is important when determining whether a person is more or less likely to shift his attitude. The salience dimension represents an attempt to assess the place of the attitude in the more complete value system, to locate the attitude's position among other attitudes.

Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (1962, p. 146) refer to dimensions of attitudes when they define attitude as "an enduring system of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings and pro or con action tendencies, with respect to a social object." Persons do hold a positive or negative relation to social objects according to Carolyn Sherif and M. Sherif (1967). Anderson and Fishbein (1965) define attitude as the evaluative dimension of a concept. Their use of

evaluative means that some order of preference-nonpreference or good-bad exist regarding the characteristics of the object.

The dimension of direction, or the double polarity in the direction of attitudes, is considered the most distinctive feature of the concept. It holds a central place in many definitions and has provided a basis for developing many instruments for measuring attitude. For years, the opposed categories of love-hate, attraction-repulsion, pleasure-pain, and alliance-combat have been investigated in psychology and other fields of study.

The dimensions of attitude provide the basis for quantifying the concept. Through the use of data, obtained from reliable instruments, the attitude held by subjects may be determined. In this investigation the subjects are high school counselors and their attitudes toward junior colleges. The increased influence of high school counselors, coupled with a greater percentage of students planning post-secondary education, make the attitude held by counselors important. Because the information the counselor passes to students and lay persons might become part of the residual attitudes toward the junior college, it is important that some assessment be made of his attitudes. The success of the junior college program may be largely dependent upon the counseling of prospective students while they are in high school.

MEASURING ATTITUDE

The definitions of the concept of attitude presented in the first section verify the existence of attitudes. While disagreement is evident with relation to definitions, it becomes more evident where instruments for measuring attitude are considered. This section of chapter two focuses on several methods which have been developed for that purpose.

Two groups of attitude-measuring instruments are described in this section, the non-disguised techniques and the disguised techniques. Non-disguised techniques provide the subject ample background material about the purpose of the research. The items contained in these instruments will also reveal the intent of the study. Other instruments, designed for a disguised technique, are planned to assess the attitude in its natural form. These latter methods attempt to capture the prejudice a subject may have without his being aware of the intent of the study.

NON-DISGUISED TECHNIQUES

When administering a non-disguised technique an investigator is attempting to take advantage of the subject's self-awareness and readiness to communicate. A further assumption is that the subject understands the test items, even after the investigator has taken steps to clarify all items presented in an instrument.

Equal Appearing Interval In 1928, Thurstone declared that "attitudes can be measured [p. 529]." Work was carried out by Thurstone and Chave (1929) with regard to attitude toward the church. The process developed by Thurstone involves the construction of a large number of statements or propositions about the issue in question. This list of statements is submitted to a group of several hundred people who are asked to arrange the statements in order along the continuum between the two extremes; thus each statement is placed in one of eleven stacks. Twenty or thirty statements should be selected so that they constitute an evenly graduated series of scale values along the continuum. A major criticism of this method is that the attitudes of the judges may influence their ranking of the items. Novland and Sherif (1952) state that "displacement of judgements along a scale seems a general phenomenon when the stimuli carry strong social and personal value [p. 823]." Although this displacement was found to be small, judges with extreme attitudes should not be used. The technique, though its instrumentation is difficult to develop, is widely accepted and used in attitude research.

Social Distance Scale Bogardus (1925) developed an instrument to measure social distance. In the study social distance was defined as "the degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other [p. 299]."

This work represents one of the earliest attempts to measure attitude. The scale used was presented as a continuum ranging from one to seven. Each participant was asked to express the extent of his desired social relationship to numerous racial groups. The continuum ranged from "exclusion from my country" to "willingness to accept as close kin by marriage." Several of the interim steps listed along the continuum were questioned as to qualifying as equal intervals. While this method provided evidence that attitudes could be measured and proved useful in measuring attitudes toward groups of persons, the procedure did not lend itself to this investigation. The method is useful in measuring attitudes toward groups of persons.

Paired Comparison Technique Guilford's (1931) method for measuring attitudes is referred to as the paired comparison technique. In this procedure an individual makes a series of judgements as to the relative approval of a number of issues, taking a pair at a time. In the Guilford study (1931), the student was given the choice between two rationalities. He was then requested to select the one which he favored most. This procedure can be modified to produce a rank-order scale, i.e., one selects, from several possible alternatives the most favored statement, the next most favored statement, and so on to the least favored statement.

Scale Discrimination Technique Edwards and Kilpatrick (1948) developed a method which they term the scale-discrimination technique. Using this technique a large set of dichotomous items is first selected. Judges are then asked, as in the Thurstone (1928) method, to sort these items into categories according to degree of favorableness. Items which are not sorted consistently by the judges are rejected as ambiguous. The remaining items are then prepared in multiple-chosen form with six response categories (strongly agree, agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, disagree, strongly disagree). The statements in this form are administered to a new group of subjects who are instructed to respond to each item by choosing the alternative which best expresses their own agreement or disagreement with it. The responses of each subject are then scored to derive his total score. Each item is then subjected to item analysis, as in the Likert (1932) method, and non-discriminating items are rejected. The remaining items are then dichotomized and subjected to cumulative scaling. This method appears to combine the strong points of Thurstone's and Likert's techniques while attempting to eliminate the points of the two methods which have been most frequently attacked. However it was the opinion of Krech, Crutchfield, and Gallachey (1962), that this approach has not been sufficiently tested to determine its strengths and weaknesses.

Summated Ratings Technique In 1932, Likert developed a method of measuring attitude called summated ratings. By this method subjects indicate their degree of agreement with a large number of statements thought to be relevant to a certain object. In developing a Likert-type scale a large number of statements should be given to a group of subjects who indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale. For positive items a strongly agree response to a statement is assigned a numerical weight of five; an agree response a four; a neutral, or undecided response, a three; a disagree response a two; and a strongly disagree response a one. On negative statements, the measuring procedure is reversed. At this stage a summation is made of each individual's responses to all items. The scale is analyzed to determine the degree of correlation between responses to each item and the total score. Those items failing to produce a high correlation with the total score are eliminated. This latter step is necessary in order to further remove the attitude of the experimenter. Likert (1932) explains the reason as follows: "No matter for what a priori reasons the experimenter may consider a statement to belong in a scale, if the statement, when tried on a group, does not measure what the rest of the statements measure, there is no justification for keeping that statement in the battery. After all, we are interested in measuring the attitudes of the members

of the group, not those of the experimenter [p. 49]." It is the use of item analysis in the Likert method that most clearly distinguishes it from the Thurstone method (Krech, Crutchfield, & Ballachey, 1962). Although the ambiguity of the neutral zone on the Likert scale is considered a weakness, the ease of administering and scoring influences the popularity of Likert-type instruments.

DISGUISED TECHNIQUES

In developing instruments for the purpose of assessing attitudes, disguised techniques have been used to conceal the intent of the study. Campbell (1950) states, "There are few, if any, indirect tests which could be confidently used for this purpose. There are, none the less, a considerable number of techniques that have been partially validated [p. 16]."

The thematic apperception test developed by Proshansky (1943) uses intermingled pictures, slides, or cartoons showing various settings. Subjects are given a brief glimpse of each setting and from this a description is written. By comparison of these stories, the subject's attitude is determined. Use of this technique by Proshansky (1943) to measure attitude toward labor resulted in correlations of .77 and .67 with a direct verbal scale.

A technique called the Incomplete Sentences Test was developed by Rotter and Willerman (1947). An investigator using this develops a schedule of incomplete sentences in

which are imbedded a number of sentence fragments dealing with the problem being studied. The subjects are asked to complete the sentences by expressing their true feelings.

Ruth and E. L. Horowitz (1938) pioneered the use of their Aussage Test. This test dealt with employing bias in perception and memory. A complicated picture would be exposed for two or three seconds, followed by a series of deliberately leading questions. Reference may be made to something not in the picture in order to obtain a response to evaluate.

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TECHNIQUE

The semantic differential technique was used by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) to secure a measure of the meaning of concepts. The hypothesis underlying the technique is that the meaning of an object for an individual includes not only the more obvious denotative meaning which he can readily state, but also more subtle connotative meaning which he can less easily describe. To measure these important connotative meanings of a given object, an indirect approach is used, in which quantitative ratings of the object in respect to a number of bi-polar adjectives are secured from the individual. The attitude toward the object is indicated by the subject's pattern or profile of his ratings on the different adjective scales. While the semantic-differential technique was originally developed to measure the connotative meaning of concepts,

the process has been used to measure attitudes as well. The evaluative factor appears to measure the valence of the subject's attitude toward an object.

In this study no attempt was made to conceal the purpose of the investigation. The instrument used was of the non-disguised type, including items which were worded to encourage the subjects to reveal whether they agreed or disagreed with various aspects of junior college operation. With limited research conducted on the subject of the high school counselor's attitude toward junior colleges, it is understandable that reliable instruments pertaining thereto would also be limited. The Junior College Attitude Survey (Appendix A), which was selected for this study, is described in Chapter 3.

GROUP ATTITUDES

EXPRESSED TOWARD THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

In this section information is presented dealing with the opinions different groups have expressed toward junior college. While not attempting to equate the opinion of one group to that of another, this study holds that the opinion expressed by one group in society may have an influence upon others. A majority of the articles and studies cited are limited to those after 1960. Opinions expressed during earlier years may hold little relevance to the current attitude toward

junior colleges. The rapid growth of junior colleges since 1960, as well as their expanded program offerings, may have caused attitudes to change. The material presented in this section provides evidence that junior colleges are gaining attention in this country. Yet while much research has taken place, the high school counselor has been neglected.

The concept opinion means a verbal expression of an attitude (Thurstone and Chave, 1929). In this section the term opinion is used as a synonym of attitude. Works cited as being opinion reports or surveys about the junior college are dealt with on the assumption that the subjects reveal the attitude held toward this institution.

While work dealing with attitude toward junior college appears limited, the amount of interest in the institution appears to have increased in accord with the growth of the college. Before 1920, the development of junior colleges was sporadic. After World War I, junior colleges opened at a fast rate for several years. In an article, Eby (1927) states that "this type of school is multiplying with such unusual rapidity that a large number of people are interested in inquiring what the attitude of our state, Texas, and more particularly of our university and other institutions, should be to the new institution [p. 20]." Many of the issues raised during the early years of rapid growth by the junior college have been reviewed by researchers.

During the earlier years of development, junior colleges were operated by local school systems, municipalities, or by church organizations. Much of the time this method of organizing colleges neglected the step of taking surveys in order to establish the needs of the community, or to determine whether additional institutions were necessary. In some instances local communities felt they must establish a college in order to maintain status with other areas of the state or nation (Eby, 1927). The college would be a device for boosting spirit or pride of the community, rather than to fulfill a verified educational need.

By the year 1920, the number and diversity of junior colleges in the United States had reached such proportions that some form of order was sought. In that year, George Zook, a specialist in higher education with the United States Bureau of Education, called a meeting in St. Louis (Gleazer, 1964). Through the efforts of representatives in St. Louis, the American Association of Junior Colleges was organized. The constitution drawn up by these delegates was little more than an agreement to study the junior college in all its types in order that the institution may make a general contribution to the work of education. The association has been invaluable to the junior colleges in helping develop a national image, in representing the colleges before agencies of the federal

government, and in assisting local committees with the development of new colleges.

For years junior colleges have existed without an identity. The struggle was to determine whether the institution was an upward extension of high school, a method of providing the first two years of university work, or a separate entity offering a needed service to society. This struggle for an identity may have influenced attitudes toward the junior college through the years.

In recent years the attention given junior colleges could be a factor in establishing an attitude in pertinent groups toward these colleges. Much of this growth has occurred since 1960. According to Gleazer (1964), "almost as though it had come into existence overnight, the American junior college is receiving unprecedented attention in the nation's press, from government, industry and labor leaders, and from the architects of educational thought and progress [p. 62]." This growth and attention, continuing since 1964, is sufficient reason to assume that attitudes toward the junior college should be explored.

An institution that must depend upon financial support from the public must attempt to determine the image it holds with that public. In the case of the junior college, as with many institutions, several publics exist which hold an opinion of the institution. Voters, leaders of industry, leaders of

organized labor, and high school students and their parents are but a few of the publics whose opinion of the junior college should be sought.

OPINION OF VOTERS

In many instances the opinion held by voters toward the junior college may be indicated by the results of elections relevant to the institution. This may be the outcome of an election to approve additional taxes for an existing program. Studies by Fryer (1968) and Mills (1969) support the position that opinions of voters toward the junior college can be determined by use of a survey questionnaire. However, the image of the junior college should be of concern to its leaders at all times rather than taking the risk of learning by the election process.

Mills' (1969) work dealt with the image voters held of Monroe Community College in Pennsylvania. The findings were that the college had achieved limited success in projecting its desired image to the public. Respondents were not familiar with cost of tuition, did not understand admission policies, and knew little about the programs offered by the college. The study revealed that citizens with the least accurate information held the lowest opinion of the college. Local newspapers were cited as the best source of information about the college.

The long history of junior college work in California may have been a factor influencing the sampling of voter opinion in a survey conducted by Fryer (1968). This study, dealing with an area in northern California, found a high level of positive sentiment. The junior college was supported by an overwhelming majority of the voters. The results of these studies indicate an area where action may be initiated by junior college leaders, that of informing the public. An informed voter may hold a more positive attitude toward the junior college.

OPINION OF ORGANIZED GROUPS

Groups more organized than the general public or registered voters also have expressed opinions about the junior college. At the convention of the AFL-CIO in 1963, organized labor adopted a strong statement of support for community-junior colleges (Leany, 1964). The AFL-CIO held that all citizens were entitled to receive two years of education beyond high school. The flexibility of community-junior colleges was listed as a point appealing to labor groups.

Research conducted by Toll (1966) found a positive attitude toward the junior college among business leaders as evidenced by a willingness to extend financial support. This indication of voluntary support was found among banking associations, retail groups, philanthropic foundations, and large industrial corporations.

Two groups close to the junior college have been polled as to their opinion: the faculty and the students of junior colleges.

Some of the work pertaining to faculty opinion has included faculty only, while other studies have dealt with faculty, administrators, and board members. These studies indicate that similar opinions of the junior college are held by all three. In general, the faculty members understand, accept, and are pleased with the role of their colleges in higher education (Fitzgerald, 1964; Harper, 1970; Beasley, 1971). The faculty indicated support for the multipurpose of the college, though the degree of support varied on some points. For example, questions were raised about the extent to which an open-door policy should be maintained. Also, there was a feeling that the heterogeneity of the students demanded a more effective college counseling program.

Research dealing with students' attitude toward the junior college has dealt with groups that could be taken as three stages: high school students, students enrolled in a junior college, and students that have attended a junior college. The attitude toward the junior college held by each of these student groups should be of concern by college administrators. Each member of the latter two groups could base his opinion upon personal experience, while the students of the high school group may have been influenced by persons in guidance roles.

OPINION OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

The image of junior colleges held by high school students should be of concern to the college's administrators. College personnel should attempt to determine the sources of information whereupon the high school student bases his opinion of the junior college. Smith (1969) found high school seniors from upper income areas held a less positive image of junior colleges than did seniors from high schools serving primarily middle and lower income groups. This study also revealed that regardless of how income or geographic location differs, seniors showed a lack of specific knowledge concerning admissions policy, transferability, and the number of programs offered by junior colleges. Seniors included in the sample by Kloeppel (1970) perceived the junior college as part of the national stereotype of higher education, rather than as a unique institution. Kloeppel also found no significant difference in familiarity with the college between students living in a college district and students living outside a college district.

Research by Classen (1965) dealt with factors that deter high school graduates from continuing their education in a junior college. The most frequent reason reported was the lack of college atmosphere or the perception of the junior college as being too much like a high school. Among the conclusions in each of the studies was the suggestion that

junior colleges could do a more effective job of informing the prospective students of the programs offered. One channel of communication could be for the colleges to keep the high school counselors informed.

OPINION OF COLLEGE STUDENTS

In an attempt to determine the satisfaction of students attending two-year colleges, Heide (1970) sent questionnaires to a random sample of students enrolled in three community junior colleges in Pennsylvania. The findings indicated that the two-year college students were typical of high school graduates in general: The students received most of their information from high school counselors, and they would again attend the two-year college given the choice.

The attitudes held toward an institution by former students are often considered worth attention. Opinions expressed by these individuals may be accepted as factual due to their previous connection with the colleges. Davis (1970) conducted a study dealing with the perception of the junior college held by students who had withdrawn. The results were that a majority of the withdrawees had a positive perception with 69 percent reporting they would enroll again under similar circumstances and 65 percent reporting they planned to return.

Students transferring to four year colleges from junior colleges have been the bases for research studies for many years. While much of this work dealt with the transfer

shock, often the subjects revealed an opinion of their former college. Among the latest research is work by Brady (1971) and Smith (1971). The results show that after the initial term in the four year college, junior college transfers do as well as native students. The transfer students felt their junior colleges had prepared them adequately to transfer to senior institutions.

NON-POSITIVE OPINIONS

Opinions of the junior college have not all been positive. While some writers have presented the institution as being essential to cope with the increased enrollments in higher education, others question its effectiveness, and some even challenge the junior college's being classed as higher education. Much of the literature to this point has given a more positive opinion.

Havighurst (1967) raised the question of the junior college's attempting to undertake too diverse a program. Acknowledgement was made that while the move to give every person in America an opportunity for post-secondary education was needed, the problem may be too much for the junior colleges. In one statement Havighurst addresses the issue: "there is a very real problem whether the community-junior college as an institution can make itself truly comprehensive, and thus serve to train people for technical and semi-professional jobs as well as prepare other people for university work [p. 428]."

Is the junior college the place to provide vocational and technical educational opportunity to students? The need for better trained technicians in society is accepted, but where the training should take place is part of a controversy. Results of work on this problem by Erick (1967) called for improved articulation between the high school and the junior college. The writer felt that in order to benefit the student a greater effort must be made to understand what the high school's vocational-technical programs consist of. This lack of understanding was compounded by not informing high school personnel of the college programs. One suggestion was that the high school counselor is in a position to provide information to the student. The counselor can carry out this guidance role if provided with sufficient, factual information about the programs.

Lynes (1966) perceives the junior college as struggling for an identity. Suggesting the move into the limelight during the 1960's as further complicating the identity problem, the writer recommends "the junior colleges must establish itself in the educational process. It must fight pressures to turn it into a 'regular' college [p.59]." In addition, the solution to the identity problem is further delayed when the junior college measures success by how close its work parallels the four year college or university. Medsker (1960) says: "The result is that some colleges identify themselves

so closely with a four year institution that they organize and teach most courses in exactly the same manner as in the four year college. When this happens, the junior college forfeits its identity and its opportunity to experiment in the development of a program most appropriate for it [p. 53]."

NEGATIVE OPINIONS

Some writers on educational trends go beyond recognizing that junior colleges have problems, i.e., identity, articulation, what to offer the students as training. The opinion expressed by Devall (1968: 168) "it is my belief that the community-junior college movement, far from being a blessing, may indeed further distort and dilute post-high school education in America" indicates opposition to the junior college. Schwartz (1964) challenges the use of the term college as being improper nomenclature for the two year institutions. The latter suggests that these neighborhood colleges are not colleges at all, but loosely joined series of courses using monies that could be put to more effective use in more traditional school programs.

The junior college, while not a new institution, has grown at a pace since 1960 so as to attract the attention of many groups. In the haste and frequent confusion of developing colleges, conditions may not allow adequate time to determine the attitudes toward the institution. The educational leaders of these colleges are aware of attitudes; thus they should

make an attempt to become cognizant of attitudes toward junior colleges. In the event a negative attitude is held, steps may be taken to determine if this position is based on factual information. College administrators could find where they have neglected to inform pertinent groups as to the programs being offered by their institutions.

COUNSELORS' INFLUENCE ON COLLEGE PLANS

While data reveals the rapid growth of junior colleges since 1960, as well as the attitudes held by many groups, the high school counselors make up a pertinent group that has been largely ignored. Evidence is presented herein that the influence of the counselor upon post-secondary education plans has increased appreciably during these years. If high school counselors do influence the students they contact, junior college administrators should be concerned with the attitudes counselors hold toward the institution.

Much of the research dealing with the influence high school counselors have in the college decision has been based upon the perception of high school seniors or college students. In a study by Roemisch and Schmidt (1962), the high school seniors responding ranked counselors fourth among groups of individuals assisting in selecting a college. Five percent of the seniors named their counselor as being an influence upon college selection. Of high school seniors participating in the research by Kerr (1962), ninety-seven percent decided

upon a specific college while in high school. The high school counselor ranked a distant second behind parent, with eight percent of the respondents listing the counselor as providing assistance in the college decision.

Hoyt (1968) provides data showing the high school counselor a close second to parents as a major influence upon the college selected. This study states that thirty-three percent of the freshmen participating named their counselor as the major influence. Fredrickson and Fonda (1971) found the high school counselor second to parents in providing assistance as to a specific college the student should attend. An attempt was made by this team of researchers to compare their results with the work of Kerr (1962). The conclusion from this comparison was that counselors played a more important role in the college selected by high school students in more recent years than did counselors in 1962.

That the high school counselor is the primary source of information about post-secondary educational opportunity is evidenced by a number of studies (Graff and Peters, 1969; Boyd, 1970; Fredrickson and Fonda, 1971). Being in the position to inform students about educational opportunities does not, however, imply that any influence to select a particular institution is involved. It is this important role, combined with the evidence of an increase in counselor influence and the growth of junior colleges, that provides the basis for this study.

The literature pertaining directly to high school counselors' attitude toward junior colleges appears to be limited. James (1969) assessed the attitudes of Illinois high school counselors toward the junior college. A Likert-type instrument was developed and mailed to a random sample of 300 high school counselors throughout Illinois. The data from respondents resulted in a mean score of 3.67 on a possible 5.00 scale. This score indicated that counselors held a slightly favorable attitude toward junior college. Based on the mean scores of groups, James concluded that counselors most informed about junior college education held a more favorable attitude toward the institution. The recommendations included the suggestion that study may be conducted in other states. This type of study should be valuable in areas where junior colleges have experienced a rapid growth rate, for in these areas the demands imposed by meeting deadlines for new programs, securing plant facilities, and obtaining the services of competent personnel have hardly left the junior college administrator opportunity to determine how the college is being received.

In Texas, the junior college is an old institution when compared to most other states. The changes in programs offered, along with the growth of new colleges since 1960 in Texas, leave the administrator at the helm of a unique educational institution. The attitude held by pertinent groups

toward the junior college should be determined, and the high school counselors appear to be one of the most significant groups.

SUMMARY

Attitude is defined by numerous scholars as the predisposition, or mental state of readiness whereby the human individual will evaluate a social object in a positive or negative manner. The three components of attitudes are the cognitive, the affective, and the conative. Information a person receives about any social object will help develop the cognitive. The affective is the feelings of liking or disliking the object. Behavior exhibited toward the object is the conative. Each component of attitude may vary in direction, degree, intensity, and salience. The dimensions of attitude allow for measurement, for example, indication of agreement or disagreement with statements about a particular social object.

Several techniques of measuring attitude have been developed. A number of methods, of the non-disguised type, reveal the social object to the subject. Disguised techniques attempt to conceal the intent of the study. Some of the non-disguised techniques discussed in this chapter were developed years ago and have been used in numerous investigations. The JCAS was selected for this study and would be classified as a non-disguised technique. Research relevant

to attitude toward the junior college is limited. The works cited include opinion studies which revealed that while many groups held a positive image of the junior college others questioned the variety of programs taken on by the colleges. A few articles expressed a negative opinion toward these institutions.

Counselors are more influential upon the college selection process than ten years ago. This growth in influence upon the college choice by high school students is evident by the research presented. While proof exists that counselors are gaining in this area, the research as to how this group perceives the junior college is quite limited. For a void to exist during a time of rapid expansion of junior colleges leaves a weakness in educational planning for post-secondary programs. This study should assist in identifying the attitude held by counselors. Chapter three presents the conduct of the study.

Chapter 3

CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

Chapter three is concerned with the methodology used in effecting the study. The chapter is presented in four divisions. The first division describes the instrument used in the study. The population and sampling technique is presented in the second division. Procedure followed in conducting the investigation is in the third division. The fourth division discusses the treatment of the data.

THE INSTRUMENT

To assess the attitude held by high school counselors toward junior colleges the Junior College Attitude Survey (Appendix A) was selected. The Junior College Attitude Survey (JCAS) was developed by James (1969: 56) and "members of the Division of Higher Education, University of Illinois," to be used in assessing the attitudes of groups toward the junior college. A review of the literature revealed limited work pertaining to this topic, with the JCAS apparently the one reliable instrument developed for this particular purpose.

A Likert-type scale, the JCAS was constructed from a large pool of items collected from perceptions and opinions of the junior college found by reviewing the literature, interviewing high school counselors, administrators, and

faculty, and examining statements expressed by college students about the junior college. "This pool of items was administered to two groups of high school and junior college counselors attending National Defense Education Act Institutes for Guidance and Counseling at the University of Hawaii and Los Angeles State College (James, 1969, p. 59)." From the responses of the subjects of the two institutes and a panel of judges consisting of junior college educators from the University of Illinois, items were analyzed for clarity and reliability to determine those which best discriminate between groups favorable and unfavorable toward the junior college. The "panel of judges selected ninety-two items to be given in the third pilot study [p. 60]."

A group of 132 junior college students responded to the ninety-two items in the third pilot study. Data collected from this group were statistically analyzed to determine the most discriminating items, as to favorableness-unfavorableness toward the junior college. This is described by James (1969: 61-62) in the following manner. After the total attitude scores were obtained they were plotted to produce a frequency distribution of scores. The 25 percent of the subjects with the lowest total score provide two criterion groups in terms of which to evaluate the individual statements. To evaluate the responses of the high and low groups to the individual statements, the "t" statistic for differences between group

means was used. This value of the "t" statistic was the measure of the extent to which a given statement differentiated between the high and low groups. With differentiating statements ranked according to the "t" value, thirty-nine items were selected for the final instrument. An item analysis method was used to correlate the total score and item scores over all the people. According to James (1969), "the chosen thirty-nine items did show a substantial correlation with the total score, indicating they did elicit different responses for those who score high and those who score low on the total test [p. 62]."

The reliability of the instrument was established by James (1969: 100) through the use of the following techniques. The questionnaire was divided into two half-questionnaires, one containing all the even number items. These two half-questionnaires were correlated using the Pearson Product Moment coefficient of correlation formula. The obtained correlation coefficient of .783 was an estimate of the reliability of the whole questionnaire. The Spearman-Brown formula for a test of twice the length of the half tests was used. This formula gave an estimate of .881 for the reliability of the whole questionnaire.

POPULATION AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUE

The population for this investigation consisted of all counselors serving students enrolled in the senior high

schools of Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties in the State of Texas. This population was ascertained by the counselor's name and school assignment as listed in the 1971-72 Directory of Public School Counselors in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 1972). Copies of the publication were obtained upon request to the Division of Guidance Services of the Texas Education Agency located in Austin, Texas. The directory was organized along the following sequence: Regional Education Service Centers were listed by number; within each region, counties were listed alphabetically; school districts followed an alphabetical order within each respective county. Where more than one high school existed within a school district, and where the individual school had more than one counselor, the alphabetical sequence was utilized.

Due to the numerical arrangement of Regional Education Service Centers, counties selected for this study appear in the directory in the following order: Harris, Dallas, Tarrant, and Bexar. The total population of high school counselors serving these counties was determined to be 519. This number was arrived at by beginning with 001 to represent the first high school counselor in Harris County and continuing numerically through 519 for the last high school counselor listed for Bexar County. Counselors listed as serving in combination junior-senior high schools were included with this group. The sample size was arbitrarily set at twenty-five percent

of the population. Twenty-five percent resulted in a sample of 130 counselors. A random sample was arrived at by having a disinterested party select 130 numbers between 000 and 520 from a table of random numbers (Glass and Stanley, 1970). The random numbers selected were then matched to the corresponding number in the population, thus identifying the sample group.

PROCEDURE

A copy of the Junior College Attitude Survey, instruction sheet (Appendix B), a transmittal letter (Appendix C), and a pre-paid return envelope were mailed to each counselor selected in the sample. This material was mailed in legal size, white envelopes with postal stamps applied by hand. The name of each counselor and his respective school address was typed on the envelopes. Effort was made in the mailing procedure to demonstrate a personal touch and to avoid any indication of mass production. Use of mechanical methods, such as an addressograph machine, gummed labels, or postal meters may have failed to gain the attention of the subject. The transmittal letter explained the purpose of the study, and the reason counselors were selected as a pertinent group, and expressed appreciation for their time and interest. Letterhead paper from the University of Houston, College of Education, was used for the transmittal letter and each copy was signed by the investigator.

The instrument and accompanying answer sheet were professionally printed on light blue paper. An instruction sheet explaining the scoring process was stapled in the position of a cover sheet on the instrument. The format of the answer sheet provided relative ease of marking the respective score selected for each statement in the instrument. A statement was placed near the top of the answer sheet requesting that this form be returned in the pre-paid envelope. The pre-paid return envelopes were professionally printed and addressed to the University of Houston, College of Education, Department of Administration. The survey was mailed on May 1, 1972. Sixty-four percent of the completed answer sheets were returned within three weeks. Due to the response to the mailing, and the approaching termination of the school year, no follow-up mailings or other forms of contacting counselors were attempted.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Each of the answer sheets from the Junior College Attitude Survey were hand scored. The score for each item on the JCAS could range from one for strongly disagree, to five for strongly agree. Adjustments were necessary for some of the individual items, i.e., when a low numeral was marked indicating disagreement with a negative statement, the item was scored at the comparable location in the positive or agree direction. This reverse scoring method was equally

applied where the respondent agreed with a negative statement. The sum of the item scores provided the total score for each respective respondent. Where an item was omitted by a respondent, a score equal to the mean of all the other items on the form was assigned. Mean scores above three indicate a favorable attitude toward junior colleges.

The total score for an answer sheet provides N for a respective subject. Each N was assigned to a particular group according to the identifying mark in the personal data section of the answer sheet. Groups were formed to test each of the hypotheses (Chapter one). Techniques used for testing were the two-tailed t-test or a one-way analysis of variance, depending upon whether a particular null hypothesis involved two, or more than two, groups. Tests for significance were made at the .05 level of significance with the appropriate number of degrees of freedom. Formulas and tables used were those presented by Bruning and Kintz (1968).

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the procedure for the development of the Junior College Attitude Survey was presented. The makeup of the population and method for selection of the sample were described as well as the procedure for distribution of instruments and collection of data. Techniques used in treatment of the data and testing of hypotheses were presented. Results of the study are discussed in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The findings of the statistical analysis of the data are presented in this chapter. The primary purpose of this investigation was to determine whether senior high school counselors hold a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward junior colleges. Seven hypotheses were tested in attempting to identify factors that may influence attitude and each of the respective hypotheses was placed in one of three categories.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Category one, consisting of three hypotheses, pertained to personal characteristics and professional experience of counselors. In category two, the two hypotheses were concerned with the influence of distance from the counselor's school to the nearest comprehensive junior college. This category included the effect of location in a college district as opposed to the counselor's school being outside a junior college district. The third category, including hypotheses six and seven, tested the impact two methods of communication between counselors and junior colleges may have upon the attitude counselors hold. In each of the respective categories the hypotheses will be stated, in null form, followed by a report of the findings in both narrative and tabular form.

Category One

The null hypotheses tested in this category represent an attempt to identify whether certain personal characteristics or professional experiences of high school counselors have influenced their attitude toward junior colleges. This includes when the subjects were last in college, whether male or female, and possible influence of employment outside the field of education.

Hypothesis 1 There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors who were last enrolled in a degree or certificate program: "In 1970 through 1972," "In 1965 through 1969," "In 1960 through 1964," "In 1955 through 1959," "In 1954 or earlier."

The span of time employed in hypothesis one was to examine whether counselors who received their professional training prior to, and during, the rapid growth of junior colleges would give evidence of holding different attitudes. Counselors were grouped by marking the appropriate date listed on the answer sheet (Appendix D). The scores of the five groups were tested by one-way analysis of variance to determine if a significant difference existed between the groups.

Table 1 contains the results of the one-way analysis of variance applied to counselor's scores which were grouped according to most recent year enrolled in college. The F

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS
 GROUPED BY MOST RECENT ENROLLMENT IN A
 DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE PROGRAM.

Categories Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Source of Variance (4)	Sum of Squares (5)	Degrees of Freedom (6)	F Ratio (7)
In 1970 through 1972	26	3.64				
In 1965 through 1969	38	3.93				
In 1960 through 1964	10	4.11				
In 1955 through 1959	6	3.87				
In 1954 or earlier	3	4.06				
			Between	3209	4	
			Within	26964	78	2.32
			Total	30173	82	N. S. .05

value of 2.32, with df of 4 and 78, was not significant at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis was not rejected. With a maximum score of 5.00 on the JCAS the mean scores of each group were favorable, with the lowest score of 3.64, coming from counselors who were last enrolled in a certificate of degree program in 1970 through 1972.

Hypothesis 2 There is no significant difference between male high school counselors and female high school counselors in their attitude toward junior colleges.

Based upon an assumption that female counselors may consider the junior college too technical or vocational oriented, hypothesis two was included to compare the attitudes of males with females. The data in Table 2 show the scores of the male counselors resulted in a mean score of 3.83 on the attitude scale with a standard deviation of .54. Female counselors had a mean score of 3.88 with a standard deviation of .45. The two-tailed t-test showed no significant difference at the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3 There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors who have been employed full time, for a minimum of six consecutive months, outside the education profession and those who have been employed only in education.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES FOR MALE
COUNSELORS WITH FEMALE COUNSELORS

Groups Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Standard Deviation (4)	Degrees of Freedom (5)	t (6)
Male	33	3.23	.54	81	0.51
Female	50	3.88	.45	N. S.	.05

Counselors were placed in one of two groups according to their response to a criterion item on the personal data section of the answer sheet. In this hypothesis the two-tailed t-test was used to determine if a significant difference existed between counselors who had a variety of employment experiences and those who had served in the field of education alone. Work experience outside may have exposed the former group of counselors to a greater number of job opportunities for which the junior college could provide the training. A mean score of 3.87 on the attitude scale with a standard deviation of .52 was determined for counselors who had worked outside the field of education. Those counselors who had spent their entire career in education provided a mean score of 3.84 with a standard deviation of .44. The null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level of significance based upon a t value of .22. Table 3 contains the data pertinent to this hypothesis.

Differences in high school counselors' attitude toward junior colleges between the groups in category one were not found to be significant. The date a counselor was last enrolled in a degree or certificate program, whether a counselor is male or female, and the past employment experience of a counselor did not prove to be significant influences on attitude toward junior college. Mean scores for all groups expressed a favorable attitude. The lowest mean score for a group was

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES FOR COUNSELORS
WHO HAVE WORKED OUTSIDE EDUCATION WITH THOSE
WHO HAVE WORKED IN EDUCATION ONLY

Groups Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Standard Deviation (4)	Degrees of Freedom (5)	t (6)
Outside Experience	52	3.87	.52	31	.22
Education Only	31	3.84	.44		
				N.S.	.05

counselors who were last enrolled in a degree or certificate program in 1970 through 1972. A mean score of 4.11 was the highest (most favorable) made by the group of counselors last enrolled in a degree or certificate program in 1960 through 1964. The remaining groups compared against the null hypotheses within this category reflected a favorable attitude with group mean scores in a range of 3.83 to 4.06.

Category Two

Hypotheses four and five, which make up this category, relate to the distance from the counselor's school assignment to the nearest junior college and whether or not that high school is located in a junior college district. With the rapid development of junior colleges, the distance many students travel in commuting has been reduced. The distance factor may then influence the attitude held by counselors.

When counselors serve in a senior high school located in a junior college district, this fact may influence their attitude. The students from the counselor's school will normally pay lower tuition rates than out-of-district, thus assuring more ease in attendance from a financial standpoint. Counselors from a high school located within a junior college district may also live in the district and therefore may be influenced by several factors. Among these factors are acquaintance with members of the faculty, familiarity

with the facilities of the college, and a feeling of partnership as a taxpayer to the local junior college.

Hypothesis 4 There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose high school is: "Less than ten miles," "Eleven to fifteen miles," "Sixteen to twenty miles," "Over twenty miles" away from the nearest junior college.

As shown by the data in Table 4, distance is not an influence upon the attitude held by counselors. Based upon the findings from the one-way analysis, null hypothesis number four was not rejected. The mean score of groups, while not statistically significant, was highest for the group furthest from a junior college. Data for this hypothesis may have been too limited due to the population's being located within counties with junior colleges. While a junior college does exist within each county, several senior high schools in the population are more than twenty miles from the nearest college.

Hypothesis 5 There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose high schools are in a junior college district and those whose high schools are not in a junior college district.

Results of the test of hypothesis five are presented in Table 5. The group of counselors employed in a high school

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORE OF COUNSELORS
 GROUPED BY HIGH SCHOOL'S DISTANCE
 FROM A JUNIOR COLLEGE

Categories Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Source of Variance (4)	Sum of Squares (5)	Degrees of Freedom (6)	F Ratio (7)
Less than 10 miles	60	3.87				
11 to 15 miles	12	3.81				
16 to 20 miles	5	3.76				
Over 20 miles	6	3.96				
			Between	228	3	
			Within	29945	79	.2
			Total	30173	82	N.S. .05

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS
 WHOSE SCHOOLS ARE LOCATED IN A JUNIOR COLLEGE
 DISTRICT WITH THOSE WHO ARE NOT

Groups Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Standard Deviation (4)	Degrees of Freedom (5)	t (6)
In District	09	3.90	.50	81	1.64
Not In District	14	3.66	.38	N.S.	.05

located within a junior college district had a mean score of 3.90 with a standard deviation of .50. Counselors whose high schools were not located within a junior college district provided a mean score of 3.66 with a standard deviation of .38.

The counselor population, from which the sample for this study was selected, consisted of the high school counselors employed in the public schools of the four Texas counties of Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant. Two of the counties, Dallas and Tarrant, have county-wide junior college districts. The other two counties have one or more junior college districts. This distribution of junior college districts, as well as the distances involved for students to commute to the various campuses, prompted the inclusion of hypotheses four and five in the study.

The t-test of differences between the group of high school counselors employed in a junior college district and those employed in a high school outside a junior college district does not permit rejection of null hypothesis five. Nevertheless, the counselors whose high schools were located in a junior college district appear to have a more positive attitude toward junior colleges. James (1969) found, "that a high school counselor whose high school is located in a junior college district will be significantly more favorable toward junior colleges than a counselor whose high school is not located in a junior college district [p. 96]."

In Texas, the local taxpayer within a junior college district pays an ad valorem tax on real property toward support of the college. Students living in a junior college district pay lower fees to attend than students from outside the district. This combination of tax support and lower fees for local students could influence counselors to hold a more favorable attitude toward the junior college.

Category Three

The two null hypotheses included in category three dealt with communications between junior college personnel and high school counselors. In Mills' (1969) study the group with least accurate information about junior colleges held a poorer image of the institutions. In addition to a college catalog mailed to high school counselors, a personal visit by an informed representative of the junior college may influence the counselor's attitude. With this information the high school counselor may be able to clear up questions about opportunities afforded students by the junior college. A visit of this type could give further recognition of the important role counselors have in providing accurate information to their student counselees.

High school counselors may also be influenced by their personal visits to junior college campuses. College personnel may find visitation by counselors a worthwhile opportunity to present their programs. Such visitation may influence the

attitude held by high school counselors toward junior colleges. In order to test the influence these two forms of communications have upon the favorableness or unfavorableness of the high school counselor's attitude toward junior colleges, hypotheses six and seven were included.

Hypothesis 6 There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose schools have been visited by junior college representatives and those whose schools have not been visited.

Sixty-five counselors reported visits to their schools by junior college representatives. The mean score of the group that was visited was 3.88 with a standard deviation of .83. The mean score for the eighteen counselors that had not been visited was 3.80 with a standard deviation of .36. Null hypothesis six was not rejected, based upon a non-significant t-test score of .36. Table 6 includes the data from this test.

Hypothesis 7 There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between high school counselors who have visited a junior college where their graduates attend and those who have not visited a junior college their graduates attend.

Null hypothesis seven was not rejected at the .05 level. Counselors who had visited junior colleges where their

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS WHOSE
HIGH SCHOOL HAS BEEN VISITED BY JUNIOR COLLEGE
REPRESENTATIVES AND THOSE WHOSE SCHOOL HAS
NOT BEEN VISITED BY REPRESENTATIVES

Groups Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Standard Deviation (4)	Degrees of Freedom (5)	t (6)
Visited	65	3.88	.83		
				81	.36
Not Visited	18	3.80	.36		
				N.S.	.05

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES OF COUNSELORS
WHO HAVE VISITED JUNIOR COLLEGES WHERE THE
GRADUATES OF THEIR HIGH SCHOOLS ATTEND AND
THOSE WHO HAVE NOT VISITED

Groups Compared (1)	Number (2)	Mean Total Score (3)	Standard Deviation (4)	Degrees of Freedom (5)	t (6)
Visited Colleges	67	3.87	.52	81	.47
Not Visited Colleges	16	3.81	.39	N.S.	.05

graduates attend returned a mean score of 3.87 with a standard deviation of .52. The group of counselors who had not visited a junior college returned a mean score of 3.81 with a standard deviation of .39.

While none of the seven null hypotheses forming the three categories was rejected, the basic purpose of the study was accomplished. The study was conducted to determine whether high school counselors held a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward junior colleges. The mean score of all 83 respondents, representing 64 percent returns, was 3.86 with a standard deviation of .49. With a mean score of 3.86 on the JCAS, which has a range of one to five, the attitude of the counselors toward junior colleges was found to be favorable.

SUMMARY

The seven null hypotheses for the study were placed in three categories. Each of the hypotheses was tested by an appropriate statistical technique, either the two-tailed t-test or the one-way analysis of variance, at the .05 level of significance.

In all three categories the null hypotheses were not rejected. While mean scores of sub-groups did vary from a low of 3.64 to a high of 4.11, when tested in their respective groups none proved to be significant. Chapter five will include the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to determine whether high school counselors from metropolitan centers of Texas hold a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward junior colleges, and if certain factors could be identified which relate to the attitudes held.

In chapter one the rapid growth of junior colleges since 1960 was cited. While junior colleges have grown, as evidenced by enrolling greater percentages of the post-secondary students each year, limited research had been conducted with regard to the attitude pertinent groups held toward these colleges. Based upon a review of the literature, senior high school counselors were selected as the most influential professional group assisting students with post-secondary plans.

The research reviewed in chapter two revealed that the attitudes held by various groups in society toward educational institutions have been of concern. Studies that dealt with the images of the junior college as perceived by voter, faculty, and student groups were among those identified. Even though administrators of an educational institution may believe the college is providing an excellent program for

its clientele, effort should be made to determine the attitudes held toward the institution. Even though high school counselors would not be considered among the clientele of a junior college, they serve the high school student at a time in life when decisions about college are made. Studies cited in chapter two identified the high school counselor as being second to the parents as the most influential in the selection of a college.

The population for this investigation consisted of all counselors in the public senior high schools of Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties of Texas. These are the four most populous counties in the State, containing the cities of San Antonio, Dallas, Houston, and Fort Worth. Membership of this population was ascertained by the counselor's name, and school assignment, being listed in the 1971-72 Directory of Public School Counselors in Texas (Texas Education Agency, 1972). From this population of 519 counselors, a sample of 130 was randomly selected and subsequently requested to take part in the study. Each counselor selected for the sample group was mailed the survey materials consisting of a transmittal letter, the instrument, an answer sheet, and a pre-paid return envelope. Within three weeks after the mailing, eighty-three usable answer sheets were returned. The number returned represented sixty-four percent of the sample group.

Each answer sheet was tabulated to arrive at a composite score for each subject. Where a positive statement received a "strongly agree" response on the answer sheet, a weight of five (5) was assigned as the score for that item. An "agree" response was assigned a four (4), an "undecided" a three (3), a "disagree" a two (2), and a "strongly disagree" response a weight of one (1). For negative statements this numerical weighting was reversed for each response, i.e., "strongly agree" was assigned a weight of one (1), a "strongly disagree" was assigned a weight of five (5). These composite scores were then grouped according to the criterion items which the respondents marked in the personal data section of the answer sheets. The appropriate statistical technique was then performed, using these scores to test the seven null hypotheses included in the investigation.

The null hypotheses tested in the study were grouped into three categories. Category one contained hypotheses one through three, all of which pertain to personal characteristics and professional experience of the counselors.

1. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors who were last enrolled in a degree or certificate program: "In 1970 through 1972"; "In 1965 through 1969"; "In 1960 through 1964"; "In 1955 through 1959"; "In 1954 or earlier."

2. There is no significant difference between male high school counselors and female high school counselors in their attitude toward junior colleges.

3. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors who have been employed full time, for a minimum of six consecutive months, outside the education profession and those who have been employed only in education.

Hypotheses four and five, placed in the second category, pertained to distance from the counselor's high school to the nearest junior college and also, whether the counselor's school was located in a junior college district.

4. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose high school is: "Less than ten miles"; "Eleven to fifteen miles"; "Sixteen to twenty miles"; "Over twenty miles" away from the nearest junior college.

5. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose high schools are in a junior college district and those whose high schools are not in a junior college district.

In the third category, consisting of hypotheses six and seven, the impact of two methods of communications were tested in an attempt to ascertain any measurable influence upon counselor attitudes.

6. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between those high school counselors whose schools have been visited by junior college representatives and those whose schools have not been visited.

7. There is no significant difference in attitude toward junior colleges between high school counselors who have visited a junior college where their graduates attend and those who have not visited a junior college their graduates attend.

Where two groups were compared the two-tailed t-test was applied. When the null hypothesis involved more than two groups the one-way analysis of variance was used. Test for significant difference was done at the .05 level, and a contributing reason for no rejections was the consistently favorable attitudes held by counselors in this population.

The group responding to this study revealed that high school counselors hold favorable attitudes toward junior colleges. Mean score of the total group was 3.86 on a scale where 5.00 represents the maximum score attainable. This mean score, coupled with a standard deviation of .49, which reveals that a small number of counselors differed from the total group, provides evidence of the positive attitudes held toward junior colleges. The mean score of the group in this investigation compares well with the group mean of 3.67, on the same 5.00 scale, for the group of Illinois counselors in James (1969:98) study.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon a review of the literature on this topic and the findings of this investigation, the following conclusions are presented.

Junior colleges are experiencing rapid growth in both student enrollment and number of campuses. During the decade of 1960 to 1970, junior college enrollment in the United States tripled, and by 1970 more students enrolled as freshmen in junior colleges than in four-year institutions. This growth rate has not taken place without gaining the attention of various groups in society which influence the growth and development of junior colleges.

The attitudes held by numerous groups toward the junior college have been the subject of research efforts. Studies have been made of high school seniors, junior college students who have transferred to four year colleges, and registered voters in efforts to ascertain the attitudes these groups hold toward junior colleges. While most research reveals a favorable attitude, evidence is available that a lack of communication and that insufficient information about junior college programs did exist. The literature also reveals that some authorities question the comprehensive nature of junior and community colleges as possibly having a diluting or weakening effect on the programs. Some critics were discovered

as holding unfavorable attitudes, even challenging the claim that junior colleges are institutions of higher education.

While evidence was presented in chapter two that the influence of high school counselors upon the college selected by their counselees has increased in recent years, limited research was discovered concerning counselor attitude toward the various types of colleges. This investigation revealed that high school counselors in Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant Counties in the State of Texas hold favorable attitudes toward junior colleges.

Junior college officials should endeavor to keep high school counselors, an important group of professionals, informed and to solicit their advice when developing new programs for the junior college. Findings of this study reveal that high school counselors serving in the afore-named counties can be looked upon as friends of the junior college, and junior college personnel would profit in attempting to further cultivate and hold the support of this influential group.

The conclusions stated are based on the assumption that the counselor's responses to the Junior College Attitude Survey reflect their real attitudes toward the junior college.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations made in this section are based upon the findings of this study, the investigator's interpretation

of the literature, and from contacts with high school counselors and junior college officials. In addition to the recommendations, more specific suggestions for further research will be included near the close of the section.

Junior college officials should make every effort to maintain the quality program now being provided, as this level of program has apparently been viewed favorably by high school counselors. When changes in the existing program are anticipated, planning could be strengthened by having high school counselors serve in an advisory capacity. In such a position the counselors could provide information pertaining to the interest of prospective students who are still in high school; the counselor would become more informed about the new program; and the counselor's attitude should become more favorable toward the junior college.

Junior college officials should encourage visitation to their campuses by high school counselors. While the findings of this study did not indicate an effect upon attitude by visits, the counselor would gain further understanding of the program offerings of the junior college. A more thorough understanding of the program should assist the counselor in working with their respective counselees.

Junior college officials should be concerned about the personality of the representatives sent to visit high school counselors. The high standard deviation among the counselors visited (Table 6, p. 68) indicated a wide range

of reactions to either the junior college, the timing of the visit, or possibly the personality of the college's representative. Visits should be made to counselors serving in high schools within the immediate vicinity of the college as well as visits to counselors located a considerable distance away from the college. College officials have on occasion ignored the "local" high school counselors due to oversight, an assumption the local counselor was adequately informed, or an assumption the local counselor was loyal to the college.

Counselors should recognize their responsibility to the high school student seeking information about post secondary institutions. Research cited in Chapter 2 reveals the increased influence counselors have acquired regarding the educational planning of their counselees. This gain in influence requires counselors to maintain current information on a multiplicity of opportunities offered by institutions in order to help students select a college and program that will accommodate his or her plans. In the event the institutions fail to provide the necessary information, counselors should initiate the action to gain this insight.

The following suggestions are made for further research. Attitude surveys may be taken to assess other relevant groups' attitudes toward junior colleges. Among high schools the attitudes of seniors, parents, administrators, and teachers may be of interest to junior college officials.

In attempts to determine attitudes, other groups having association with junior colleges should not be overlooked. Junior college students, former students, parents of junior college students, and junior college faculty hold attitudes which should be ascertained from time to time. University and college admissions officers, registrars, and professors in senior institutions hold opinions which should be determined by junior college planners and evaluators.

Community groups' attitudes toward junior colleges could be determined with a similar type of study. Surveys may include registered voters, members of the chambers of commerce in selected communities, and members of other civic organizations. Groups such as manufacturers' associations, organized labor, and taxpayer associations could be checked in order to determine their respective group attitudes toward junior colleges.

Comparisons could be made between the attitudes toward junior colleges held by various groups. The attitudes of high school counselors in a junior college district could be contrasted with those further removed from any junior college district. While a statistically significant difference was not found between counselors in a district versus those outside a junior college district, the t-score indicated that this issue could be one to pursue in other studies. A more sensitive instrument may reveal that persons living or working

in a junior college district do hold more favorable attitudes toward "their" college.

Further research on attitudes toward junior colleges could be conducted using other types of instruments. Investigations could be directed toward specific programs offered by junior colleges, i.e., the transfer program, technical, and continuing education. Junior college officials could determine the attitudes held by various groups toward a particular program, thus ascertaining where perceived strengths and weaknesses exist. When a program is ranked weak, either the program could be strengthened or more thorough information describing the program could be disseminated.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. Attitude. In C. Murchison (Ed.), A handbook of social psychology. Worcester: Clark University Press, 1935.
- Anderson, L. R. & Fishbein, M. Prediction of attitude from the number, strength, and evaluative aspect of beliefs about the attitude object. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 437-443.
- Baldwin, J. M. Dictionary of philosophy and psychology. Vol. 1. New York: Macmillan, 1901.
- Beasley, W. S. Faculty attitudes toward the California community college. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 72-5560.
- Bernard, L. L. Encyclopedia of the social sciences. Vol. 2. New York: Macmillan, 1930.
- Bogardus, E. S. Measuring social distances. Journal of Applied sociology, 1925, 9, 299-308.
- Bogardus, E. S. Fundamentals of social psychology. New York: Century, 1931.
- Boyd, E. V. Reaction of first year college students to their high school guidance programs. (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970, No. 70-457.

- Brady, W. J. A comparison of the academic performances of native students and junior college transfer students in the colleges of agriculture, business, and education at the University of Georgia. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 72-16, 921.
- Brick, P. Two plus two. *Junior College Journal*. 1967, 38(2), 25-29.
- Bruning, J. L. & Kintz, B. L. Computational handbook of statistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1968.
- Campbell, D. T. The indirect assessment of social attitudes. Psychological Bulletin, 1950, 47, 15-38.
- Chave, E. J. A new type scale for measuring attitudes. Religious Education, 1928, Vol. 23.
- Classen, A. C. Factors that deter high school graduates from continuing their education in a junior college district. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1965, No. 65-14, 033.
- Davis, B. H. The community junior college experience as perceived by students who have withdrawn. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970, No. 71-12, 743.
- DeFleur, M. L. & Westie, F. R. Verbal attitude and overt acts: An experiment on the salience of attitude. American Sociological Review, 1958, 23, 667-673.

- DeVall, W. B. Community college: A dissenting view. Educational Record, 1968, Spring, 168-176.
- Droba, D. D. The nature of attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4, 444-463.
- Eby, Frederick. Shall we have a system of public junior colleges in Texas. Texas Outlook, 1927, 11(5), 20-24.
- Edwards, A. L. & Kilpatrick, F. P. A technique for the construction of attitude scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32, 374-384.
- Eells, W. C. The junior college. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.
- Epperson, D. C. Counseling junior college bound students. The Journal of the Association of College Admissions Counselors, 1967, 12(3), 6-9.
- Festinger, L., Bock, K., Schachter, S., Kelly, H. H., & Thibour, T. Theory and experiment in social communications. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1950.
- Fishbein, M. & Raven, B. H. The A B scales: An operational definition of beliefs and attitudes. Human Relations, 15, 35-45.
- Fitzgerald, J. S. Faculty views of the California public junior college. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1964, No. 64-12, 464.
- Fredrickson, R. H. & Fonda, T. College admissions assistance by secondary school counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 49, 383-389.

- Fryer, T. V. An investigation of registered voter opinions concerning the community college as an educational institution in a Northern California junior college district. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1967, No. 69-14, 887.
- Garrison, R. H. Junior college faculty: Issues and problems: a preliminary national survey. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Glass, G. V. & Stanley, J. C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Gleazer, E. J. The junior college. College and University Business, 1964, 37(2), 62-67.
- Gleazer, E. J. This is the community college. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Graff, R. W. & Peters, D. E. Junior college freshmen view secondary guidance received in college selection. Journal of Secondary Education, 1969, 44, 271-276.
- Griffith, C. R. The junior college in Illinois. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1945.
- Guilford, J. P. Racial preference of 1000 American university students. Journal of Social Psychology, 1931, 2, 179-209.
- Halloran, J. D. Attitudes: Formation and change. Leicester, England: Leicester University Press, 1967.
- Harper, B. H. Beliefs held by selected groups regarding the North Carolina community college system. (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970, 71-5147.

Havighurst, R. J. Social change and the community college.

The North Central Quarterly, 1967, 41, 421-428.

Heide, E. E. They came for the best reasons: Some aspects of student choice and satisfaction at two-year colleges in Southwestern Pennsylvania. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburg) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970, No. 71-8776.

Hickok, H. Ask junior college parents what they think. Junior College Journal, 1964, 35(3), 25-29.

Hovland, C. & Sherif, M. Judgement phenomena and scales of attitude measurement: Item displacement in Thurstone scales. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 822-832.

Horowitz, E. L. & Horowitz, R. E. Development of social attitudes in children. Sociometry, 1938, 1, 301-338.

Hoyt, D. P. Description and prediction of diversity among junior colleges. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 48, 997-1004.

Hutchinson, N. S. Faculty image of the junior college. Junior College Journal, 1963, 34(1), 14-15.

James, G. A. The assessment of attitudes of Illinois public high school counselors toward the junior college. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 70-887.

Jennings, F. G. The two-year stretch. Change, 1970, 2(2), 15-25. Junior College Journal, 1972, 42,(6), 12-14.

Junior College Journal, 1972, 42,(7), 25-26.

- Katz, D. The functional approach to the study of attitudes. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960, 24, 163-204.
- Katz, D. & Stotland, E. A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change. In S. Kock (Ed.), Psychology A Study of a Science. New York: McGraw-Hill, Vol. 3, 1959.
- Kerr, W. Student perceptions of counselor role in the college decision. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 337-342.
- Kloeppel, M. C. The difference between certain high school seniors' perceptions of the community college. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970, No. 70-26, 578.
- Koos, L. V. The junior college. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R., & Ballachey, E. I. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Likert, R. A technique for the measurement of attitude. Archives of Psychology, 1932, No. 140, 1-55.
- Lynes, R. How good are the junior colleges? Harper's Magazine, 1966, 223(11), 53-60.
- McDavid, J. W. & Harari, H. Social psychology. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Meany, G. Labor and the community college. Junior College Journal, 1964, 34(5), 6-8.
- Nedsker, L. L. The junior college: Progress and prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

- Mills, E. D. Determining the image of a community college held by voters. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 70-4516.
- Murphy, G., Murphy, L. E., & Newcomb, T. M. Experimental social psychology. (Rev. ed.) New York: Harper Bros., 1937.
- Nelson, E. Attitude: Their nature and development. The Journal of General Psychology, 1939, 21, 367-436.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Peak, H. Attitudes and motivation. In L. R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1955.
- Prohansky, H. A projective method for the study of attitudes. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 373-395.
- Roemmich, H. & Schmidt, J. Student perception of assistance provided by counselors in college planning. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 157-158.
- Rosenberg, M. & Hovland, C. Attitude, organization, and change. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Rotter, J. B. & Willerman, B. The incomplete sentences tests as a method of studying personality. Journal Consulting Psychologist, 1947, 11, 43-48.
- Schwartz, B. Is it really higher education? Saturday Review, 1964, 47, 52-54.
- Seeman, M. Moral judgment: A study in racial frames of reference. American Sociological Review, 1947, 12, 404-411.

- Sherif, C. & Sherif, M. Attitude, ego-involvement, and change.
New York: J. Wiley, 1967.
- Sherif, M. & Cantril, H. The psychology of attitudes.
Psychological Review, 1945, 52, 295-319.
- Smith, D. H. Assessing the image of a community college held by high school seniors. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 70-4523.
- Smith, P. C. Reactions of former junior college students to junior and senior college experiences. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 71-18, 554.
- Suchman, E. A. The intensity component in attitude and opinion research. In S. A. Stouffer (Ed.), Measurement and Prediction. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Texas Education Agency. 1971-72 Directory of public school counselors in Texas, 1972.
- Thurstone, L. L. Attitude can be measured. American Journal of Sociology, 1928, 33, 529-554.
- Thurstone, L. L. & Chave, E. J. A measurement of attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Toll, G. B. Voluntary support of California public junior colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, L. A.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1966, No. 66-6826.

- Triandis, H. C. Exploratory factor analysis of the behavioral component of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 420-430.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Projection of educational statistics to 1979-80. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Weschler, I. R. An investigation of attitude toward labor and management by means of the error-choice method. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 50, 51-62.

APPENDIX A
JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY

JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY

<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Un'ecided</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>
1	2	3	4	5

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

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

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

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

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

APPENDIX B
INSTRUCTION SHEET

JUNIOR COLLEGE ATTITUDE SURVEY INSTRUCTION SHEET

Junior and community colleges are undergoing rapid development at the present time in Texas. This growth is especially noticeable in the more populous counties. The direction and rate of development will be somewhat dependent upon the attitudes and beliefs relevant groups hold regarding these colleges.

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

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

If you strongly agree with an item, mark the five (5). Mark the four (4) if you agree with the item. Mark the three (3) if you feel undecided about the item. Mark the two (2) if you disagree with the item. Mark the one (1) if you strongly disagree with the item.

Please use the blank space at the end of the questionnaire for any comments you care to make regarding junior colleges or this questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and interest in this study.

APPENDIX C
TRANSITTAL LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

CULLEN BOULEVARD

HOUSTON, TEXAS 77004

May 4, 1972

98

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Dear Counselor,

Junior colleges are growing at a fast rate though little evidence has been compiled about how these colleges are perceived by pertinent groups. The study I have undertaken is to look at the attitudes high school counselors hold toward junior colleges. Information provided by your response to the enclosed questionnaire is vital to the research.

Counselors were selected to work with due to the professional growth of this group in recent years. Evidence appearing in the literature at this time leads one to appreciate the guidance work counselors are now doing in assisting students with their post secondary plans.

I am requesting a few minutes of your busy day. The enclosed questionnaire can be completed in ten to fifteen minutes. As you were randomly selected to take part in this study it is most important that I receive your completed answer sheet at the earliest possible date.

I thank you for your willingness to take part.

Sincerely,

James J. Lewis

APPENDIX D
PERSONAL DATA SHEET

PERSONAL DATA SHEET

The following information is needed to give meaning to the responses you have made on this questionnaire. All of the information asked for will be used in group analysis. No attempt will be made to identify individuals, or to make individual assessment. Your response to this form will remain confidential.

Please continue to mark your responses on the answer sheet, starting with number 41. Blacken the box which corresponds to the number of your response.

41. Sex: 1. Male
2. Female
42. Highest degree earned:
1. Bachelors
2. Masters
3. Doctorate
43. What year listed below is nearest the last date in which you were enrolled in a degree or certificate program at a college or university?
1. 1972
2. 1967
3. 1962
4. 1957
5. Before 1954
44. Approximately how far is your high school from the nearest comprehensive junior college? (NCTE: A junior college offering an evening program only would not qualify as a comprehensive junior college)
1. Less than 10 miles
2. 11 to 15 miles
3. 16 to 20 miles
4. Over 20 miles
45. Does your high school receive regular visits from junior college representatives with information concerning their programs?
1. Yes
2. No
46. Have you had the opportunity to visit any of the junior colleges which your graduates attend?
1. Yes
2. No

47. Is your high school located in a junior college district?
1. Yes
 2. No
48. Have you had the opportunity to take a course focusing on junior college education?
1. Yes
 2. No
49. Have you ever been employed on a full time basis, for a minimum of six consecutive months, outside the education profession?
1. Yes
 2. No

Comments regarding junior colleges on this questionnaire:

APPENDIX E
ANSWER SHEET

Please mark the bracket of your choice. Return this form in the prepaid envelope enclosed. Thank you for your time and interest.

	1	2	3	4	5
1.	()	()	()	()	()
2.	()	()	()	()	()
3.	()	()	()	()	()
4.	()	()	()	()	()
5.	()	()	()	()	()
6.	()	()	()	()	()
7.	()	()	()	()	()
8.	()	()	()	()	()
9.	()	()	()	()	()
10.	()	()	()	()	()
11.	()	()	()	()	()
12.	()	()	()	()	()
13.	()	()	()	()	()
14.	()	()	()	()	()
15.	()	()	()	()	()
16.	()	()	()	()	()
17.	()	()	()	()	()
18.	()	()	()	()	()
19.	()	()	()	()	()
20.	()	()	()	()	()
21.	()	()	()	()	()
22.	()	()	()	()	()
23.	()	()	()	()	()
24.	()	()	()	()	()
25.	()	()	()	()	()
26.	()	()	()	()	()
27.	()	()	()	()	()
28.	()	()	()	()	()
29.	()	()	()	()	()
30.	()	()	()	()	()
31.	()	()	()	()	()
32.	()	()	()	()	()
33.	()	()	()	()	()
34.	()	()	()	()	()
35.	()	()	()	()	()
36.	()	()	()	()	()
37.	()	()	()	()	()
38.	()	()	()	()	()
39.	()	()	()	()	()
41.	()	()	()	()	()
42.	()	()	()	()	()
43.	()	()	()	()	()
44.	()	()	()	()	()
45.	()	()	()	()	()
46.	()	()	()	()	()
47.	()	()	()	()	()
48.	()	()	()	()	()
49.	()	()	()	()	()

Write your comments about this study in this space. Your suggestions will be appreciated.

Please continue according to instructions on personal data sheet.