MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

The professional preparation of community college faculty in the Northwest
by Robert Wayne Harsha

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
Montana State University
© Copyright by Robert Wayne Harsha (1978)

Abstract:
In this study, the responses to 718 mailed questionnaires returned from faculty and administrators at 59 community colleges in eight states in the northwest were analyzed. The purpose of the study was to obtain and analyze data about the academic training and experience of respondents and to obtain data concerning the professional preparation and desired qualifications of community college faculty.

Five percent of the faculty had no degree, 26.8% had less than a masters, 56.5% had a masters, and 11.3% had a doctorate. Respondents had taken an average of 10.9 courses in education. Nearly half of the administrators and 38.1% of the faculty had taught in the secondary schools. Ten percent of the faculty teaching in terminal programs, 29.1% of the faculty teaching in transfer programs, and 26.7% of the administrators had taught in four—year colleges. Approximately one fourth of the respondents had non-teaching work experience. One administrator in ten and l8.4% of the faculty had no experience at any college or position other than the present one. Respondents had been at their present schools an average of eight years and in their present positions six and one half years. Nearly twenty percent of the respondents were currently taking courses which would lead to a higher degree, and another twenty-five percent planned to do so at a later date.

Over ninety percent of the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with their present positions. Nearly three fourths of the respondents would choose their present school as a first choice of place of employment.

The training recommended for faculty was the same for faculty teaching in terminal and transfer programs. An in-service program was the recommended training for 26 of 37 skills. The five skills ranked as most important were: teaching techniques, motivating students, how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, learning theory and its application for adults, and teaching to community college students. These were all methods skills.

The desired qualifications were: a bachelors degree in a subject field for faculty teaching in terminal programs and a masters in a subject field for faculty teaching in transfer programs, professional or trade certification for all faculty, a teaching internship and teaching experience in a community college, and membership in professional organizations for all faculty.

Faculty and administrators all had similar views of the training needs of both types of faculty. Administrators were not hiring people with the training they suggested and in-service programs were not being provided to meet the training needs. Approximately half of the respondents had received training in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas.

THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY IN THE NORTHWEST

by

ROBERT WAYNE HARSHA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Approved:

John W. Kohl
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Eric Stoknuyk
Head, Major Department

Henry L. Parsons
Graduate Dean

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

December, 1978

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wants to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the many people who helped make this project possible. Dr. John Kohl and Dr. Al Suvak were especially helpful in providing stimulating ideas and encouragement. They willingly went above and beyond the call of duty to make themselves available despite the odd hours and short deadlines the Air Force obligation necessitated. The other members of the committee, Dr. Robert Thibeault, Dr. Earl Ringo, Dr. Henry Worrest, and Dr. Jack Jelinski, were also helpful, offering professional advice and assistance and were tolerant of the odd hours situations.

The assistance of the personnel at the Montana State University computer center was invaluable in completing the project. The author wishes to acknowledge the patience and cooperation of Mrs. Helen Tucker who typed the manuscript.

The writer is indebted to many friends and neighbors who licked, stuffed and stamped envelopes. Finally, the author's wife, Heidi, deserves the greatest credit for her love, patience, tolerance, and encouragement throughout the project. Her help in typing the drafts and constant support have made the project possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

VITA ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES viii

ABSTRACT xxi

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

SETTING 1

NEED FOR THE STUDY 9

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 11

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED 12

GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING DATA 13

DEFINITION OF TERMS 15

LIMITATIONS 16

DELIMITATIONS 17

SUMMARY 17

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 18

INTRODUCTION 18

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE 20

TRAITS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY 23

PROBLEMS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY 27

CHAPTER

Page

HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED 29

DESIRABLE ACADEMIC DEGREE 36

DESIRABLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE 43

EXPERIENCE AS A JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT 44

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION 46

PREPARATION PROGRAMS 49

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS 51

IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS 60

SUMMARY 62

3. PROCEDURES 65

INTRODUCTION 65

POPULATION DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE 65

QUESTIONNAIRE 68

Development 68
Validation 68
Data Obtained 69

DATA COLLECTION 71

STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES 73

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS 75

ANALYSIS OF DATA 77

PRECAUTIONS TAKEN FOR ACCURACY 77

SUMMARY 77

CHAPTER Page

4. RESULTS AND FINDINGS 79

INTRODUCTION 79

THE POPULATION 79

Enrollment, Faculty, Administrators 79
The Sample 81
The Responses 83

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 88

State 89
Administrator/Faculty Groups 89
Part-time/Full-time 92
Highest Degree Attained 95
Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student 102
Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree 106
Teaching Experience 112
Length of Service 122
Supervised Teaching Experience 135
Number of Courses in Education 143
Degree of Satisfaction 150
Choice of Employment 156
Summary 163

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION 166

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS 190

SUMMARY 208

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTHER STUDY 211

SUMMARY 211

Purpose Of The Study 211
Background 212
Methodology 214
Findings Of The Study 216

CHAPTER Page

CONCLUSIONS 220

THE MODEL 222

IMPLICATIONS 224

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY 227

APPENDIX A 230

APPENDIX B 235

APPENDIX C 238

APPENDIX D 240

APPENDIX E 245

APPENDIX F 250

APPENDIX G 254

APPENDIX H 259

APPENDIX I 288

APPENDIX J 299

BIBLIOGRAPHY 326

LIST OF TABLES

1. Highest Degree Attained by Junior College Faculty. . . . 30

2. Teaching Experience of Junior College Faculty 39

3. Faculty With Experience as a Junior College Student. . . 45

4. Professional Preparation of Community College Faculty. . 48

5. Overview of Courses Recommended 53

6. The Community College: It's Functions, Organization, and History 54

7. Characteristics of Community College Students 55

8. Principles of Counseling and Guidance 56

9. Educational Psychology of Junior College Students . . . 56

10. Techniques of Teaching 57

11. Learning Theory 57

12. Curriculum Development 58

13. Evaluation 58

14. Teaching Internship 59

15. In-Service Programs 60

16. The Population of The Study 80

17. Distribution of Population by State 81

18. Distribution of Sample by State 82

19. Response Rate by State 82

20. Type of Comments 85

21. Type of Comments by State 85

TABLE Page

22. Type of Comments By Administrator/Faculty Groups. 86

23. Type of Comments By part-time/Full-time 87

24. Type of Comments By Degree Groups 88

25. Distribution of Respondents By State 89

26. Distribution of Respondents By Administrator/Faculty Groups 90

27. Distribution of Administrator/Faculty Groups By State . . 90

28. Distribution of Administrator/Faculty Groups By Part-time/Full-time 91

29. Distribution of Respondents By Part-time/Full-time. . . . 92

30. Distribution of Part-time and Full-time Respondents By State 93

31. Distribution of Part-time and Full-time Respondents By Administrator/Faculty Groups 94

32. Distribution of Part-time and Full-time Respondents By Degree Groups 94

33. Distribution of Respondents By Highest Degree Attained. . 95

34. Distribution of Highest Degree By State 96

35. Distribution of Highest Degree By Administrator/Faculty Groups 97

36. Distribution of Highest Degree Attained By Part-time/ Full-time 101

37. Distribution of Respondents By Experience As A Community College Student 102

38. Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student By State 103

TABLE Page

39. Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student By Administrator Faculty Groups 104

40. Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student By Part-time/Full-time 104

41. Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student By Degree Groups 105

42. Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student By Those Pursuing A Higher Degree 105

43. Distribution of Respondents By Persons Pursuing A Higher Degree 106

44. Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By State 107

45. Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Administrator/Faculty Groups 109

46. Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Part-time/Full-time 110

47. Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Degree Groups 111

48. Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Experience As A Community College Student 112

49. Distribution of Respondents By Teaching Experience. . . . 113

50. Teaching Experience of Respondents By State 114

51. Teaching Experience of Respondents By Administrator/ Faculty Groups 117

TABLE Page

52. Studies From TABLE 2 Compared to Current Study 119

53. Teaching Experience of Respondents By Part-time/ Full-time 120

54. Teaching Experience of Respondents By Degree Groups. . . . 122

55. Teaching Experience of Respondents By Those Pursuing A Higher Degree 123

56. Teaching Experience of Respondents By Experience As A Community College Student 124

57. Distribution of Respondents By Length of Service 125

58. Length of Service at Present School By State 125

59. Length of Service in Present Position By State 126

60. Length of Service at Present School by Administrator/ Faculty Groups 127

61. Length of Service in Present Position By Administrator/ Faculty Groups 128

62. Length of Service at Present School By Part-time/ Full-time 129

63. Length of Service in Present Position By Part-time/ Full-time 129

64. Length of Service at Present School By Degree Groups . . . 131

65. Length of Service in Present Position by Degree Groups 132

TABLE Page

66. Length of Service at Present School By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree 133

67. Length of Service in Present Position By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree 134

68. Length of Service at Present School By Experience As A Community College Student 134

69. Length of Service in Present Position By Experience As A Community College Student 135

70. Distribution of Respondents By Supervised Teaching Experience 136

71. Student Teaching Experience By State 136

72. Teaching Internship Experience By State 137

73. Student Teaching Experience By Administrator/Faculty Groups 137

74. Teaching Internship Experience By Administrator/Faculty Groups 138

75. Student Teaching Experience By Part-time/Full-time . . . 139

76. Teaching Internship Experience By Part-time/ Full-time 140

77. Student Teaching Experience By Degree Groups 140

78. Teaching Internship Experience By Degree Groups 141

79. Student Teaching Experience By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree 142

TABLE		Page
80	Teaching Internship Experience By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree	142
81	Student Teaching Experience By Experience As A Community College Student	144
82	Teaching Internship Experience By Experience As A Community College Student	144
83	Number of Courses in Education Taken By Respondents	145
84	Number of Courses in Education Taken By Respondents By State	146
85	Number of Courses in Education Taken By Respondents By Administrator/Faculty Groups	147
86	Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents By Part-time/Full-time	148
87	Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents By Degree Groups	149
88	Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents By Those Pursuing A Higher Degree	149
89	Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents By Experience As A Community College Student	150
90	Degree of Satisfaction of Respondents	151
91	Degree of Satisfaction By State	152
92	Degree of Satisfaction By Administrator/Faculty Groups	153
93	Degree of Satisfaction By Part-time/Full-time	153
94	Degree of Satisfaction By Degree Groups	154
95	Degree of Satisfaction By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree	155

TABLE		Page
96	Degree of Satisfaction By Experience As A Community College Student	155
97	Choice of Employment By Respondents	157
98	Choice of Employment By States	158
99	Choice of Employment By Administrator/Faculty Groups	159
100	Choice of Employment By Part-time/Full-time	161
101	Choice of Employment By Degree Groups	162
102	Choice of Employment By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree	163
103	Choice of Employment By Experience As A Community College Student	164
104	Summary of Chi-square Tests	165
105	Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Most Important By States	169
106	State Rankings Of The Five Most Important Professional Skills	170
107	Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Most Important By Administrator/Faculty Groups	172
108	Administrator/Faculty Group Rankings of The Five Most Important Professional Skills	173
109	Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Most Important By Part-time/Full-time	173
110	Part-time/Full-time Rankings of The Five Most Important Professional Skills	174
111	Professional Skills Ranked as Five Most Important By Degree Groups	175

TABLE		Page
112	Degree Group Rankings of The Five Most Important Professional Skills	176
113	Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in The Five Most Important Professional Skill Areas	177
114	Recommended Training For Faculty in The Five Most Important Professional Skill Areas	178
115	Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Least Important By States	179
116	State Rankings of the Five Least Important Professional Skills	180
117	Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Least Important By Administrator/Faculty Groups	181
118	Administrator/Faculty Group Rankings of The Five Least Important Professional Skills	182
119	Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Least Important By Part-time/Full-time	183
120	Part-time/Full-time Rankings of The Five Least Important Professional Skills	184
121	Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Least Important By Degree Groups	185
122	Degree Group Rankings of The Five Least Important Professional Skills	186
123	Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in The Five Least Important Professional Skill Areas	187
124	Recommended Training for Faculty in The Five Least Important Professional Skill Areas	188
125	Comparison of Training Recommended and Received in Professional Skills	189

TABLE		Page
126.	Three Qualifications Ranked as Most Desired	191
127.	State Rankings of The Three Most Desired Qualifications	192
128.	Administrator/Faculty Group Rankings of The Three Most Desired Qualifications	194
129.	Part-time/Full-time Rankings of The Three Most Desired Qualifications	195
130.	Degree Group Rankings of The Three Most Desired Qualifications	196
131.	Qualifications Ranked as The Three Least Desired.	198
132.	State Rankings of The Three Least Desired Qualifications	199
133.	Administrator/Faculty Group Rankings of The Three Least Desired Qualifications	200
134.	Part-time/Full-time Rankings of The Three Least Desired Qualifications	201
135.	Degree Group Rankings of The Three Least Desired Qualifications	202
136.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 27	260
137.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 28	260
138.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 30	260
139.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 31	261
140.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 32	261
141.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 34	261
142.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 35	262
143.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 36	262

TABLE		Page
144.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 38	262
145.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 39	263
146.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 40	263
147.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 41	263
148.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 42	264
149.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 44	264
150.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 45	264
151.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 46	265
152.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 47	265
153.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 48	265
154.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 50	266
155.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 51	266
156.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 53	267
157.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 54	267
158.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 55	268
159.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 56	268
160.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 58	269
161.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 59	269
162.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 60	270
163.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 61	270
164.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 62	271
165.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 63	271

TABLE Page

166. Raw Numbers from TABLE 64 272

167. Raw Numbers from TABLE 65 272

168. Raw Numbers from TABLE 66 273

169. Raw Numbers from TABLE 67 273

170. Raw Numbers from TABLE 68 274

171. Raw Numbers from TABLE 69 274

172. Raw Numbers from TABLE 71 274

173. Raw Numbers from TABLE 72 275

174. Raw Numbers from TABLE 73 275

175. Raw Numbers from TABLE 74 275

176. Raw Numbers from TABLE 75 276

177. Raw Numbers from TABLE 76 276

178. Raw Numbers from TABLE 77 276

179. Raw Numbers from TABLE 78 277

180. Raw Numbers from TABLE 79 277

181. Raw Numbers from TABLE 80 277

182. Raw Numbers from TABLE 81 278

183. Raw Numbers from TABLE 82 278

184. Raw Numbers from TABLE 84 278

185. Raw Numbers from TABLE 85 279

186. Raw Numbers from TABLE 86 279

187. Raw Numbers from TABLE 87 279

TABLE		Page
188.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 88	280
189.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 89	280
190.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 90	280
191.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 92	281
192.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 93	281
193.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 94	281
194.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 95	282
195.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 96	282
196.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 98	283
197.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 99	284
198.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 100	285
199.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 101	286
200.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 102	287
201.	Raw Numbers from TABLE 103	287
202.	Percent of Respondents In Each State Who Have Received Training in Professional Skill Areas	291
203.	Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in Professional Skill Areas By Administrator/Faculty Groups	292
204.	Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in Professional Skills By Part-time/Full-time	293
205.	Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in Professional Skills By Degree Groups	294

TABLE Page

206. Recommended Training For Faculty In Each Professional Skill Area By State 295

207. Recommended Training For Faculty In Each Professional Skill Area By Administrator.Faculty Groups 296

208. Recommended Training For Faculty In Each Professional Skill Area By Part-time/Full-time 297

209. Recommended Training For Faculty In Each Professional Skill Area By Degree Groups 298

210. Recommended Qualifications For Faculty By State 302

211. Recommended Qualifications For Faculty By Administrator/ Faculty Groups 306

212. Recommended Qualifications For Faculty By Part-time/ Full-time 310

213. Recommended Qualifications For Faculty By Degree Groups 314

214. Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By State 318

215. Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By Administrator/Faculty Groups 320

216. Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By Part-time/Full-time 322

217. Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By Degree Groups 324

ABSTRACT

In this study, the responses to 718 mailed questionnaires returned from faculty and administrators at 59 community colleges in eight states in the northwest were analyzed. The purpose of the study was to obtain and analyze data about the academic training and experience of respondents and to obtain data concerning the professional preparation and desired qualifications of community college faculty. Five percent of the faculty had no degree, 26.8% had less than a masters, 56.5% had a masters, and 11.3% had a doctorate. Respondents had taken an average of 10.9 courses in education. Nearly half of the administrators and 38.1% of the faculty had taught in the secondary schools. Ten percent of the faculty teaching in terminal programs, 29.1% of the faculty teaching in transfer programs, and 26.7% of the administrators had taught in four-year colleges. Approximately one fourth of the respondents had non-teaching work experience. One administrator in ten and 18.4% of the faculty had no experience at any college or position other than the present one. Respondents had been at their present schools an average of eight years and in their present positions six and one half years. Nearly twenty percent of the respondents were currently taking courses which would lead to a higher degree, and another twenty-five percent planned to do so at a later date. Over ninety percent of the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with their present positions. Nearly three fourths of the respondents would choose their present school as a first choice of place of employment.

The training recommended for faculty was the same for faculty teaching in terminal and transfer programs. An in-service program was the recommended training for 26 of 37 skills. The five skills ranked as most important were: teaching techniques, motivating students, how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, learning theory and its application for adults, and teaching to community college students. These were all methods skills.

The desired qualifications were: a bachelors degree in a subject field for faculty teaching in terminal programs and a masters in a subject field for faculty teaching in transfer programs, professional or trade certification for all faculty, a teaching internship and teaching experience in a community college, and membership in professional organizations for all faculty.

Faculty and administrators all had similar views of the training needs of both types of faculty. Administrators were not hiring people with the training they suggested and in-service programs were not being provided to meet the training needs. Approximately half of the respondents had received training in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

SETTING

Though most of America's educational institutions were patterned after institutions in Europe, the junior college was an exception. It was a unique American invention.

The concept of a unit of higher education separate from the traditional college began to grow in the mid-1850's. Henry P. Tappan, president of the University of Michigan, in his inaugural address of 1852 predicted that the first two years of college work would soon be offered in the high schools in larger cities (Brick, 1964:19; Eells, 1936:193-195; Monroe, 1975:7-8). Tappan and other early leaders were aware of growing enrollment in the universities. As a means of easing this enrollment problem, they envisioned keeping the first two years of college as a part of the secondary school system. William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago, gave this idea an acceptable status by referring to the new institution as a "junior college", giving it a separate and unique identity (Brubacker and Ruby, 1976: 253-254).

Harper's influence was instrumental in establishing what is generally accepted as the first public junior college in Joliet, Illinois in 1901 (Monroe, 1975:9; Brick, 1964:11).

From that meager beginning, the junior college grew to over 650

colleges (Gleazer, 1966:5) and 660,000 students by 1960 (Kumpf,1974:11). By 1975, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges listed 1211 colleges with 206,865 faculty and administrators and an enrollment of 4,031,621 (Drake, 1976:95).

The phenomenal growth of the junior college created an acute shortage of qualified junior college instructors. In 1949 the American Council on Education called for "immediate consideration of the establishment. . . of a program designed to develop the competencies of the teachers required in these institutions" (American Council on Education, 1949:13). It predicted that 30,000 new instructors would be needed. In 1963, Gleazer (1963:5) reported that 17,500 additional faculty would be required by 1975. O'Banion (1972:63) quoted a need of 78,000 to 118,000 additional faculty in community colleges by 1980.

The shortage of teachers focused attention on the need to expand programs designed especially for junior college teachers. A multitude of studies which attempted to answer questions about community college teacher preparation have been conducted.

The need for new faculty in the junior college was so great that it far exceeded the expectations of planners and the ability of preparation programs to produce enough qualified faculty. Graduates with traditional masters or doctors degrees were not prepared to teach in the two-year colleges. Unfortunately, most graduate schools prepared students to be researchers and not teachers. While four-year colleges

and universities were more interested in the research ability of their faculty than in their desire or ability to teach, the reverse was true of the junior colleges where teaching was the primary activity. Therefore, most graduates with advanced degrees sought and accepted positions in four-year institutions, rather than in the new and less respected junior college.

For over thirty years, the expanding role of the junior college went unnoticed or ignored by many university personnel. Hawk (1960) described the attitude of many college and university officials and faculty this way:

> The junior college position in the educational scheme is in many respects similar to that of the American junior high school when it first appeared on the educational ladder. It was considered too sophisticated for elementary folks and too juvenile for the high school (p.340).

Many "senior" college staff did not care about the "junior" college. They did not understand or agree with the junior college philosophy and were insensitive to the factors which made the junior college unique. They ignored both the potential and the problems of the junior college. As Venuto (1972) stated, "the indifference of the four-year colleges and universities to the special needs and functions of the two-year institutions has led to feelings of hostility" (p.23).

A few colleges and universities did recognize the uniqueness of the two year colleges and established programs to prepare faculty for the junior college. However, by 1954, there were only twenty-three

schools which offered any preparation especially designed for the junior college faculty. By 1968, seventy-five colleges and universities offered complete preparation programs for the student planning to teach in a two-year college (Cohen and Brawer, 1972:149).

These few pre-service programs were faced with a nearly impossible task. They could not provide enough faculty to meet the demands of junior colleges. The faculty shortage occurred for three reasons: first, the number of junior colleges increased significantly; second, the few trained individuals who did join the community college faculty soon moved to administrative positions; and third, some faculty members who accepted positions with community colleges chose to continue their academic preparation. Medsker (1960:171) reported that ten percent of the community college faculty were working on the doctorate and nine percent on the masters degree. According to Principe (1972:113) approximately thirty-three percent of the science faculty of community colleges in the New York area planned to continue their graduate study through the doctoral level. Bushnell (1973:32-33) stated that fifty percent of vocational faculty were actively enrolled in an advanced degree program, thirty-three percent of the academic faculty were pursuing an advanced degree, and six percent were working on the doctorate.

With this proportion of teachers pursuing advanced degrees it seemed that the faculty of two-year colleges would improve its academic

qualifications as its members completed their advanced degrees. This did not prove to be the case. As faculty members completed their degrees, they accepted positions other than teaching in community colleges. Some went to the four-year colleges, some went to administrative positions, and some left the teaching profession completely. But, very few continued as community college faculty members.

The teacher shortage in higher education and the expanded role of community colleges resulted in very little change in the academic preparation of persons who actually taught in community colleges. It has been difficult for the relatively few programs designed to prepare community college faculty to demonstrate an impact on community colleges because so few of the graduates actually accepted teaching positions in community colleges.

Concurrent with the slow growth in programs of teacher preparation was an expansion of the role of the two-year college. Initially, the primary role of the junior college was that of a transfer or feeder school to four-year colleges and universities. Good's definition of the junior college typified this philosophy. The junior college is:

> . . .generally, a 2-year institution of higher learning; a question has been raised about whether it should be classified as an extension of secondary education or as a part of higher education; sometimes regarded as a "feeder" for 4-year colleges or universities; grants an an associate in arts degree in most cases. (Good, 1973:321)

The broadening of the junior college role and an effort to

expand the number and type of students served brought a change in the name of many institutions. Thus, many junior colleges became community colleges. This move toward change which began after World War II and was given new impetus following Russia's launch of Sputnik, was reflected in the development of the community college concept. Good's definition of the community college demonstrated this expanded role. The community college is:

> . . . a college typically set up to meet the educational needs of a particular community and offering 2-year training, either terminal or preparatory, in preprofessional and liberal arts fields; most community colleges are publically controlled and are coeducational. (Good,1973:114)

The role of the junior college broadened to include not only the transfer function, serving as a "feeder" facility, but also preprofessional and vocational training. These two roles were often in conflict with one another. Proponents of the two roles neither understood nor accepted the opposing role. This dual role has continued to cause conflict and dissention within the community college faculty and administration since each of these areas has traditionally called for instructors with unique teaching skills.

Strained relations between two-year and four-year colleges, absorption of many qualified community college teachers by the four-year colleges, the magnitude of the teacher shortage throughout higher education, and the dual role of the community college were all significant factors which hindered attempts to establish or expand preparation

programs for community college teachers.

Community college teacher candidates were often unwilling to continue their formal education because the positions to which they would be appointed were no different than those for which they were already academically qualified. Candidates who did continue their formal education were appointed to administrative positions or they accepted positions in four-year institutions. Faculty members who completed higher degrees also moved to administrative positions or to four-year institutions.

The upward movement of qualified faculty members has existed since the community college began and has caused the academic preparation of the community college faculty to remain nearly constant for many years. However, opportunities for selecting better prepared faculty in community colleges have begun to appear. Cheit (1971) studied the financial condition of forty-one colleges and universities and painted a rather gloomy picture of the 1970's for colleges and universities. He predicted that sizeable reductions in faculty would be required at many colleges and universities in order to meet budgets and compensate for declining enrollment.

This writer conducted a similar study in the state of Montana (Harsha and Boyle,1977). Cutbacks in faculty have occurred in Montana and throughout the nation for the very reason that Cheit predicted. Faculty reductions at four-year institutions have increased the number

of applicants available for teaching positions in community colleges. Both four-year colleges and two-year colleges have felt the impact of this increased teacher supply. In interviews with Dr. David Stimmel, Head of the Psychology Department at Southwest Texas State University and Dr. Gordon Stone at Belleville Area College, an Illinois community college, both men noted an increase in the number of highly qualified applicants for teaching positions. (Stimmel,1978; Stone,1978). As this trend continues and an oversupply of teacher candidates develops, employers can become increasingly selective. As this situation occurs, changes in the quality and preparation of community college faculty will take place.

Historically, because of the shortage of teachers, community college administrators have not always been able to find faculty with the qualifications they desired. As the competition for teaching positions becomes keener, more candidates will be expected to possess the desired qualifications as reported by Stimmel(1978). To be more competitive, according to Phair (1977), candidates will be inclined to enroll in the preparation programs which will give them the qualifications preferred by administrators. An analysis of the desirable qualifications of community college faculty members and of the ideal preparation programs which will develop those qualifications has been the subject of this study.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

As the community college grew to be an entity separate from either secondary schools or colleges and universities, teachers were recruited from a variety of sources and came with a multitude of backgrounds, experiences, preparation, and commitment to their institutions and tasks. The Dean of Wright Junior College in Chicago recognized in 1939 that this new type of institution would require a new type of staff. He said, "If a new type of institution has emerged then we should expect to find a new type of instructor, one that is not merely a glorified high school teacher, and one that is not a transplanted college professor." (Conley,1939:507)

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965) expressed the need for adequate preparation programs for community college teachers this way:

> One area in which responsibility must be exercised involves the adequate preparation of teachers. In the past, teaching personnel have been trained specifically for the elementary or secondary school, and the Ph.D. level for research and teaching in the four-year institutions. If the community colleges are to assume the broad responsibilities... it is apparent that there must be certain adaptations in the pre-service and in-service training of teachers for this particular segment of higher education. Instructors in the two-year colleges are neither university professors nor secondary school teachers. They require a preparation that is broader than that ordinarily found among university personnel yet deeper than that necessary for secondary school teachers. Both kinds of preparation should be included in upper and graduate divisions for individuals planning to teach in the two-year colleges. (p.285)

The literature indicates that educators agree with Blocker,

Plummer, and Richardson (1965), that the type of preparation community college teachers receive should be different from the training received by teachers at other levels of education. The variety of pre-service programs reported by Cohen and Brawer (1972), suggests disagreement among educators concerning the desired or necessary content of preparation programs for community college faculty. Many studies have been conducted to determine what training is appropriate for community college faculty, but the issue has not been resolved.

Colleges and universities which propose to train teachers for two-year colleges need to know what an ideal preparation program for faculty members would entail as perceived by the employers of their graduates. They need to know how preparation should be different for faculty members who teach the traditional transfer courses and for those who teach the new voactional or terminal courses. They follow graduates so they can know what qualifications are desirable for teachers of different courses and what qualifications are possessed by the teachers who were able to secure teaching positions.

Johnson (1977) in his review of literature on community college teacher preparation stated:

> . . . it was impossible to know anything about institutions or of what goes on within them if we know nothing of the men and women who teach in them. It is necessary to know what kind of people they are; it is necessary to know from what parts of society they come; it is necessary to know what forms of preparation they have had; it necessary to know their values, their

roles, and the material they teach. (Johnson,1977:38; Trent,1972)

To this date, no comprehensive study of community college faculty in the northwest has been attempted. Thus, there is little descriptive data available to aid in program planning. The decisions being made in higher education concerning the community colleges in the northwest are being made without the benefit of valuable data about that faculty.

Accurate, adequate, and timely planning for the preparation of community college faculty should be based on data about the qualifications and training needs of faculty presently employed and the desired qualifications of faculty as expressed by administrators. Currently, neither of these planning tools exist in the northwest.

This study has attempted a comprehensive study of community college faculty in the northwest. Demographic data, data about academic preparation, experience, and training needs of faculty was gathered from faculty and administrators. This information can now provide the data base necessary for improved planning in higher education for more adequate preparation of community college teachers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The concerns of this study were (1) to develop a profile of the background, academic preparation, and experience of administrators and faculty at community colleges in the northwest using as a base the

1977-1978 school year; (2) to examine the ideal pre-service and in-service preparation programs for community college teachers as perceived by administrators and faculty of community colleges in the northwest during the base year; (3) to compare the actual pre-service preparation of faculty members currently employed at community colleges in the northwest with the ideal faculty preparation as perceived by administrators from the community college in which those faculty were employed; and (4) to compare the responses of faculty that taught courses and community college administrators to see if there were differences between these groups in terms of how they thought community college faculty should be prepared.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

The following questions were answered based on the responses to the questionnaire.

1. What is the academic background, experience, and degree of job satisfaction of the faculty and administrators in the northwest?

2. What academic preparation, work experience, and professional education qualifications are perceived as desirable by currently employed community college faculty teaching in terminal and transfer programs in the northwest?

3. What professional preparation have community college faculty and administrators in the northwest actually had?

4. What professional preparation is seen as most important for community college faculty as perceived by current faculty members.

5. How much training should current and new faculty receive in professional preparation activities?

GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR GATHERING DATA

The information for this study was collected by a questionnaire mailed to faculty and administrators employed by fifty-nine community colleges in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Each college in these states, listed in the 1976 Community, Junior and Technical College Directory (Drake,1976), was contacted and asked to participate in the study. Initial contact was made with the president of each institution to seek his cooperation and approval to send the questionnaire to faculty in the institution. His approval was indicated by sending a college catalog from which lists of faculty and administrators were compiled. This procedure was patterned after that used by Cohen (1975) in his study of community college faculty. A detailed explanation of procedures is presented in Chapter 3.

After lists of faculty and administrators at participating colleges had been compiled, random samples were drawn. Each faculty member and administrator selected was mailed the questionnaire shown in Appendix F. Each questionnaire contained a self-addressed, stamped

envelope in which the completed form was returned.

Demographic data was gathered from each respondent. Each respondent was asked to select, from a list of possible professional education skills, the five most important and five least important skills to be included in a preparation program for community college teachers. Rank orderings by faculty teaching in terminal programs, faculty teaching in transfer programs, and administrators were established. These rank orderings were compared to reveal perceptual differences between faculty and administration concerning preparation. Recommendations concerning desirable pre-service and in-service training were made from the rank ordered possibilities.

The desired or ideal faculty preparation as perceived by administrators was compared with the preparation of instructors actually employed. The proportion of instructors who have completed each aspect of the ideal pre-service preparation program was determined and a comparison was made to determine if administrators' hiring practices were congruent with their statements of desired preparation.

The need for preparation programs specifically designed for community college teachers was determined by comparing the preparation of faculty with the desired or ideal preparation. With the above information, a model pre-service program was designed and recommendations for needed in-service programs were made.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The terms used in this study are defined as follows:

Community College. The term community college is used interchangeably with community junior college; junior college; and two-year college. Community college includes any college listed in the American Association of Community and Junior College's 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, (Drake,1976).

Community Junior College. same as community college.

Two-Year College. same as community college.

Junior College. Although there were differences between the junior college and the community college, this study assumes that all two-year colleges are now operating with the community college philosophy, regardless of the name they use. Therefore, junior college is used interchangeably with community college.

Full-Time. Any staff member who (1) works for the institution thirty hours a week or more, (2) teaches twelve or more credit hours, or (3) is classified by the institution as .75 FTE or more was considered full-time.

Part-Time. A staff member who (1) works for the institution fewer than thirty hours per week, (2) teaches fewer than twelve credit hours, or (3) is classified by the institution as less than .75 FTE was considered part-time.

Terminal Programs. Programs which offer a degree or certification upon completion. These programs include vocational programs, trade school programs, and other programs such as the adult education GED preparation program, not designed to transfer to the four-year college.

Transfer Programs. Any program of study whose primary goal is to prepare the student who intends to continue upper class work at a four-year college or university.

Significant. The .05 confidence level was used to determine significance in all tests in this study.

LIMITATIONS

A limitation to any study using a mailed questionnaire is the responsiveness of the persons invited to participate. Participation was voluntary and that fact automatically introduced the potential of a distorted population. The possibility existed that the non-respondents were different demographically from the respondents. As a control, three follow-up letters were sent to non-respondents to attempt to improve the response rate. In addition, some non-respondents were contacted by phone to gather the demographic data of those individuals.

A second limitation was that the findings of this study can only be applied to the population from which the sample was drawn. Therefore, generalizations and predictions may be valid only for

faculty, administrators, and community colleges in the states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming who participated in the study.

Another limitation was that the faculty list was obtained from the college catalog of the institution. Only full-time faculty were listed in many of these catalogs. Therefore, the part-time instructors were not included in the population of most schools.

DELIMITATIONS

The geographic area from which the sample was drawn was delimited to the states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

SUMMARY

The preparation a teacher receives is an important aspect of the ultimate quality of teaching he or she will do. This study examined the academic background, experience, and professional preparation of community college faculty and administrators, the perceived ideal faculty preparation program, and the relationship between administrators' concepts of ideal faculty preparation and the preparation of the faculty members actually employed.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Harold C. Reade (1973:19) in his review of literature on community college teacher preparation, stated:

> In 1968 Frank Leet commented that it was significant to the needs of his study that there had been little research done which concerned the specific preparation of junior college teachers (Leet,1968:17). Unfortunately, this still holds true. Most of the writers in the field do make mention of the need, or desirability, for a more specific preparation, but there has been no definitive work done in this vein.

This investigator has found the literature to be replete with writings about and studies of community college teacher preparation because the field is so broad and multifaceted. The academic preparation, teaching experience, and professional preparation of community college faculty have been studied in several parts of the country. But, as Reade (1973) noted, the preparation needs of the community college faculty have not been examined on a systematic basis.

The junior college was conceived as a way to relieve some of the pressure of growing enrollments at colleges and universities (Monroe, 1975:7-8). Some educators felt that the first two years of undergraduate education could best be handled at some location other than the four-year college. The secondary school seemed to be the logical place to teach the thirteenth and fourteenth years of schooling. It was theorized that moving the thirteenth and fourteenth years off the

college campuses would free these institutions to concentrate their efforts on upper division research and teaching. The four-year colleges then would not have to be bothered with the general education courses and could teach what they viewed as really important.

This concept was never fully adopted. Resistance came from both the public schools and the colleges. The distribution of education took a variety of forms, but eventually the junior college emerged as a separate and unique institution (Brubacker and Rudy, 1976:249).

But who was to staff these new institutions? Jarvie (1956:216) quoted California administrators as saying that "we don't have any junior-college teachers in California. We have simply borrowed them from high schools and universities." An opposing view of preparation needs was expressed by Dolar:

> Since these institutions were viewed as extensions of the high school, faculty members were recruited primarily from secondary schools. Thus, traditional teacher preparation programs were viewed as sufficient to meet existing needs. (Dolar, 1952:329).

Following World War II, higher education was flooded with returning veterans when congress passed the G.I. Bill of Rights. The president appointed a commission to investigate the impact of higher education in America. The report of that group noted the change in the role of the junior college and identified the need for programs to prepare teachers who were different from either the secondary school or four-year college teachers. The report said:

> It is expected that the bulk of the growth in college enrollment during the next decade will be absorbed by the community colleges. The community-centered, community-serving institution is rapidly emerging as a distinctive American institution. The curriculum it is developing calls for some unique teaching abilities. The emergency aspects of the need make it desirable to call special attention to the problem. There are other special subjects which would be included in the training of the prospective community college teacher. For example, the community college teacher needs an understanding of the community, and insight into the total public school program and a background in special professional problems of the community college.
>
> Two years of graduate study, including a rich internship, would be sufficient to equip these teachers with minimum qualifications.
>
> Such a 2-year program, however, should be accepted only during the period of the emergency and as a temporary expedient aimed at meeting the needs of prospective teachers for the thirteenth and fourteenth grades. (President's Commission on Higher Education, Vol 3, 1947:25-26).

This Commission identified important pre-service training needs of community college teachers which need attention.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Conceived as an institution which would prepare students for lower division courses at traditional universities, the junior college was intended to be a teaching centered institution. Levy (1957:19) and Eckert and Stecklein (1959:86) found that community college teachers spent about seventy-five percent of their time teaching.

The change to the community college concept brought with it new functions for the two-year college. The President's Commission on

Higher Education (1947) made the following statement which reflected the expanded role and function of the community college:

> The community college seeks to become a center of learning for the entire community, with or without the restrictions that surround formal course work in traditional institutions of higher education. It gears its programs and services to the needs and wishes of the people it serves, and its offerings may range from workshops in painting or singing or play writing for fun to refresher courses in journalism or child psychology. (p.69-70)

Later in that same report, the Commission added another dimension to the function of the community college, that of adult education.

Reynolds agreed with that concept, but he expressed the role of the community college in broader terms. He identified the function of the community college as satisfying the educational needs of the supporting community rather than as strictly teaching. He listed the following as criteria for identifying a true community college:

> 1. Sensitivity of the curriculum to community needs: the development of practical methods for discovering community needs, the facility with which innovations may be adopted in the curriculum, methods of evaluating the success with which community needs are met.
> 2. Extension of the educational program beyond the conventional classroom aspects: cultural activities, recreational activities, thought-provoking activities, adult education classes.
> 3. Faculty competence used in solving community problems.
> 4. Student competence used in solving community problems.
> 5. Community participation in curriculum making. The development of methods for community participation.
> 6. Using the community as an instructional laboratory. The development of methods for discovering the resources of the community which can be so used, and of methods for using these resources.

7. An effective public relations program.
8. A system for evaluating the success of the community service program. (Reynolds, 1950:202)

The ideas of an expanded student population and of community service were included by Bogue (1950) in discussing the community college. He stated that "a basic function of the community college, it should be apparent, is to make higher education available to larger numbers of people." (p.67) He later summarized the functions of the community college this way:

> By examination of life situations of identifiable problems that need solution, on national, state, and local levels, we arrive at conclusions regarding the basic functions of community colleges. They are guidance and counseling for all students and for the people of the community; general education for all students regardless of vocational objectives; technical and other vocational training, and that on a continuing basis, for students who will not advance to upper division collegiate studies; the further democratization of higher education by surmounting barriers of geography and family financial difficulties; the popularization of higher education by breaking down family traditions and creating greater personal interest and motivation; adult education and university-parallel studies for those students who would continue formal education. (Bogue, 1950:76)

The role of the community college was restated by Dolan. He identified the four major functions of the community college as: popularizing, preparatory, terminal, and guidance" (1952:329).

Levy, (1957) expressing a similar line of thinking, listed the four functions of the community college teachers as: "(1) teaching, (2) counseling, (3) administrative duties, and (4) community service." (p.19) The functions of the community college were similarly described

by Fritwell. (1968:46)

Most educators agree that the community college is a teaching institution, its faculty are primarily teachers, and meeting the educational needs of the local community through a variety of channels and programs is the task of these teachers. Meeting educational needs means "opening the doors" and involving the community in the college and the faculty in the community. Meeting educational needs also means responsible and responsive counseling of students.

From the aforementioned literature, the functions of the community college can be described as: (1) teaching, all students of all ages in terminal, transfer, vocational, or refresher courses, (2) community service to meet community needs, both directly and indirectly related to education, and (3) counseling, assisting students to reach their goals and full potential. To these tasks, the community college has dedicated its existence.

TRAITS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

The students and the curriculum are two areas which differentiate the community college from other levels of education. These factors in turn impact on the faculty member. What type of person is needed to teach these special students and to perform the varied functions mentioned? The desirable traits of junior college faculty members have long been a topic of interest.

Eells talked with many junior college administrators about this question. He found the following identified as desirable traits of junior college teachers: strength of character, integrity, interest in both subject matter and students, ability to use a variety of teaching techniques, and a sense of humor. (Eells, 1931:391-393)

Conley (1939) listed four necessary characteristics of community college faculty:

> First, he must possess a distinct philosophy of education which is based upon a realization that there is a different type of student in the junior college than in either the university or the high school. Second, the junior college should have a special type of training and a broad background. Thirdly, this new type of instructor in the field of college education should be interested in teaching. A fourth characteristic of the junior college instructor should be intellectual alertness which is measured by creative scholarship. (p.507-508)

Hollis (1941:556) noted that junior college students need counseling and need to be guided to relate their education to life situations. He stated that faculty should be able to help meet those needs. Mead, in a nationwide study, found "broad general scholarship, inspirational power, social culture, potential teaching efficiency, and specialized knowledge" as the most desirable qualifications of teachers, while "ability to advertise the institution, previous secondary school or college teaching experience, ability to write texts and articles, and research ability" were considered "least" desirable qualifications for the community college teacher. (Mead, 1941:246)

Blake (1944) reported that potential faculty members should be able to demonstrate "common sense and a sense of humor, vigorous personality and qualities of leadership, sympathy with humanity, understanding of the adolescent, his experience patterns, his problems and his needs, and work experience" (p.44) before selection to the faculty of a community college.

Smith (1949:391-396) named strong spiritual values, interest in world affairs, and interest in young people as important characteristics. Wood (1950:515) stated that the community college teachers should have a keener interest in people than in subject matter. Trabue (1950:140) found that community college presidents felt the most important characteristics were friendliness and concern for students and the ability to inspire students to think for themselves and to express their own ideas. Bogue (1950:133) listed broad academic background, enthusiasm for teaching, background in general education, understanding of students who attend the community college, and understanding of the duties of an instructor as important qualities in community college faculty.

Other characteristics discussed in the literature were: pleasing appearance, confident and pleasant voice (Colvert, 1952:502-503); teaching ability (Melvin, 1957:402); warmth, establishes rapport easily, adaptable, motivates students (Merson, 1956:496-501); well adjusted, interest in teaching instead of research, cultured background, loyalty to the institution, interest in subject matter, adequate professional

training, good habits of citizenship (Hillway, 1958:186); understands the institution, communicates well (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966); possess a masters degree, positive attitude toward extracurricular activities, taken courses on the mission of the community college (Blocker, Plummer, Richardson, 1965:48); likes the junior college atmosphere, sold on the value of community college education, dedicated to teaching, empathetic (Kelley and Wilbur,1970:55-57); participates in community activities (Solomon, 1968:125); academic depth as well as breadth, student teaching in a community college, and knowledge of the sociological foundations of education. (Stone, 1958:369).

These traits or characteristics make an impressive list when taken collectively. If any faculty member could have all these qualifications, he or she would be a superteacher and would have no trouble finding employment. Preparation programs are faced with the task of trying to find ways to develop these traits in the students who will become community college faculty.

The fact must be faced that few if any teachers will have all the desired traits. Three authors reported studies which identified weaknesses in community college teachers. Pugh and Morgan asked community college administrators about weaknesses in their teachers. About fifty shortcomings were identified. They named every desired trait listed in the literature as lacking in some of the faculty. Over half of the respondents identified problems of new faculty members

coming from graduate schools as emotional and physical health, and lack of orientation toward the community college philosophy. (Pugh and Morgan, 1943:430)

Stone (1958) identified four major weaknesses in community college faculty:

> One deficiency is too narrow specialization in a single subject. A lack of understanding of the concept of general education. Too little stress on the concept of the junior college as an institution - its place in higher education and its unique role as a community college. There is a lack of understanding of the learning process. (p.368-369)

The areas pointed out by these authors can and should be improved by better pre-service and in-service preparation. Programs should be designed which will ameliorate these weaknesses.

PROBLEMS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

The weaknesses discussed in the previous section were those identified by administrators. Blake surveyed junior college teachers and identified the ten problems of greatest concern to them. Those problems were:

> . . .attempting to teach students whose high school preparation had been poor; adjusting assignments and written work to the ability of the students; making provision for individual differences; integrating the work of the high school and the work of the junior college; revising the curriculum; integrating the work of the junior college and higher institutions; cooperating with students in building loyalty to the college; assisting students to learn how to study effectively; cooperating with students in the development of their personalities; assisting students to learn their responsibility to society. (Blake, 1943:57)

Siehr developed a lengthy questionnaire which contained seventy-two possible problems for faculty. He asked new faculty to indicate which problems they had encountered and which persisted. Lack of time ranked first in frequency and persistence. Other problems which ranked high were: arousing and maintaining student interest; adapting instruction to individual differences, dealing with students who require special attention to overcome deficiencies, understanding college policies to be followed in curriculum development and revision, challenging superior students, grading or marking students' work, and increasing my effectiveness in student counseling techniques. (Siehr, 1962:61)

The studies by Blake (1943) and Siehr (1962) identified similar types of problems. Garrison (1967:16-17) also found lack of time to be the greatest single problem for community college faculty. Cohen and Brawer (1973) in their studies of humanities faculty in junior colleges reported that teachers, when asked what they would like to do with a summer or extra time, indicated that they would like to be able to spend more time in research, in graduate courses, and in interaction with students. This finding also seemed to indicate a lack of time, which would agree with the previously mentioned studies.

Loomis (1964:94) questioned community college administrators in the western states and found the single most important problem in the academic preparation of community college faculty to be insufficient

grounding in the philosophy of the community college. A lack of understanding or acceptance of the community college philosophy could have created or at least contributed to many of the problems identified by the authors listed in this section. Loomis recommended pre-service and in-service education programs which he felt would be capable of ameliorating many of these problems. Studies conducted since 1964 indicate that those programs have not been successfully adopted.

HIGHEST DEGREE ATTAINED

Over sixty studies have reported information concerning the highest degree attained by community college faculty. TABLE 1, page 30-36, contains a chronological listing of those studies and their results. Although a few of these studies included schools from the northwest, none was conducted exclusively in the northwest.

The proportions of the faculty with each degree varied considerably depending on the particular type of faculty or part of the country being studied. O'Banion concluded in his study and book that the percentages had remained constant for the last ten years. He found the averages to be about seven percent doctors degrees(O'Banion, 1972:54). The studies in TABLE 1, page 30-36, confirmed that finding. The last two studies, Johnson (1977) and Phair (1977), reported an increase in the number of doctorates. Phair had discovered this trend when he wrote his dissertation in 1975. He predicted an increase in doctorates

TABLE 1

Highest Degree Attained by Junior College Faculty (in percent)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
McDowell, 1919 Nationwide, all faculty	13.8	49.0	31.2	6.0
Koos, 1924 Nationwide, all faculty	32.2	23.1	41.4	3.6
Ewing, 1925 California, all faculty	17.1	23.9	59.0	
Koos, 1925 Nationwide, all faculty	4.4	52.4	41.2	2.0
Wahlquist, 1930 Nationwide, all faculty	7.0	29.0	59.0	5.0
Eells, 1931 Nationwide, all faculty	3.0	47.0	47.0	3.0
Hollis, 1941 Nationwide, terminal faculty	13.0	29.0	52.0	6.0
Koos, October 1947 Midwest, South, California All faculty	3.3	26.8	63.6	6.3
Mushitz, 1947 Nationwide, all faculty		10.2*	77.1	12.7
Colvert and Litton, 1953 Nationwide, all faculty	4.9	23.1	67.6	6.2
Colvert and Baker, 1954 Nationwide, all faculty	5.7	19.7	67.3	7.3
Levy, 1957 One Texas college Academic faculty		16.0	67.0	17.0

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

TABLE 1 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
Levy, 1957 One Texas college Terminal faculty	67.0	15.0	18.0	
Eckert and Stecklein, 1959 Minnesota, all faculty		16.0*	80.0	4.0
Laffin, 1959 New York, mathematics faculty		40.0	57.8	2.2
Rainey, 1959 Oklahoma, accounting faculty		23.4	76.6	
Clark, 1960 One California college All faculty	4.5	31.3	59.7	4.5
Hawk, 1960 Nationwide, administrators		4.3	51.9	43.8
Hawk, 1960 AACJC records, administrators		6.9	57.0	35.7
Medsker, 1960 Fifteen states, all faculty	8.8	17.0	64.0	9.6
Donnelly, 1961 Michigan, all faculty		2.5	89.9	7.6
Montgomery, 1962 Florida, all faculty and administrators		4.0*	81.0	12.0
Siehr, 1962 Nationwide, new faculty	1.2	18.4	73.2	7.2
Loomis, 1964 Western states, all faculty	2.3	13.8	74.5	8.9

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

TABLE 1 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
Smith, 1964 Nationwide, all faculty		11.4	79.5	9.1
Blocker, 1965 Nationwide, all faculty	1.2	18.4	73.2	7.2
Blocker and others, 1965 South and Southwest, all faculty		12.3	78.0	9.7
Lipscomb, 1965 Mississippi, all faculty		20.0*	78.0	2.0
Maul, 1965 Nationwide, new faculty		23.0*	70.0	7.0
Birnbaum, 1966 New York, all faculty	3.2	21.8	64.0	11.0
Phair, 1968 (1967-68) California, new faculty		21.0*	76.0	3.0
Cashin, 1968 California, all faculty		5.8*	83.8	10.3
Hurlburt, 1968 Florida, all faculty		11.0*	77.0	12.0
Leet, 1968 Missouri, all faculty		6.5	89.0	4.5
National Science Foundation, 1968 Nationwide, science faculty	3.0	11.0	77.0	9.0
Phair, 1968 (1968-69) California, new faculty		18.0*	78.0	4.0
Anderson and Thornblod, 1969 Illinois, all faculty	6.0	13.0	77.0	4.0

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

TABLE 1 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
Beazley, 1969 Nationwide, all faculty		18.4*	74.9	5.9
Morrison, 1969 Florida, all faculty		14.0*	79.0	7.0
Reynolds, 1969 Nationwide, all faculty	5.0	19.0	69.0	7.0
Yarrington, 1969 Florida, all faculty		11.0*	77.0	12.0
Koos, 1970 Nationwide, public faculty	4.0	46.0	47.0	3.0
Koos, 1970 Northern states, private faculty	6.0	58.0	35.0	2.0
Cohen and associates, 1971 Nationwide, all faculty		24.0*	69.0	7.0
Medsker and Tillery, 1971 Nationwide, all faculty	3.5	10.2	77.7	8.6
Buxton, 1972 Phoenix College, all faculty		1.6	78.5	19.8
Hawaii**, 1972 Hawaii, all faculty	3.0	8.0	74.0	7.0
Hisert, 1972 New York, all faculty		10.1	84.5	5.4
O'Banion, 1972 Nationwide, all faculty		18.0	75.0	7.0

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

**Title: Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Professional Staff

TABLE 1 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
Ohm, 1972 Nationwide, physics faculty		1.0	79.4	10.9
Principe, 1972 New York, science faculty		10.1	74.8	16.1
Rydzik, 1972 New York, allied health faculty	6.2	16.4	68.9	4.0
Rydzik, 1972 New York, allied health administrators	3.1	9.4	56.3	28.1
Thornton, 1972 Florida, all faculty		7.0*	89.0	7.0
Bushnell, 1973 Nationwide, all faculty	5.6	13.9	75.0	5.5
Cash, 1973 Texas, natural science faculty		3.4	80.2	16.4
Larson, 1973 California, new faculty	9.0	17.0	67.0	7.0
Reade, 1973 Mississippi, all faculty		4.1	85.8	10.2
Smith, 1973 Texas, allied health faculty	31.2	41.1	17.8	2.3
Brown, 1974 North Central Association area all faculty	8.4	31.0	53.7	6.9
Grymes, 1974 One Virginia college, part-time faculty	5.0	34.7	52.8	7.5

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

TABLE 1 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
Grymes, 1974 One Virginia college, full-time faculty	1.0	9.0	74.0	16.0
Hale, 1974 Nationwide, mathematics faculty	6.7	23.4	65.5	4.4
Kumpf, 1974 Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky Administrators	2.2	9.0	69.7	19.1
Kumpf, 1974 Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, all faculty	4.9	22.4	66.6	6.1
Sylves, 1974 New York, all faculty	3.8	13.7	72.4	8.8
Hawaii**, 1975 Hawaii, all faculty	15.0	20.0	57.0	8.0
Hill, 1975 Pennsylvania, all faculty		21.7*	72.7	5.5
Phair, 1975 California, all faculty		28.0*	65.0	7.0
Cohen and Brawer, 1976 Nationwide, humanities faculty		10.0*	76.0	14.0
Quanty, 1976 One Kansas college, part-time faculty	8.0	23.0	56.0	13.0
Johnson, Robert, 1977 Western states, administrators		8.0	52.0	40.0

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

**Title: Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Professional Staff

TABLE 1 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate
Johnson, Robert, 1977 Western states, all faculty		5.0	71.0	19.0
Phair, 1977 California, new faculty		23.0*	65.0	12.0

*includes those with less than a bachelors degree

because of keener competition in four-year colleges and because of better opportunities to teach in the community colleges. He also explained that the number of faculty with less than a masters degree had increased because of the new emphasis on para-professional, vocational-technical, and occupation programs which did not need faculty with advanced degrees (Phair,1975:41-53) His findings agree with the prediction of Cheit (1971) which was discussed in Chapter 1.

Although the academic degrees possessed by community college faculty remained relatively constant for many years, recent trends indicate that changes have begun to take place. There is now an over supply of teachers, employers are being more selective, and the academic qualification of community college faculty members is increasing (Stone,1978)

DESIRABLE ACADEMIC DEGREE

Attitudes concerning which academic degree is most desirable for community college faculty have been mixed and changing. Garrison

(1941:135-136) stated that the masters degree is almost universally accepted as the desired degree. This sentiment was restated by Sexson and Harbeson (1946):

> As a general principle, it may be stated that in the academic departments the minimum amount of academic training acceptable for appointments as a junior college instructor is that represented by the master's degree with a major in the field of his teaching. In some cases, the equivalent of a master's degree may prove satisfactory, but in general it will be found that the best evidence of advanced training is the actual possession of the advanced degree. (p.180)

Pugh (1947), Colvert (1952), Chambers (1976), and Johnson (1977), all reported the same finding. These studies dealt with faculty teaching in transfer programs and little attention was given to faculty in terminal programs.

Other writers reported that the doctorate is not a desirable degree as community college teacher preparation. Garrison (1967:70) stated that "there is general agreement that the PhD is not necessary for junior college teaching. It is recognized and respected as a research degree; but it represents a depth and manner of training rarely required of junior college faculty." Kovack (1972:31) noted that Michigan administrators felt that "the doctorate as a degree for faculty members is not needed or wanted in the community college."

The masters degree remained as the primary degree in theory and in fact. Other degrees were invented as alternatives. The "Diplomate in Collegiate Teaching" degree was begun at the University of Miami in

conjunction with Miami-Dade Junior College (Besvinick and Fryer,1969). This degree had some positive advantages, but offered nothing not already available in a well planned doctoral program. The Doctor of Arts degree has been tried, but Johnson (1977) found little better acceptance of this degree than the traditional doctorate as preparation for the community college teacher.

Previously cited studies show that the masters degree still holds the most promise as a desired degree for community college transfer program faculty. Too little information is available to make conclusions about faculty in terminal programs. However, the content rather than the name of the degree seems to be most important. Content of preparation programs will be discussed later in this chapter.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

The teaching experience of community college faculty has often been recorded as a part of other studies. The results of nearly fifty such studies are presented in TABLE 2, page 39. Again, none of these studies were conducted in the northwest.

The trend, as these studies show, was from recruiting the greatest share of the faculty from the secondary schools to hiring teachers from many sources. Eells(1931) reported that eighty percent of the California faculty had secondary school experience. Phair(1977) questioned new faculty in California and found that only twelve percent

TABLE 2

Teaching Experience of Junior College Faculty (in percent**)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Grad School	Non-Educ	Elem Sch	High Sch	Commun College	4-year College
Wahlquist, 1930 Nationwide, all faculty			28.1	53.1		32.1
Eells, 1931 California, all faculty			21.0	80.0		34.0
Garrison, November, 1941 Nationwide, all faculty			38.0	70.0		35.0
Koos, November, 1947 Midwest, South, California, all faculty		6.2	12.1	61.7	7.3	12.7
Roland, 1953 Nationwide, administrators			19.0	70.0		
Levy, 1957 One Texas college, academic faculty		11.5	29.4	59.0	9.9	41.2
Levy, 1957 One Texas college, terminal faculty			7.5	17.5		12.5
Laffin, 1959 New York, mathematics faculty					20.0	
Clark, 1960 One California college, all faculty	13.0	2.0		67.0	3.0	15.0
Hawk, 1960 Nationwide, administrators		27.2	15.9	40.9	31.8	34.0
Medsker, 1960 Fifteen states, all faculty				64.0*		
Montgomery, 1962 Florida, all faculty and administrators				70.0*		44.0
Siehr, 1962 Nationwide, new faculty			10.9	49.4	19.1	23.5
Siehr and others, 1963 Nationwide, all faculty			11.0	49.0		25.0
Siehr and others, 1963 Nationwide, new faculty	20.5	27.1	2.1	30.6	7.0	11.4
Johnson, 1964 (1957-58) California, new faculty	23.0			46.0	15.0	13.0

**Not all studies will have figures which total 100%. This is because of the various ways of reporting experience.

*reported as from public schools. May include both elementary and high school experience.

TABLE 2 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Grad School	Non-Educ	Elem Sch	High Sch	Commun College	4-year College
Johnson, 1964 (1962-63) California, new faculty	27.0			37.0	16.0	13.0
Johnson, 1964 Nationwide, all faculty	27.6	11.1		30.0		17.6
Wattenbarger, 1964 Nationwide, all faculty	21.0	11.0		33.0		17.0
Carter, 1965 Florida, all faculty			11.1	66.7	11.5	30.8
Lipscomb, 1965 Mississippi, all faculty				66.0*		
Maul, 1965 Nationwide, new faculty	23.7	22.9	1.3	31.3		17.1
National Education Association, 1965 Nationwide, new faculty	24.0	11.3		30.0		17.0
Birnbaum, 1966 New York, new faculty	0.5	35.1		28.2	9.8	26.3
Gleazer, 1967 Florida, new faculty	36.0	10.0		27.0		14.0
Gleazer, 1967 Miami-Dade Junior College, all faculty	11.5	23.4		31.0*		28.0
Cashin, 1968 California, all faculty	12.3	18.4		44.7		19.8
Farris, 1968 New York Metropolitan Region; new faculty	12.0			15.0	20.0	46.0
Good and others, 1968 Kansas, all faculty			17.0	67.0	11.0	5.0
Hurlburt, 1968 Florida, all faculty				70.0*		
Leet, 1968 Missouri, all faculty					20.0	
Phair, 1968 (1967-68) California, new faculty	9.0	11.0	2.0	36.0	19.0	15.0
Phair, 1968 (1968-69) California, new faculty	7.0	11.0		34.0	19.0	19.0

*reported as from public schools. May include both elementary and high school experience.

TABLE 2 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Grad School	Non-Educ	Elem Sch	High Sch	Commun College	4-year College
Cohen and Brawer, 1969 Nationwide, humanities faculty	3.6			53.1		36.8
Morrison, 1969 Florida, all faculty				53.0*		
Phair, 1969 California, new faculty	4.5	19.0	5.0	36.5*	20.00	15.0
Medsker and Tillery, 1971 Nationwide, all faculty	22.0	10.0		33.0*		11.0
Buxton, 1972 Phoenix College, all faculty	8.4	7.0	11.3	38.5	4.2	30.5
Hisert, 1972 New York, all faculty	8.9	16.1		49.4	19.6	28.0
Rydzik, 1972 New York, allied health faculty			11.8	12.4	25.2	32.8
Rydzik, 1972 New York, allied health administrators			9.4	9.4	53.3	56.3
Thornton, 1972 Florida, all faculty						20.0
Bushnell, 1973 Nationwide, all faculty			10.7	40.8	14.1	26.8
Cash, 1973 Texas, natural science faculty				51.7		
Larson, 1973 California, new faculty	13.0	27.0	2.0	17.0	26.0	15.0
Reade, 1973 Mississippi, all faculty			42.6	56.1	100.00	18.9
Reade, 1973 (more recent study) Mississippi, all faculty	21.6	2.0	10.9	46.6		18.9
Smith, 1973 Texas, allied health faculty		52.0	4.6	6.9	48.0	7.5
Brown, 1974 North Central Assn. region, all faculty	19.2	48.8	1.0	4.9	14.3	11.8
Fricke, 1974 Florida and Texas, psychology faculty	22.0	24.3		31.4*	8.1	13.8

*reported as from public schools. May include both elementary and high school experience.

TABLE 2 (continued)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Grad School	Non-Educ	Elem Sch	High Sch	Commun College	4-year College
Kumpf, 1974 Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, all faculty			6.3	35.6		63.9
Kumpf, 1974 Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, administrators			5.6	48.3		58.4
Phair, 1975 California, new faculty	5.0		3.0	16.0	31.0	16.0
Phair, 1977 California, new faculty		20.0	2.0	12.0	44.0	15.0

had secondary experience while fifteen percent had taught in four-year colleges, and twenty percent had come from non-teaching positions. The increased proportion of faculty with four-year college teaching experience has followed the prediction of Cheit (1971) as discussed in the previous chapter. Phair (1975) explained the increase as a reflection of a shortage of jobs in the colleges and universities. He also theorized that fewer teachers with secondary experience were being hired because more applicants with community college and four-year college teaching experience were available and preferred. He further pointed out that more faculty came without any teaching experience because more community colleges were obtaining both full-time and part-time faculty members from the local community.

Increased diversity of experience of the faculty has offered new potential and new problems for administrators and new challenges for people attempting to design preparation programs for community college faculty.

DESIRABLE TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Early leaders in the junior college movement envisioned the junior college as an extension of the secondary school. This concept led administrators to seek and employ faculty with secondary teaching experience. Hamlin (1950) in a study in California, reported that sixty-three percent of the administrators wanted faculty members with high school experience. The reasons given were because faculty with this experience were more sympathetic toward students and their problems and because they were better able to relate subject matter to the needs of the students (pp.236-239). Dolan (1952:330) reported that high school teaching experience was desirable because the preparation of high school teachers had emphasized teaching rather than research. Levy (1957:48) found that high school experience was rated as being of great value due to the close relationship between secondary school and community college and to former secondary school teachers' improved ability to understand the student.

Other writers have made conflicting suggestions. Garrison (1941) wrote that "administrators prefer instructors with experience first in

other public junior colleges; second, in colleges and universities; third, in high schools" (p.136). Buechel (1948:117) stated that "those who have had practical experience in industry or professional fields develop into better instructors."

The literature indicates that the issue of desired or optimum experience of faculty members has not been decided but attitudes are changing. Administrators seem to have moved from preferring secondary experience to looking for teachers who have varied backgrounds and work experiences.

EXPERIENCE AS A JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT

Two problems of faculty mentioned earlier in this chapter were: insufficient grounding in the philosophy of the community college (Loomis,1964) and failure to understand the junior college (Colvert, 1952). Teachers who have had experience as students in the junior college find it easier to cope with these problems. TABLE 3, page 45, presents the findings of studies concerning this aspect of the background of teachers.

The percentage of teachers who have had experience as a junior college student should be gradually increasing as a result of the increased number of students attending junior colleges before entering four-year institutions. However, too few studies were found to adequately establish a trend.

TABLE 3

Faculty With Experience as a Junior College Student (percent)

Author and Date Location and Sample	Yes	None
Gordon, 1949 California, all faculty	10.0	90.0
Medsker, 1960 Fifteen states, all faculty	27.0	73.0
Montgomery, 1962 Florida, all faculty and administrators	16.0	84.0
Lipscomb, 1965 Mississippi, all faculty	52.0	48.0
Good and others, 1968 Kansas, all faculty	30.0	70.0
Leet, 1968 Missouri, all faculty	7.5	92.5
Morrison, 1969 Florida, all faculty	20.0	80.0
Medsker and Tillery, 1971 Nationwide, all faculty	28.0	72.0
Hisert, 1972 New York, all faculty	13.7	86.3
Cash, 1973 Florida, all faculty	11.0	89.0
Cohen and Brawer, 1976 Nationwide, humanities faculty	25.1	74.1
Evans, 1970 Nationwide, all faculty	26.2	73.8

The study by Evans (1970:67) found experience as a junior college student to be significant at the .0001 level as a factor relating to faculty agreement with the community college philosophy. He recommended that "communities should give preference to applicants who have been junior college students" (p.88). He thought faculty with a background as a junior college student would help the community college accomplish its goals.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

The central aspect of teacher preparation considered in this study was professional preparation. Some community college instructors have had formal course work designed primarily for teachers. Others have come into the teaching profession with no teacher training.

According to Loomis (1964) administrators thought the most important problem of faculty was a lack of grounding in the philosophy of the community college. After his study of junior colleges, Medsker (1960:319) wrote that "even the most adequate preparation of teachers is incomplete if their attitudes toward the junior college is incompatible with its purpose."

Morrison's study revealed that taking a formal course or an in-service program in education helped faculty to more fully accept the philosophy of the community college (Morrison, 1969:159). Another conclusion he reached was that "the greater the acceptance of the community

junior college concept by public junior college faculty, the greater the probability that they will exhibit more student consideration in their role orientation."

In a similar study, Montgomery (1962) found that faculty who accepted the community college philosophy were more likely to have had a teaching methods course than were those who did not accept that philosophy. Litton (1953), studying the preparation of teachers, discovered that a course in the history of education had been a part of the preparation of more "good" teachers than those in the control group. Carter (1965: 180-181) found that teachers who had taken courses in Testing and Measurements and Foundations of Education were more likely to be rated "high" by administrators than teachers who had not taken these courses.

The results of studies which explored the professional preparation of teachers are presented in TABLE 4, page 48. The only national study which reported this data was Medsker and Tillery (1971) who found that one third of the faculty had taken a course dealing with the community college.

The relationship between taking a course dealing with the community college and faculty agreement with the community philosophy was studied by Evans (1970). He found this course to be significant at the .0001 level. Apparently, having taken a course dealing with the community college did make a difference in faculty acceptance of the

TABLE 4

Professional Preparation of Community College Faculty (percent)

Author and Date Location and Sample	None	Some Education Courses	Community College Course
Levy, 1957 One Texas college, academic faculty		76.0	10.0
Laffin, 1959 New York, mathematics faculty	35.6	64.4	
Good and others, 1968 Kansas, all faculty	32.0	33.0	33.0
Leet, 1968 Missouri, all faculty		16.0	84.0
Medsker and Tillery, 1971 Nationwide, all faculty			33.0
Hisert, 1972 New York, all faculty	50.0	50.0	3.6
Cash, 1973 Texas, natural science faculty	43.0	57.0	57.0
Evans, 1970 Nationwide, all faculty			22.5

community college philosophy (p.66-67).

These studies and those cited earlier indicated that faculty acceptance of the community college philosophy and the resulting teacher effectiveness were enhanced by professional preparation. A course dealing with the community college was especially helpful to faculty. Evans (1970:88) recommended that "community colleges should give preference to applicants. . .who have taken a course in the junior college." He further recommended that "courses on the community college need to be offered more widely and made more acceptable."

The present study attempted to determine which professional education courses were most important and needed to be included in the preparation programs. It also attempted to differentiate between the needs of faculty teaching in transfer programs and faculty teaching in terminal programs.

PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Correspondence with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) revealed that they listed one hundred two colleges and universities which offer some type of preparation for community college faculty in 1977 (Castillo, 1978). The AACJC list makes no distinction between schools which offer full degree programs and those which offer only a few courses. The AACJC does not list schools or organizations which conduct primarily in-service programs.

The schools from the geographic area of this study which offer pre-service community college courses are: Idaho State University, University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Brigham Young University, University of Utah, Eastern Washington University, University of Washington, Washington State University, University of Wyoming (Castillo, 1978), and Montana State University.

The major weakness in most traditional preparation programs has been that the graduates are too narrow and too specialized. Pugh and Morgan (1944), Fields and Pike (1950), and Stone (1958) all addressed this weakness. O'Banion (1972) in his book noted that:

> The disciplines in universities are inflexible; the colleges of education are unsure and unpracticed. Available instructors are either discipline-oriented, narrow, subject-matter specialists or secondary school-oriented, college of education graduates. Neither is prepared to instruct at the community-junior college. (p.84)

He goes on to say that many of the courses in these pre-service programs are often taught by faculty who have had no experience with the community college.

A list of ten weaknesses in professional preparation programs was developed by Pugh and Morgan (1944).

1. Preparation is frequently of a narrow and specialized nature.
2. Have the content point of view rather than the student point of view.
3. Lack of suitable balance of subject-matter and professional training.

4. Do not understand the junior college.

5. Fail to develop personality traits adapted to the dynamic leadership of youth.

6. Lack ability or knowledge to relate their teaching to practical everyday problems.

7. Placement officers make recommendations upon insufficient evidence.

8. Interested in research, not classroom teaching.

9. Considered junior college with attitudes of condescension.

10. Lack of work experience (p.406-408).

The similarity of these statements by Pugh and Morgan in 1944 and those by O'Banion in 1972 indicate that the same weaknesses and problems have persisted.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION COURSES

The desirable or ideal preparation for community college teachers has been studied since shortly after the junior college movement began. It would be impractical and beyond the scope of this study to review every study individually. Most of the studies or writers recommended particular content ranging from one course to a complete two or three year masters or doctoral program. TABLE 5, page 53, presents an overview of the courses recommended and the number of studies which recommended each course as a necessary part of the pre-service preparation

of community college teachers. TABLES 6 to 14, pages 54-59, list the authors recommending each course.

As TABLE 5, page 53, indicates, the course most often recommended by researchers and authors was the Teaching Internship (TABLE 14, page, 59). Just as student teaching is a prerequisite for certification of public school teachers in most states, these authors basically recommended the same for community college faculty. The writers did not recommend certification but the supervised teaching experience was viewed as a valuable, if not essential, aspect of professional preparation. They recommended that, other things being equal, administrators should give preference to applicants who had participated in a supervised teaching experience in a community college.

The second most frequently mentioned course was The Community College (TABLE 6, page 54). Faculty, administrators, and writers in this field identified a course on the community college, its functions, organization, and philosophy as vital to community college teachers. Morrison (1969) and Evans (1970) both studied what effect a course on the community college had on a faculty member's acceptance of the community college philosophy. They both found that such a course was significantly related to faculty acceptance of the community college philosophy.

TABLE 5

OVERVIEW OF COURSES RECOMMENDED

Course Title or Description Location of Data	Number of Studies Making Recommendation
Teaching Internship TABLE 14	55
The Community College TABLE 6	54
Techniques of Teaching TABLE 10	37
Characteristics of Community College Students TABLE 7	36
Principles of Counseling and Guidance TABLE 8	26
Evaluation TABLE 13	24
Curriculum Development TABLE 12	22
Educational Psychology of Junior College Students TABLE 9	17
Learning Theory TABLE 11	16

TABLE 6

The Community College: It's Functions, Organization, and Philosophy

Author and Date	Author and Date
Eells, 1936	La Grandeur, 1966
Garrison, 1941b	Samlin, 1967
Pugh and Morgan, 1943	Cashin, 1968
Blake, 1944	Hurlburt, 1968
Pugh, 1947	Leet, 1968
Koos, 1949	Pass, 1968
Smith, 1949	Cashin, 1969
Colvert, 1950	Gleazer, 1969
Koos, 1950	Stratton, 1969
Tapley, 1950	Ward, 1969
Colvert, 1952	Evans, 1970
Dolan, 1952	Moore, 1970
Hawkins, 1955	Hisert, 1972
Merson, 1956	O'Banion, 1972
Levy, 1957	Ohm, 1972
Hillway, 1958	Rydzik, 1972
Levy, 1958	Thornton, 1972
Stone, 1958	Lewis, 1973
Laffin, 1959	Reade, 1973
Pyle, 1962	Stockdale and Wochok, 1973
Siehr, 1962	Huff, Kinneavy and Kline, 1974
Rudick, 1963	Kumpf, 1974
Eaton, 1964	Sylves, 1974
Fitzgerald, 1964	Chambers, 1976
Loomis, 1964	Hammons and Wallace, 1976
Blocker and others, 1965	Moe, 1977
Carter, 1965	Smith, 1977

TABLE 7

Characteristics of Community College Students

Author and Date	Author and Date
Garrison, 1941b	Cashin, 1969
Koos, 1949	Gleazer, 1969
Smith, 1949	Stratton, 1969
Koos, 1950	Ward, 1969
Colvert, 1952	Worthen and Shugrue, 1969
Dolan, 1952	Moore, 1970
Merson, 1956	Hisert, 1972
Tapley, 1956	O'Banion, 1972
Levy, 1957	Rydzik, 1972
Stone, 1958	Thornton, 1972
Medsker, 1960	Reade, 1973
Eaton, 1964	Lewis, 1973
LaGrandeur, 1966	Huff, Kinneavy and Kline, 1974
Louk, 1966	Sylves, 1974
Samlin, 1967	Phair, 1975
Cashin, 1968	Hammons and Wallace, 1976
Hurlburt, 1968	Moe, 1977
Leet, 1968	Smith, 1977

TABLE 8

Principles of Counseling and Guidance

Author and Date	Author and Date
Garrison, November 1941	Siehr, 1962
Garrison, December 1941	Rudick, 1963
Pugh and Morgan, 1943	Gleazer, 1969
Pugh, 1947	Moore, 1970
Smith, 1949	Gunderson, 1971
Colvert, 1950	Lindahl, 1971
Colvert, 1952	Hisert, 1972
Dolan, 1952	Ohm, 1972
Tapley, 1956	Principe, 1972
Levy, 1958	Thornton, 1972
Stone, 1958	Kumpf, 1974
Laffin, 1959	Moe, 1977
Pyle, 1962	Smith, 1977

TABLE 9

Educational Psychology of Junior College Students

Author and Date	Author and Date
Garrison, November 1941	Laffin, 1959
Garrison, December 1941	Donnelly, 1961
Blake, 1944	Carter, 1965
Koos, 1949	Ward, 1969
Colvert, 1950	Ohm, 1972
Koos, 1950	Thornton, 1973
Dolan, 1952	Smith, 1973
Tapley, 1956	Kumpf, 1974
Levy, 1957	

TABLE 10

Techniques of Teaching

Author and Date	Author and Date
Eells, 1936	Leet, 1969
Blake, 1944	Ward, 1969
Koos, 1949	Worthen and Shugrue, 1969
Smith, 1949	Gunderson, 1971
Colvert, 1950	Lindahl, 1971
Colvert, 1952	Hisert, 1972
Dolan, 1952	O'Banion, 1972
Tapley, 1956	Ohm, 1972
Levy, 1957	Principe, 1972
Hillway, 1958	Rydzik, 1972
Laffin, 1959	Thornton, 1972
Donnelly, 1961	Smith, 1973
Montgomery, 1962	Stockdale and Wochok, 1973
Loomis, 1964	Huff, Kinneavy and Kline, 1974
Carter, 1965	Kumpf, 1974
Louk, 1966	Sylves, 1974
Cashin, 1968	Moe, 1977
Gleazer, 1968	Smith, 1977
Cashin, 1969	

TABLE 11

Learning Theory

Author and Date	Author and Date
Garrison, December 1941	Ohm, 1972
Tapley, 1956	Rydzik, 1972
Samlin, 1967	Thornton, 1972
Cashin, 1968	Lewis, 1973
Cashin, 1969	Kumpf, 1974
Gleazer, 1969	Sylves, 1974
Stratton, 1969	Smith, 1977
Ward, 1969	
Worthen and Shugrue, 1969	

TABLE 12

Curriculum Development

Author and Date	Author and Date
Koos, 1949	Cashin, 1968
Smith, 1949	Cashin, 1969
Colvert, 1952	Gleazer, 1969
Koos, 1950	Stratton, 1969
Colvert, 1952	Ward, 1969
Dolan, 1952	Worthen and Shugrue, 1969
Tapley, 1956	Moore, 1970
Hillway, 1958	Lewis, 1973
Laffin, 1959	Rydzik, 1972
Carter, 1965	Stockdale and Wochok, 1973
Siehr, 1965	Kumpf, 1974

TABLE 13

Evaluation

Author and Date	Author and Date
Garrison, November 1941	Cashin, 1969
Garrison, December 1941	Ward, 1969
Smith, 1949	Moore, 1970
Colvert, 1950	Rydzik, 1972
Colvert, 1952	Thornton, 1972
Koren, 1952	Reade, 1973
Laffin, 1959	Stockdale and Wochok, 1973
Donnelly, 1961	Stratton, 1973
Rudick, 1963	Sylves, 1974
Cashin, 1968	Hammons and Wallace, 1976
Tapley, 1956	Moe, 1977
Levy, 1957	Smith, 1977

TABLE 14

Teaching Internship

Author and Date	Author and Date
Eells, 1936	Cashin, 1968
Garrison, 1941	Cohen and Brawer, 1968
Garrison, 1941b	Gleazer, 1968
Pugh and Morgan, 1943	Hanzeli, 1968
Blake, 1944	Henry, 1968
Pugh, 1947	Howe, 1968
Bishop, 1948	Leet, 1968
Smith, 1949	Solomon, 1968
Koos, 1950	AACJC, 1969
Colvert, 1952	Birkholz, 1969
Dolan, 1952	Gleazer, 1969
Merson, 1956	Stratton, 1969
Tapley, 1956	Ward, 1969
Henderson, 1957	Anderson, 1972
Kinerson, 1957	Cohen and Brawer, 1972
Stone, 1958	Moodie, 1972
Laffin, 1959	Nelson, 1972
Medsker, 1960	O'Banion, 1972
Donnelly, 1961	Ohm, 1972
Wilson, 1961	Principe, 1972
Pyle, 1962	Reese, 1972
Clark, 1963	Rydzik, 1972
Eurich, 1963	Thornton, 1972
Gleazer, 1965	Cash, 1973
Cohen, 1967	Lewis, 1973
Garrison, 1967	Kumpf, 1974
Gilbert, 1967	Chambers, 1976
Gleazer, 1967	

IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

Even the most cursory comparison between the estimated need for new community college faculty and the ability of current programs to prepare the teachers to meet those needs reveals that community colleges will have to look for sources other than conventional university programs for adequately prepared faculty. Many of the instructors currently employed have not had the necessary training to prepare them to teach in the community college. O'Banion (1972) pointed out that the only way to meet the training needs of these teachers was the well planned in-service program. TABLE 15 presents a list of the authors who have written about the need for in-service training.

TABLE 15

In-Service Programs

Author and Date	Author and Date
Ivey, 1960	Croy, 1973
Samlin, 1967	Smith, 1973
Hurlbert, 1968	*Wilson, 1973
Roueche, 1968	Cohen and Brawer, 1975
Solomon, 1968	Falk, 1975
Wetzler, 1970	Justice, June 1976
O'Banion, 1972	Riechmann and Malec, 1976
Sims, 1972	
Bornheimer, Burns and Dumke, 1973	

Ivey (1960), writing about part-time faculty, noted that adjunct faculty often lacked adequate pre-service training. Meeting the preparation needs of this large segment of the faculty required "a continuous in-service program" (p.41). According to Solomon (1968) the purpose of the in-service program should be to assist faculty to reach a minimum level of preparation.

Samlin (1967), also concluded that in-service programs were needed as an essential part of the preparation of faculty. He found that thirty-eight percent of the schools conducted in-service programs, twenty-eight percent of those without in-service education planned to begin such programs in the next year, and eighty percent of the schools held pre-school orientation seminars.

The list of topics for in-service programs which have been presented or identified as needed was very similar to the courses listed in the previous section. Studying topics needed for staff development, Justice (1976) found that forty percent of the teachers questioned stated that they would attend in-service programs concerning Learning Theory and Student Motivation. The topic, Improving Your Lectures, was identified as the next most popular program.

In-service training, as O'Banion (1972) stated, may offer the most feasible and acceptable means of providing adequate preparation for the community college faculty. Carefully and skillfully presented programs offer real and immediate hope for improving the professional

preparation of faculty. Both the need and success of in-service education have been demonstrated.

SUMMARY

This chapter has presented a review of the literature germane to community college faculty preparation. The findings of this review can be summarized by the following statements.

1. The primary function of the community college is teaching.

2. The community college should attempt to meet the educational needs of the local community.

3. Community college faculty must have a greater interest in teaching and in students than their colleagues in four-year institutions.

4. The major weaknesses of community college faculty are too narrow a specialization in subject matter and lack of understanding of the community college philosophy and role.

5. Lack of time is the greatest problem of the community college instructor.

6. The masters degree is the most common degree held by faculty members, and is considered by administrators to be the most suitable degree for community college faculty.

7. Although historically, many faculty members have been recruited from secondary schools, the recent trend is toward seeking

teachers with previous teaching experience at the community college level.

8. Experience as a junior college student is perceived as advantageous for faculty members, and other factors being equal, persons with that background should be given preference.

9. Having taken a course dealing with the community college is a significant factor in helping a faculty member accept the philosophy of the community college. Nationwide, only about one quarter of the faculty have taken such a course.

10. There are 104 colleges and universities nationwide offering some pre-service preparation for community college faculty. Their capability to produce new faculty is well below the predicted requirements of community colleges.

11. The teaching internship, the community college, characteristics of students, and the techniques of teaching are the courses most often identified as desirable in preparation programs.

12. In-service programs are needed to fill the present needs for professional preparation of faculty members.

Preparation of its faculty may be the most critical issue in the success of the community college. The lack of definitive studies of preparation and the total lack of studies of community college faculty in the northwest, indicate the need for further study.

The differences between faculty who teach in transfer programs

and faculty who teach in terminal programs has not been addressed in the literature.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

The problem of this study was to develop a descriptive profile of faculty and administrators at community colleges in the northwest, and to examine their responses concerning the ideal pre-service and in-service preparation of community college faculty.

Random samples of faculty and administrators were surveyed with a mailed questionnaire to obtain the data. The data was analyzed to determine an ideal pre-service program for faculty and to determine the need for pre-service and in-service preparation programs in the northwest.

POPULATION DESCRIPTION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The population for this study was the faculty and administrators of two-year colleges listed in the 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (Drake 1976) in the states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. A total of seventy-six schools were listed in this geographic area. These schools were contacted and asked to participate in the study. The fifty-nine schools listed in APPENDIX A agreed to participate. The three schools listed in APPENDIX B declined to participate, two schools had become four-year colleges since 1976, and the twelve

schools listed in APPENDIX B did not acknowledge the request. The two colleges which had become four-year schools were no longer considered for this study. The twelve schools who did not respond were contacted a second time and encouraged and invited to participate. None of the twelve responded to the second request and so were counted as non-participants. The faculty and administrators at the fifty-nine schools who agreed to participate became the population of the study.

Lists of faculty and administrators were compiled using the names listed in the college catalogs of the institutions. Two random samples were drawn for the study, one of administrators and one of faculty. Both samples were drawn using the following procedure.

The names of faculty and administrators were consecutively numbered in the respective college catalogs. Numbering began with the first school listed in the directory (Drake 1976) and continued in the order in which they appear in the directory. A random number table was used to draw a sample from each list (Parsons 1974:819-822).

The formula suggested by Cochran (1963:74-75) was used to determine the minimum sample sizes.

The formula is:
$$n = \frac{\frac{t^2PQ}{d^2}}{1 + \frac{1}{N}\frac{t^2PQ}{d^2} - 1}$$

In this formula, "t is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts an area α at the tails."(p.75) In this study, a t of two was used. P is the probability of the parameter and Q is equal to (1 - P).

P = .5 and Q = .5 were used in this study because they produce the largest required sample size. The value of d is the margin of error, .05 was used. N is the population size.

When the original sample was drawn, fifty-five schools had agreed to participate. The minimum required sample size was 274 administrators and 369 faculty of the 861 administrators and 4724 faculty members listed in the catalogs of the participating schools. The required sample size approached 400 as the population increased. This number exceeded the minimum and was used as the faculty sample size. Twenty percent was added to each sample to account for the people who could not be contacted because they had terminated their employment with the college and had moved, retired, or died.

Questionnaires were mailed to 329 administrators and 480 faculty members. Later, four more schools agreed to participate. Nineteen administrators and sixty-two faculty members were added to the sample from these schools by examining the random number table again to the same point that the first sample had stopped and choosing all the numbers which appeared.

The final population was 914 administrators and 5010 faculty members. The final sample was 348 administrators and 542 faculty members.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Development

The questionnaire was constructed by the investigator after an extensive review of literature on this topic. The design had two goals: first, to obtain the necessary information for the study, and second, to be brief enough so that it could be completed in a reasonable time.

The knowledge or skill areas listed in the Professional Preparation section of the questionnaire were derived from the literature. After the areas were identified, they were divided into six basic categories. See APPENDIX G for the literature citations and the list of areas in each category. The skill or knowledge areas were placed on the questionnaire in alphebetical order rather than by category to avoid a built-in category bias.

Validation

After the knowledge or skill areas were identified, faculty members at Montana State University who teach in the subject areas corresponding to the categories reviewed the questionnaire for thoroughness and made any needed additions. Three former community college faculty members who were now students at Montana State University also reviewed the questionnaire and made comments and additions. These reviews and the pre-test of the questionnaire were used to establish the validity of the instrument.

The instrument shown in APPENDIX D was pre-tested on a random sample of thirty-five faculty and fifteen administrators in each of two community colleges. Belleville Area College, Belleville, Illinois, and St. Louis Community College at Forest Park, St. Louis, Missouri, two community colleges close to the investigator's home, agreed to participate in the testing of the instrument. They had faculty and student populations very different from each other. Belleville Area College was a rural middle class college and St. Louis Community College at Forest Park was primarily an urban community college. These two schools offered somewhat the extremes on a rural-urban continuum of faculty and administration which could have been included in the study sample. Their responses and feedback were valuable in establishing the effectiveness and clarity of the instrument.

Several weaknesses were found in the instrument. Modifications were made and a similar procedure was followed with the improved version. A new questionnaire was pre-tested on a random sample of twenty-five faculty and ten administrators at St. Louis Community College at Meramec, St. Louis, Missouri. The responses to this improved instrument were satisfactory and no additional alterations were made. Following this process, the instrument shown in APPENDIX F was mailed to the samples of faculty and administrators.

Data Obtained

The questionnaire was divided into three sections, Descriptive

Data, Desired Qualifications, and Professional Preparation. APPENDIX J presents the breakdown of professional skills.

1. Descriptive Data: This section provided the data for an analysis of the respondents concerning:

a. State of employment.

b. Level of employment: administrator, faculty teaching in terminal programs, faculty teaching in transfer programs, or a combination of those.

c. Full-time or part-time employment.

d. Highest degree attained.

e. Credits taken beyond the highest degree.

f. Pursuing higher degree.

g. Experience as a community college student.

h. Teaching and non-teaching experience.

i. Length of employment at present school and in present position.

j. Student teaching experience.

k. Teaching internship experience.

l. Number of courses taken in education.

m. Degree of satisfaction.

n. Preferred place of employment.

2. Desired Qualifications: This section provided the data necessary to compare:

a. Desired academic preparation.

b. Desired teaching and non-teaching experience.

c. Desired professional activity.

d. Desired combination of degree, professional preparation, and work experience.

3. Professional Preparation: This section provided the data necessary for analysis of:

a. Professional training received by respondents.

b. Amount of professional education training faculty teaching in terminal programs should receive in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas.

c. Amount of professional education training faculty teaching in transfer programs should receive in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas.

d. The most important and least important of the thirty-seven professional education skills or knowledge areas.

All analysis of data was done on the basis of responses to this questionnaire.

DATA COLLECTION

The data for this study was collected from the responses to the questionnaire shown in APPENDIX F. The questionnaire was mailed to random samples of administrators and faculty at the community colleges listed in APPENDIX A.

Initial contact was made with the president of each institution to seek his permission to mail the questionnaire to the staff at that college. This procedure was used because Cohen (1975) found that when initial contact was made with and permission received from the president of the institution, fewer schools would agree to participate, but a higher percentage of the instruments would be returned. He found a return rate of nearly ninety percent using this method (p.4).

Each questionnaire included a self-addressed, stamped envelope with which to return the completed questionnaire. The questionnaires were not coded in any way so that the information could be kept confidential. The return envelopes were coded so that follow-up letters could be mailed to non-respondents.

Three weeks after the first questionnaire was mailed, the first follow-up letter was mailed. Three weeks later, a second follow-up letter was mailed. A third letter was sent two weeks after the second. Each letter contained a questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope.

A fourth letter was mailed two weeks after the third letter. This letter asked the recipients to complete only the Descriptive Data section of the questionnaire and informed them that they would be contacted by phone if they had not responded by 20 July. On 21 and 24 July, telephone contact was attempted with some of the non-respondents. Copies of the letters are shown in APPENDIX E.

STATISTICAL HYPOTHESES

There were thirteen variables derived from the information in the Descriptive Data section of the questionnaire. These variables are listed below.

a. Four types of employment.

b. Part-time or full-time employment.

c. Six categories of highest degree attained.

d. Three categories of those taking courses toward a higher degree.

e. Attended a community college or not attended a community college.

f. Eight types of teaching and non-teaching experience.

g. Five divisions of length of employment at present school.

h. Five divisions of length of employment in present position.

i. Had student teaching or had not had student teaching.

j. Had teaching internship or had not had teaching internship.

k. Five divisions of number of courses taken in education.

l. Five degrees of satisfaction.

m. Seven first and second choices of place of employment.

The following hypotheses were suggested by the questions to be answered by the study. The hypotheses are stated in the null form.

1. (Ho) There are no differences among the states when compared

on each of the fifteen variables listed above.

2. (Ho) There are no differences among administrators, faculty teaching in terminal programs, faculty teaching in transfer programs, and faculty teaching in both terminal and transfer programs when compared on each of the fifteen variables listed above.

3. (Ho) There are no differences between full-time employees and part-time employees when compared on each of the fifteen variables listed above.

4. (Ho) There are no differences among respondents with less than the bachelors degree, respondents with the bachelors degree, respondents with the masters or teaching specialist degree, and respondents with the doctorate when compared on the fifteen variables listed above.

5. (Ho) There are no differences between respondents with experience as a community college student and respondents without experience as a community college student when compared on each of the fifteen variables listed above.

6. (Ho) There are no differences among respondents who are taking courses which will lead to a higher degree, respondents who are not taking courses which will lead to a higher degree, and respondents who are not now taking courses which will lead to a higher degree but plan to when compared on each of the fifteen variables listed above.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

The information gathered from the Professional Preparation and Desired Qualifications sections of the questionnaire did not lend itself to analysis by meaningful statistics. The information was compiled and presented in tabular form. Each of these sections is discussed at length in CHAPTER 4.

There were three major questions asked in the Professional Preparation section of the questionnaire. They were:

a. What proportion of respondents had received training in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas?

b. How much training should faculty teaching in terminal programs and faculty teaching in transfer programs receive in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas?

c. Which five of the thirty-seven professional skill areas were the most important and which five were the least important?

There were five major questions asked in the Desired Qualifications section of the questionnaire. Each question was asked about four subgroups of the faculty, giving a total of twenty questions. The five major questions were:

a. What degree is desired for the different faculty groups?

b. What teaching experience is desired for the different faculty groups?

c. How much non-teaching experience is desired for the

different faculty groups?

d. Which professional activities are desired for the different faculty groups?

e. Which combination of degree, professional preparation, and work experience is most important and which is least important for the different faculty groups?

The discussion of the Professional Preparation and Desired Qualifications sections of the questionnaire attempted to answer the following questions.

1. Were there differences among states in the way they answered the eight questions listed above?

2. Were there differences among administrators, faculty teaching in terminal programs, faculty teaching in transfer programs, and faculty teaching in both terminal and transfer programs in the way in which they answered the eight questions listed above?

3. Were there differences between full-time respondents and part-time respondents in the way in which they answered the eight questions listed above?

4. Were there differences among respondents with less than the bachelors degree, respondents with the bachelors degree, respondents with the masters or teaching specialist degree, and respondents with the doctorate in the way in which they answered the eight questions listed above?

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data gathered from the Descriptive Data section of the questionnaire was compiled and arranged in tables. A chi-square test was computed for each table and tested for significance at the .05 level.

The information from the Professional Preparation section of the questionnaire was used to determine professional skills in which training was needed.

All other analyses were non-statistical.

PRECAUTIONS TAKEN FOR ACCURACY

All responses to the questionnaire were checked by the investigator to insure that the respondents had properly followed the instructions. When erroneous information was detected, the response to that question was considered unusable and deleted from consideration.

All coding for computer input was double checked by the investigator and all keypunched cards were verified.

All keypunch operations, data distributions, and chi-square tests were done on the computer at Montana State University.

SUMMARY

This study attempted to develop a descriptive profile of the faculty and administrators at community colleges in the northwest, and to determine differences in the several subgroups of the sample

mentioned in this chapter.

The purpose of the study was accomplished by developing a questionnaire and sending it to a random sample of administrators and faculty at community colleges in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. 338 administrators and 542 faculty were included in the sample.

The data was collected, compiled, analyzed, and presented in appropriate tables. Six subgroupings of the sample were compared on fifteen variables. The hypotheses based on these comparisons were tested at the .05 level with a chi-square computed on the tables.

In addition to the statistical analysis, non-statistical comparisons were made of the attitudes of four subgroupings of the sample.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This study collected information about faculty and administrators at fifty-nine community colleges in eight states in the northwest. The responses of the faculty and administrators were sampled concerning the training needs of faculty members at community colleges. The findings of the study are presented in four major subdivisions. First, a description of the population and response received is presented. Second, a descriptive profile of faculty and administrators in the sample was developed from the questionnaires and is presented. The third and fourth sections deal with the responses concerning the professional preparation and desired qualifications of faculty members.

Each subdivision contains tables which present the data collected and a discussion of the findings as compared to previous research in the area. The tables are presented using percentages. Tables with the raw numbers can be found in APPENDIX H.

THE POPULATION

Enrollment, Faculty, and Administrators

The population of this study was the faculty and administrators employed by the fifty-nine community colleges listed in APPENDIX A.

TABLE 16 shows the enrollment, number of full-time faculty and part-time faculty, and the number of administrators at these schools as listed in the 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (Drake, 1976) and in the 1978 edition of the same directory (Drake, 1978).

TABLE 16

The Population of The Study

		Enrollment	Full-time Faculty	Part-time Faculty	Administrators
Alaska	1976	3865	79	197	26
8 schools	1978	6862	99	340	31
Idaho	1976	9011	342	135	64
3 schools	1978	9381	409	40	95
Montana	1976	2444	55	57	10
2 schools	1978	2600	57	96	11
Nevada	1976	7651	51	196	11
2 schools	1978	7738	84	381	15
Oregon	1976	40919	708	1298	188
10 schools	1978	40121	1080	1946	272
Utah	1976	11976	359	343	45
5 schools	1978	13575	448	446	54
Washington	1976	103067	1902	2852	328
22 schools	1978	112423	2104	3839	347
Wyoming	1976	10436	316	278	51
7 schools	1978	10375	368	393	54
Total	1976	189369	3812	5356	723
59 schools	1978	203075	4649	7481	879

This table shows a seven percent increase in enrollment in this geographical area between October 1975 and October 1977. The number of full-time faculty and administrators grew by twenty-two percent and part-time faculty grew by forty percent during the same period.

The faculty was 41.6% full-time and 58.4% part-time in 1975. By 1977 the number of part-time faculty had increased so that only 38.3% were full-time and 61.7% were part-time (Drake, 1976 and Drake, 1978).

The Sample

In this study, department heads were considered to be administrators. Therefore, the number of administrators was 914. Not all schools listed part-time faculty in their catalogues. Thus, the number of faculty from which the sample was drawn was 5010. TABLE 17 shows the distribution of the population by state. TABLE 18 shows the distribution of the sample by state. The response rate for faculty and administrators in each state is displayed in TABLE 19. The rate

TABLE 17

Distribution of Population by State

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	TOTAL
Administrators	47	95	14	15	220	85	351	87	914
Faculty	272	455	56	101	1145	434	2163	384	5010

TABLE 18

Distribution of Sample by State

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	TOTAL
Administrators	19	32	9	7	81	32	133	35	348
Faculty	41	48	14	13	99	41	239	47	542
Total	60	80	23	20	180	73	372	82	890

TABLE 19

Response Rate by State

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	TOTAL
Administrators	15[a]	31	7	5	77	29	120	31	315
	78.9[b]	93.9	77.8	71.4	95.1	90.6	90.9	88.6	90.5
Faculty	23	39	12	10	85	35	161	38	403
	56.1	81.3	85.7	76.9	85.9	85.4	67.4	80.9	74.4
Total	38	70	19	15	162	64	281	69	718
	63.3	87.5	82.6	75.0	86.6	85.3	75.5	84.1	80.7

[a]number of respondents

[b]percent of each group who responded

of usable responses was 90.5% for administrators, 74.4% for faculty, and 80.7% overall.

Seventy-six questionnaires were returned because the addressees

had terminated their employment at the college subsequent to the printing of the catalogue used to define the population. Twenty of these were administrators and fifty-six were faculty. When these responses were added, the response rate was 96.3% for administrators, 84.7% for faculty, and 89.2% overall.

The response rate in this study was similar to that reported by Cohen (1975) using a similar method. The response rate also indicated the interest in this subject among community college personnel.

The Responses

When the questionnaires were returned, many of them had comments written on them. These comments included explanatory remarks, a complete outline of possible courses and in-service training sessions in which all thirty-seven professional preparation areas could be presented, and a five page letter explaining why community colleges are failing and how university education departments are contributing to the failure.

The comments were categorized as: negative toward education, negative toward the questionnaire or project, positive toward education, positive toward the project or questionnaire, and neutral. Comments categorized as negative toward education included comments such as: "Education courses are a bunch of worthless methods courses, I avoid them at all costs," "Education courses are for high school only," "I hope I never have to take any (education courses)," "Don't

waste your time trying to improve education, it's hopeless." Comments categorized as negative toward the questionnaire or project included comments such as: "This is too long," "This is too complicated," "I quit four times before I finished," "Who is paying for this anyway," "There is no way to choose the least important, it is impossible," and "Where did you get these anyway?"

Positive comments about education were: "Everyone needs all these courses, how can anyone teach without them," "They (professional education courses) are the key to successful teachers," and "We need more in-service stuff." Positive comments about the questionnaire or project were: "This is a well designed questionnaire, it must have taken you a long time to do," "It's about time someone did this," "This is very interesting, I would like to know how it comes out," and "Good luck, I wish I had thought of this."

TABLE 20 shows the distribution of the comments. TABLES 21-24 present the same information by state, administrator/faculty groups, full-time/part-time, and degree groups. There were more negative comments than positive, 9.7% compared to 1.0%. Alaska had the highest percentage of negative comments about the questionnaire or project. Part-time employees were more positive than full-timers. In fact, only one part-time employee had a negative comment. Respondents with less than a bachelors degree had the lowest proportion of comments, 7.8%. Respondents with the masters or teaching specialist degree made

TABLE 20

Type of Comments

	None	Negative Education	Negative Project	Positive Education	Positive Project	Neutral
Number	567	19	51	3	4	74
Percent	79.0	2.6	7.1	0.4	0.6	10.3

TABLE 21

Type of Comments By State

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
None	24[a]	61	16	12	130	51	216	57	567
	63.2[b]	87.1	84.2	20.0	80.2	79.7	76.9	82.6	79.0
Negative Education	1	2	1	0	3	1	9	2	19
	2.6	2.9	5.3	0.0	1.9	1.6	3.2	2.9	2.6
Negative Project	6	5	0	1	6	5	23	5	51
	15.8	7.1	0.0		6.7	7.8	8.2	7.2	7.1
Positive Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.4	0.4
Positive Project	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.4	1.4	0.6
Neutral	7	2	1	2	22	7	30	3	74
	18.4	2.9	5.3	13.3	13.6	10.9	10.7	4.3	10.3

[a]number of respondents

[b]percent of respondents

TABLE 22

Type of Comments By Administrator/Faculty Groups

	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
None	242[a]	139	146	40	567
	77.8[b]	80.8	81.6	71.4	79.0
Negative Education	5	7	5	2	19
	1.6	4.1	2.8	3.6	2.6
Negative Project	29	9	9	4	51
	9.3	5.2	5.0	7.1	7.1
Positive Education	2	0	1	0	3
	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.4
Positive Project	2	1	1	0	4
	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.6
Neutral	31	16	17	10	74
	10.0	9.3	9.5	17.9	10.3

[a]number of respondents
[b]percent of respondents

the highest proportion of negative comments, 20.6%. Respondents with the doctorate were more negative than other degree groups about the questionnaire or project, 11.0%.

These findings generally agree with the expectations of the investigator. It was anticipated that the lower the educational level of those who received the questionnaire, the more willing they would be to participate because respondents with lower education levels would more readily accept the project as a genuine attempt to improve the

TABLE 23

Type of Comments By Part-time/Full-time

	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
None	542	25	567
	79.2	73.5	79.0
Negative Education	18	1	19
	2.6	2.9	2.6
Negative Project	51	0	51
	7.5	0.0	7.1
Positive Education	3	0	3
	0.4	0.0	0.4
Positive Project	4	0	4
	0.6	0.0	0.6
Neutral	66	8	74
	9.6	23.5	10.3

[a]number of respondents
[b]percent of respondents

situation in community colleges. They would see the greatest need for training and as a result be the most positive toward the project.

It was also anticipated that respondents with higher degrees would be more critical of attempts to improve the community college program and would be more critical of the questionnaire because they would view any discussion of training as leading or forcing them into additional training which they perceive to be redundant and counter-productive. The comments written by respondents with the masters or

TABLE 24

Type of Comments By Degree Groups

	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
None	47[a]	85	331	104	567
	92.2[b]	78.7	78.3	78.3	79.0
Negative Education	1	5	12	1	19
	2.0	4.6	12.8	0.7	2.6
Negative Project	0	3	33	15	51
	0.0	2.8	7.8	11.0	7.1
Positive Education	0	0	3	0	3
	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.4
Positive Project	1	2	3	0	4
	2.0	1.9	0.7	0.0	0.6
Neutral	2	13	41	16	74
	3.9	12.0	9.7	11.8	10.3

[a]number of respondents
[b]percent of respondents

doctors degree agreed with this expectation.

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

A descriptive profile of the respondents was developed. The respondents were divided into six different subgroupings: states, administrator/faculty groups, full-time/part-time, degree groups, respondents pursuing advanced degrees, and community college student experience. These six subgroupings of respondents were compared on

fifteen variables. A chi-square was computed on each comparison.

State

The respondents were from eight states. TABLE 25 displays the distribution of respondents by state.

TABLE 25

Distribution of Respondents By State

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WN	WY	Total Sample
Number	38	70	19	15	162	64	281	79	718
Percent	5.3	9.7	2.6	2.1	22.6	8.9	29.1	9.6	100

Administrator/Faculty Groups

The sample was divided into four groups by position of employment: administrator, faculty teaching in terminal programs, faculty teaching in transfer programs and faculty who teach in both terminal and transfer programs. The distribution of the respondents into these groups is presented in TABLE 26. Administrators comprised 43.3% of the respondents and faculty comprised 56.7%.

The distribution of these groups in each state is shown in TABLE 27. Because so few respondents were in the All Three group, it was collapsed into the administrator group for the chi-square test. The chi-square of 47.41 is just short of the 49.81 required for

significance.

TABLE 26

Distribution of Respondents By Administrator/Faculty Groups

	Admin	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Admin/ Faculty Terminal	Admin/ Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	All Three
Number	252	172	179	27	24	56	8
Percent	35.1	24.0	24.9	3.8	3.3	7.8	1.1

TABLE 27

Distribution of Administrator/Faculty Groups By State (in percent)

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Administrator	47.4	32.9	31.6	40.0	38.3	39.1	32.0	31.9	35.1
Faculty/Term	21.1	17.1	10.5	33.3	23.5	37.5	24.9	18.8	24.0
Faculty/Trans	10.5	28.6	47.4	26.7	22.8	15.6	26.3	30.4	24.9
Admin/Fac Term	2.6	4.3	5.3	0.0	2.5	4.7	3.9	5.8	3.8
Admin/Fac Tran	2.6	8.6	0.0	0.0	1.9	1.6	2.8	7.2	3.8
Fac Term/Fac Tran	15.8	7.1	5.0	0.0	9.9	1.6	8.5	4.3	7.8
All Three	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.1

Chi-square = 47.41 df = 35

The null hypothesis was retained. No significant differences existed between the states in the administrator/faculty groups.

TABLE 28 compares the percentage of part-time and full-time people in each of the administrator/faculty groups. This distribution was found to be significant. The null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that significant differences in the percentages of full-time and part-time employees existed among the administrator/faculty groups.

TABLE 28

Distribution of Administrator/Faculty Groups
By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

	Admin	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Admin/ Faculty Terminal	Admin/ Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	All Three
Full-Time	36.0	23.4	25.1	3.8	3.5	7.0	1.2
Part-Time	17.6	35.3	20.6	2.9	0.0	23.5	0.0
Total Sample	35.1	24.0	24.9	3.8	3.3	7.8	1.1

Chi-square = 18.26* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

Part-time/Full-time

The sample was divided into those who indicated they were employed part-time and those who indicated they were employed full-time in education. The number and percent of the sample in each group is presented in TABLE 29. Only 4.7% of the sample was part-time. This compared with 61.7% in the population as listed in the 1978 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (Drake, 1978). The problem of getting part-time people into the study was anticipated and discussed in CHAPTER 1.

TABLE 29

Distribution of Respondents By Part-time/Full-time

	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
Number	684	34	718
Percent	95.3	4.7	100

The distribution of part-time and full-time respondents from each state is shown in TABLE 30. The chi-square of 19.48 determined from this table was significant. The null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there were significant differences between the states in the proportion of part-time and full-time employees. This finding was expected because not all schools listed part-time employees.

TABLE 30

Distribution of Part-time and Full-time Respondents
By State (in percent)

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Full-Time	81.6	97.1	100.0	93.3	96.9	96.9	94.7	97.1	95.3
Part-Time	18.4	2.9	0.0	6.7	3.1	3.1	5.3	2.9	4.7

Chi-square = 19.48* df = 7 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

Part-time employees were not included in the population of each state and therefore, the distribution of part-time respondents was not evenly distributed.

The distribution of part-time and full-time employees within the Administrator/Faculty groups is shown in TABLE 31. This distribution was found to be significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there were significant differences between these groups in part-time and full-time employees. This finding was also expected. Few administrators were part-time. The Faculty Terminal/Faculty Transfer group had the largest proportion of part-timers and contributed over half of the chi-square total.

TABLE 32 compares part-time and full-time respondents by degree. Those with an associate or bachelors degree had the largest proportion

TABLE 31

Distribution of Part-time and Full-time Respondents
By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

	Admin	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Admin/ Faculty Terminal	Admin/ Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	All Three	Total Sample
Full-Time	97.6	93.0	96.1	96.3	100.0	85.7	100.0	95.3
Part-Time	2.4	7.0	3.9	3.7	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.7

Chi-square = 18.26* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 32

Distribution of Part-time and Full-time Respondents
By Degree Groups (in percent)

	None	Assoc	Bachelors	Masters	Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Full-Time	96.7	85.7	90.7	96.6	90.0	97.8	95.3
Part-Time	3.3	14.3	9.3	3.4	10.0	2.2	4.7

Chi-square = 15.19* df = 5 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

of part-time respondents, 14.3% and 9.3% respectively. The difference between the percentages of those with the Specialist degree compared to those with the masters or doctors degree may indicate that some people misunderstood what Specialist meant. Some respondents may have indicated this degree if they had special certification or training rather than if they had a Teaching Specialist degree. This distribution was found to be significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Although these three divisions of the data were found to be significant, no conclusions can be made based on this data alone because of the small size of the part-time group.

Highest Degree Attained

Respondents were asked to indicate which degrees they held. TABLE 33 presents the distribution of the sample by the highest degree attained. 4.2% had no degree, 2.9% had only an associate degree, 15.0% had a bachelors degree, 53.3% had a masters degree, 5.6% had a teaching specialist degree, and 18.9% had a doctorate.

TABLE 33

Distribution of Respondents By Highest Degree Attained

	None	Associate	Bachelors	Masters	Teaching Specialist	Doctorate
Number	30	21	108	383	40	136
Percent	4.2	2.9	15.0	53.3	5.6	18.9

The highest degree earned by respondents from each state is shown in TABLE 34. For the chi-square analysis, the two categories with less than a bachelors degree were combined and the masters degree and specialist degree were combined resulting in four groups. The chi-square of 36.42 was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that significant differences exist between the states in the highest degree attained by the community college personnel.

TABLE 34

Distribution of Highest Degree Attained
By State (in percent)

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
None	2.6	5.7	0.0	13.3	4.3	7.8	3.9	1.4	4.0
Associate	2.6	0.0	5.3	0.0	4.9	4.7	2.1	2.9	2.9
Bachelors	28.9	11.4	10.5	6.7	11.7	23.4	16.4	8.7	15.0
Masters	31.6	64.3	63.2	46.7	59.3	48.4	50.2	56.5	53.3
Specialist	2.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	3.7	1.6	8.9	7.2	5.6

Chi-square = 36.42* df = 21 $p = < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

The distribution of the highest degree attained analyzed by Administrator/Faculty groups is presented in TABLE 35. As was anticipated, faculty teaching in terminal programs had the highest proportion of respondents with an Associate degree or no degree, 18.6%. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had the highest proportion of respondents with the masters degree, 69.3%, and administrators had the highest proportion of doctorates, 28.9%. The differences in the distribution were found to be significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 35

Distribution of Highest Degree Attained By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

	Admin	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
None	2.9	10.5	1.7	0.0	4.0
Associate	1.6	8.1	0.6	1.8	2.9
Bachelors	11.6	30.8	6.1	14.3	15.0
Masters	49.2	39.0	69.3	69.6	53.3
Specialist	5.8	6.4	5.0	3.6	5.6
Doctors	28.9	5.2	17.3	10.7	18.9

Chi-square = 139.84* df = 15 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

The respondents were divided into a faculty group and an administrator group by combining the three faculty subgroups. The distribution of faculty was then compared with the findings of O'Banion (1972). After his study and a review of the literature, he concluded that the "proportion of instructors with bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees has remained fairly constant over the past ten years" (O'Banion, 1972:54). He found these proportions to be eighteen percent bachelors, seventy-five percent masters, and seven percent doctorates. After combining those with the specialist degree and those with a masters degree and combining those with less than a bachelors degree and those with a bachelors degree, the distribution was compared with O'Banion's findings. O'Banion's findings were used as the expected frequency and a chi-square was computed. This test was significant at greater than .05. Even if the respondents with less than a bachelors degree were not considered, the test was still significant at greater than .05.

The direction of the differences between the findings of the current study and the findings reported by O'Banion was an increase in the proportion of doctorates, an increase in the proportion of those with less than a masters degree, and a decrease in the proportion with the masters degree. This change agreed with Phair's (1975) prediction. The increase in the proportion of faculty with less than a masters degree was especially notable in the faculty teaching in terminal

programs where almost half, 49.4% of the faculty had less than a masters degree.

The same procedure was used to compare the findings of the present study with those reported by Larson (1973). His study was of new faculty members in California. He reported that 9.0% had less than a bachelors degree, 17.0% had a bachelors degree, 67.0% had a masters degree and 7.0% had doctorates. The chi-square for the comparison was significant at the .05 level.

The findings of the current study were compared to those reported by Brown (1974). Brown studied the faculty in the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools geographical region. The chi-square from this comparison was significant at greater than the .05 level. When compared with Phair's (1975) study of California faculty, the chi-square was significant. Compared with Cohen and Brawer's (1976) study of humanities faculty nationwide, the chi-square was significant. The findings of the current study were compared with Johnson's (1977) study of faculty in the Western states and the chi-square was significant at greater than the .05 level.

The study most similar in findings to the current study was Phair's (1977) study of new faculty in California. The chi-square was not significant. He reported 23.0% of the faculty with less than a masters degree, 65.0% with the masters degree, and 12.0% with the doctorate.

Three possible explanations exist for these findings. First, Phair's prediction is true that more doctorates are available and have been employed, and the growth of para-professional, vocational programs has increased the demand for faculty with less than the masters degree. Second, the attractiveness of the northwest as a place of residence has attracted an increased number of people to the area who have doctors degrees. Third, the sample was not representative of the population. Although the correct explanation is probably a combination of these three, the first explanation seems to be the most probable.

The highest degree attained by administrators was compared with the findings of three recent studies which reported degree information about administrators. Rydzik (1972) studied administrators in allied health programs in New York. Kumpf (1974) studied administrators in parts of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky. Johnson (1977) studied administrators in the western states. The chi-square was significant at greater than the .05 level for the Kumpf and Johnson studies and not significant for the Rydzik study. The proportions of administrators with less than the masters degree was higher in the current study than in any of the other three. The proportion of administrators with the doctors degree was higher in the current study than in Kumpf's study but lower than in the Johnson study. The reasons for these differences appear to be the same as for the differences reported about faculty.

The distribution of highest degree attained by part-time and full-time respondents is presented in TABLE 36. The part-time people had a higher proportion of associate and bachelors degrees. This finding agreed with Phair's prediction of an increased emphasis on para-professional and vocational programs. It may also indicate that people with higher degrees were not available on a part-time basis. If this were true, it would contradict Cheit's (1971) prediction of an excess of personnel with advanced degrees seeking employment at the community college.

TABLE 36

Distribution of Highest Degree Attained
By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

	None	Assoc	Bachelors	Masters	Specialist	Doctorate
Full-time	4.2	2.6	14.3	54.1	5.3	19.4
Part-time	2.9	8.8	29.4	38.2	11.8	8.8
Total Sample	4.0	2.9	15.0	53.3	5.6	18.9

Chi-square = 15.19* df = 5 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had attended a community or junior college as a student. As TABLE 37 shows, 42.2% of the respondents indicated they had attended a community college. This compares to 26.2% (Evans, 1970), 28.0% (Medsker and Tillery, 1971), and 25.1% (Cohen and Brawer, 1976) reported by other recent nationwide studies. Lipscomb's (1972) study of Mississippi faculty was the only study which reported a proportion as high as that found in the current study. Lipscomb reported 52.0% of the Mississippi faculty with this experience.

TABLE 37

Distribution of Respondents By Experience As A Community College Student

	Yes	No
Number	303	415
Percent	42.2	57.8

TABLE 38 displays how the respondents from each state answered the question concerning attendance at a community college. This distribution was not found to be significant and the null hypothesis was retained. That is, no differences existed in the proportion of respondents from each state who had attended a community college. Alaska,

with 47.4%, had the highest proportion who indicated that they had attended a community college, however, this was still below the 52.0% reported by Lipscomb.

TABLE 38

Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student By State (in percent)

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Yes	47.4	45.7	31.6	40.0	42.6	37.5	45.2	30.4	42.2
No	52.6	54.3	68.4	60.0	57.4	62.5	54.8	69.6	57.8
	Chi-square = 7.22			df = 7					

TABLE 39, TABLE 40, TABLE 41, and TABLE 42 show the proportion of those persons with experience as a community college student as indicated by administrator/faculty groups, part-time/full-time, degree groups, and persons pursuing a higher degree respectively.

A higher proportion of faculty members than administrators had attended a community college. However, the differences were not significant. The differences between part-time and full-time respondents were also not significant and the null hypotheses were retained for both these distributions. Thus, it was concluded that no differences existed in the proportion of administrators and faculty who had

TABLE 39

Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student
By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

	Admin	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Admin/ Faculty Terminal	Admin/ Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	All Three	Total Sample
Yes	43.1	47.7	44.1	37.0	20.8	32.1	37.5	42.2
No	56.9	52.3	55.9	63.0	79.2	67.9	62.5	57.8

Chi-square = 9.72 df = 6

TABLE 40

Respondents With Experience As A Community College
Student By Part-Time/Full-Time (in percent)

	Part-time	Full-time	Total Sample
Yes	44.1	42.1	42.2
No	55.9	57.9	57.8

Chi-square = .0029 df = 1

TABLE 41

Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student
By Degree Groups (in percent)

	None	Associate	Bachelors	Masters	Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Yes	66.7	81.0	46.3	37.1	55.0	38.2	42.2
No	33.3	19.0	53.7	62.9	45.0	61.8	57.8

Chi-square = 28.72* df = 5 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 42

Respondents With Experience As A Community College Student
By Those Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent)

Community College Student	Taking Courses			Total Sample
	Yes	No	No but Plan to	
Yes	54.3	38.7	40.4	42.5
No	45.7	61.3	59.6	57.8

Chi-square = 10.60* df = 2 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

attended a community college and that no differences existed in the proportion of part-time and full-time employees who had attended a community college.

The differences among degree groups were found to be significant at greater than the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for

these groups, and it was concluded that significant differences did exist among the groups. Eighty-one percent of the respondents with an associate degree and 66.7% of those with no degree had attended a community college. This compared to 37.1% and 38.2% respectively for respondents with the masters degree and doctorate.

When compared by respondents who were pursuing a higher degree, more respondents who had attended a community college were presently enrolled in classes which would lead to a higher degree, 54.3% versus 45.7%. The differences among the groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were taking courses which would lead to a higher degree by selecting one of the following responses: yes, no, or no but plan to. The distribution of the respondents by these categories is presented in TABLE 43.

TABLE 43

Distribution of Respondents By Persons Pursuing A Higher Degree

	Yes	No	No but plan to
Number	140	395	183
Percent	19.5	55.0	25.5

TABLE 44 shows the distribution of persons pursuing a higher degree within each state. Utah, Nevada and Alaska had the highest proportions of persons presently pursuing a higher degree, 29.7%, 28.9%, and 26.7% respectively. Montana had the lowest proportion with 10.5%. However, Montana had the highest proportion who said they planned to pursue a higher degree, 47.4%. The differences among the states were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. It was concluded that no differences existed in the proportion of respondents from each state who were taking courses toward a higher degree.

TABLE 44

Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree
By State (in percent)

Taking Courses	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Yes	28.9	17.1	10.5	26.7	21.0	29.7	16.7	15.9	19.5
No	50.0	55.7	42.1	46.7	55.6	40.6	60.1	53.9	55.0
No But Plan To	21.1	27.1	47.4	26.7	23.5	29.7	23.1	30.4	25.5
	Chi-square = 18.92 df = 14								

One reason why fewer Montana respondents would have been actively pursuing higher degrees was that the universities in Montana are geographically separated from the community colleges and, thus, it

was more difficult for them to attend classes than it would have been for respondents from states where more community colleges were geographically closer to four year colleges and universities offering degree programs appropriate for community college personnel. This would also explain why the high percentage reported that they plan to pursue a higher degree. When the Yes and No but plan to responses were combined, almost no differences existed.

The distribution of administrators and faculty who were pursuing a higher degree is presented in TABLE 45. The differences among these groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. As would be expected, the faculty who teach in terminal programs, who had the highest proportion of respondents with less than a masters degree, had the highest percentage, 28.5%, who said they were presently taking courses which would lead to a higher degree.

Administrators, with 62.4%, had the highest proportion of responses that stated that they were not taking courses toward a higher degree. One unexpected finding was that a lower proportion of faculty teaching in both transfer and terminal programs were currently taking courses toward a higher degree than were administrators.

These findings agreed with Principe who found that one-third of the science faculty of community colleges in the New York area planned to continue their education (1972:113). Science faculty would have been considered in this study as faculty teaching in transfer programs.

This group reported over 42% who were either presently enrolled or planned to take courses which would lead to a higher degree.

TABLE 45

Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Taking Courses	Admin	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
Yes	17.4	28.5	16.8	12.5	19.5
No	62.4	40.1	57.8	51.8	55.0
No But Plan To	20.3	31.4	25.7	35.7	25.5

Chi-square = 28.27* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

Bushnell reported that thirty-three percent of the academic faculty were pursuing a higher degree (1973: 32-33). This compared to the 16.8% presently taking courses noted in the current study. Bushnell found fifty percent of the vocational faculty were actively enrolled in advanced degree programs (1973:32-34). The same group in the current study reported only 28.5% presently enrolled.

TABLE 46 displays the distribution of part-time and full-time respondents who were taking courses toward a higher degree. The differences between these groups were not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that no differences existed

in the proportion of part-time and full-time employees who were taking courses toward a higher degree.

TABLE 46

Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree
By Part-Time/Full-Time (in percent)

	Taking Courses		
	Yes	No	No But Plan To
Full-time	20.0	54.5	25.4
Part-time	8.8	84.7	26.5
Total Sample	19.5	55.0	25.5
	Chi-square = 2.71 df = 2		

The responses to the same question by persons in the different degree groups are presented in TABLE 47. The differences among these groups was found to be significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. As the education level increased, the proportion who said they were not presently pursuing a higher degree increased and the proportion currently taking courses decreased.

Eighteen percent of those persons with a masters or teaching specialist degree were currently taking courses toward a higher degree. This figure was somewhat higher than the six percent reported by Bushnell (1973). However, Bushnell was reporting only faculty while this study included both administrators and faculty with the masters degree.

Medsker reported that ten percent of the faculty were working on a doctorate and nine percent on the masters degree (1960:171). The findings of this study, although it included both faculty and administrators, showed an increase in the number of persons pursuing a higher degree from that reported by either Medsker or Bushnell.

TABLE 47

Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Degree Groups (in percent)

	Highest Degree Held				
Taking Courses	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Specialist or Masters	Doctorate	Total Sample
Yes	51.0	30.6	18.0	3.7	19.5
No	25.5	32.4	53.9	87.5	55.0
No But Plan To	23.5	37.0	28.1	8.8	25.5

Chi-square = 116.66* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

A comparison of respondents who had experience as a community college student and respondents taking courses toward a higher degree is presented in TABLE 48. This comparison was found to be significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. More respondents with experience as a community college student than those who had not attended a community college were taking courses which would lead to a higher degree,

25.1% compared to 15.4%. Evans (1970) found experience as a community college student to be a significant factor relating to faculty agreement with the community college philosophy. The findings of the current study indicated that this experience was also a significant factor in motivating community college personnel to continue their formal education.

TABLE 48

Respondents Taking Courses Toward A Higher Degree By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Community College Student	Taking Courses		
	Yes	No	No but plan to
Yes	24.1	50.5	24.4
No	15.4	58.3	26.3
Total Sample	19.5	55.0	25.5
	Chi-square = 10.60*	df = 2	$p < .05$
	*significant at the .05 level		

Teaching Experience

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had taught in elementary schools, secondary schools, business or trade schools, vocational technical schools, other community colleges, four-year colleges and/or worked as a graduate assistant or in non-teaching positions. TABLE 49 presents the number, percent, and mean number of years of teaching or work experience of respondents. As this table

TABLE 49

Distribution of Respondents By Teaching Experience

	Teaching Experience								
	Elemen	Second	Bus or Trade	Vo-Tec	Comm College	4-year College	Grad Assist	Non-Teach	None
Number	98	333	28	53	157	163	141	170	106
Percent	13.6	46.4	3.9	7.4	21.9	22.7	19.6	23.7	14.8
Mean Years	4.0	6.5	4.3	4.5	4.8	3.9	2.0	7.8	

shows, respondents had more experience in the secondary school than in any of the other choices. 46.4% of the respondents had taught in a secondary school and had the most teaching experience with an average of 6.5 years. The longest experience was in the non-teaching work situation. Although only 23.7% of the respondents indicated they had experience in non-teaching jobs, they averaged 7.8 years work experience. 14.8% of the respondents reported no teaching or work experience prior to their present position.

The differences in the teaching experience of respondents in each state were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. The distribution of teaching experience in each state is shown in TABLE 50. Montana and Idaho had the highest proportion of respondents with secondary teaching experience with 57.9% and 57.1% respectively. Washington had the lowest proportion of respondents with secondary teaching experience with 42.3%. Montana with 5.1 years and Utah with 4.5 years had

TABLE 50

Teaching Experience of Respondents By State
(in percent and mean years)

Teaching Experience	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Elementary	34.2[a]	17.1	15.8	20.0	10.5	9.4	12.1	14.5	13.6
	3.0[b]	4.6	1.7	1.0	6.4	5.2	2.6	6.7	4.0
Secondary	47.4	57.1	57.9	46.7	47.5	45.3	42.3	46.4	46.4
	8.8	5.7	5.1	6.3	5.9	4.5	7.5	6.4	6.5
Business	5.3	2.9	0.0	0.0	3.1	12.5	3.6	1.4	2.9
Trade	2.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	4.9	5.2	10.0	4.3
Vocational	5.3	4.3	0.0	0.0	6.8	21.9	7.5	2.9	7.4
Technical	1.5	7.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	4.4	5.3	5.0	4.5
Community	23.7	15.7	15.3	33.3	29.0	12.5	21.0	21.7	21.9
College	5.0	3.6	10.3	3.8	3.3	1.4	5.7	5.7	4.8
Four year	34.2	21.4	21.1	26.7	23.5	15.6	21.0	29.0	22.7
College	4.9	4.0	1.8	3.3	3.9	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.9
Graduate	28.9	10.0	21.1	46.7	19.1	14.1	16.4	37.7	19.6
Assistant	2.5	1.3	2.8	1.9	2.2	1.4	2.1	1.9	2.0
Non-Teaching	26.3	25.7	21.1	26.7	22.8	23.4	23.5	23.2	23.7
	7.4	3.8	10.0	4.5	8.3	7.6	9.4	5.4	7.8

[a]percent of respondents

[b]mean years experience

Chi-square = 82.46* df = 49 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

the shortest secondary teaching experience. Alaska, with 8.8 years had the longest secondary experience.

Montana had no respondents who had taught in either a business or trade school or in a vocational-technical school. This may have been because the community college which would have had personnel with this type experience did not participate in the study.

Utah had the lowest proportion of respondents with experience at other community colleges, 12.5% with 1.4 mean years experience. Montana had the second lowest proportion with community college teaching experience, 15.3% with the longest mean years experience of 10.3 years. Nevada had the highest proportion of respondents, 33.3%, with community college teaching experience.

Utah recorded the lowest percentage of respondents with four-year college teaching experience, 15.6%. Montana respondents had the shortest four-year college teaching experience, 1.8 years. Alaska respondents had the highest proportion with four-year college teaching experience, 34.2%, and also the longest such experience, 4.9 years.

Montana respondents had the lowest proportion of respondents with non-teaching work experience, 21.1%, but they had the longest such experience, 10.0 years. Two factors seem to contribute to this finding. First, the college with people most likely to have this experience did not participate. Secondly, Montana may be recruiting more of its new personnel from four-year colleges rather than from the market place.

Analysis of responses of administrators and faculty concerning teaching experience is presented in TABLE 51. This distribution was significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Administrators had a higher proportion of respondents who had experience in public schools, other community colleges and non-teaching work situations than did faculty. Faculty teaching in terminal programs had the highest proportion of respondents with experience in business or trade schools and in vocational-technical schools. Faculty who taught in both terminal and transfer programs, many of who were also counselors, had nearly the same percentage of respondents with teaching experience in the public schools as did the administrators. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had the highest percentage of respondents who had taught in the four-year college.

The teaching experience of respondents tends to lend support to the predictions of Cheit (1971), Phair (1975), and Phair (1977) discussed earlier. The faculty teaching in transfer programs reported a much higher proportion of respondents with experience in a four-year college than previous studies had reported. One fourth of the faculty teaching in terminal programs had non-teaching work experience with an average of 9.7 years experience. Also, 26.7% of faculty teaching in terminal programs reported no teaching or work experience prior to their present position.

The findings of the current study were compared to studies

TABLE 51

Teaching Experience of Respondents By Administrator/Faculty Groups
(in percent and mean years)

Teaching Experience	Administrator	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
Elementary	18.0[a]	8.7	9.5	17.9	13.6
	4.3[b]	3.5	3.3	4.0	4.0
Secondary	57.2	25.6	41.9	64.3	46.4
	6.7	5.9	6.2	7.0	6.5
Business or Trade	2.9	9.3	1.1	1.8	3.9
	6.0	4.5	2.5	2.0	4.3
Vocational Technical	8.4	13.4	0.0	3.1	7.4
	3.6	5.7	0.0	3.8	4.5
Community College	29.3	13.4	19.6	14.3	21.9
	4.9	5.3	4.5	3.3	4.8
Four-Year College	26.7	9.9	29.1	19.6	22.7
	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.9	3.9
Graduate Assistant	18.3	12.2	31.8	10.7	19.6
	2.0	1.8	2.2	1.5	2.0
Non-Teaching	25.7	25.0	18.4	25.0	23.7
	7.3	9.7	7.9	4.3	7.8
None[c]	10.0	26.7	13.4	8.9	14.8

[a] percent of respondents

[b] mean years experience

[c] no experience indicated in any of the above categories

Chi-square = 118.21* df = 21 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

reported in TABLE 2, page 32. The findings of previous studies were used as the expected frequencies and chi-square tests were computed. For the comparisons, all faculty were combined into one group.

The findings for faculty were compared to thirty-five of the studies from TABLE 2. All thirty-five comparisons were significant. The findings for administrators were similarly compared to the four studies listed in TABLE 2 which reported information concerning administrators. These four were also found to be significant. TABLE 52 lists the studies and the computed chi-square for each comparison.

Teaching experience of part-time and full-time respondents is displayed in TABLE 53. More part-time personnel had experience in elementary schools, business or trade schools, vocational-technical schools, and four-year colleges. Full-time personnel had more experiences only in the secondary schools and other community colleges. It would appear that people are being employed on a part-time basis from public schools, four-year colleges, and the business and industry sector. Public school teachers and college professors may be employed full-time at these schools but teach part-time at the community college for a second source of income. This might also be true for those coming from business and industry. These people may be looking for a second income, but more importantly, they seem to be filling a great need for the community college.

TABLE 52

Studies From TABLE 2 Compared To Current Study

Author and Date	Chi-square	Significant
	Faculty	
Wahlquist, 1930	82.71	Yes
Eells, 1931	136.13	Yes
Garrison, 1941	168.67	Yes
Koos, 1947	263.97	Yes
Siehr, 1962	15.01	Yes
Siehr and others,1963	14.72	Yes
Siehr and others,1963	215.77	Yes
Johnson, 1964	20.80	Yes
Johnson, 1964	20.11	Yes
Johnson, 1964	61.45	Yes
Wattenbarger, 1964	50.60	Yes
Carter, 1965	74.47	Yes
Maul, 1965	264.01	Yes
NEA, 1965	54.58	Yes
Birnbaum, 1966	3358.55	Yes
Gleazer, 1967	114.21	Yes
Cashin, 1968	30.05	Yes
Farris, 1968	310.37	Yes
Good and others,1968	246.30	Yes
Phair, 1968	255.83	Yes
Phair, 1968	151.6	Yes
Cohen and Brawer, 1969	14.65	Yes
Phair, 1969	18.32	Yes
Medsker and Tillery, 1971	89.54	Yes
Hisert, 1972	95.19	Yes
Rydzik, 1972	251.73	Yes
Bushnell, 1973	9.84	Yes
Larson, 1973	290.00	Yes
Reade, 1973	123.23	Yes
Reade, 1973	829.98	Yes
Smith, 1973	862.98	Yes
Brown, 1974	1350.46	Yes
Kumpf, 1974	135.82	Yes
Phair, 1975	424.77	Yes
Phair, 1977	449.80	Yes

TABLE 52 (continued)

Author and Date	Chi-square	Significant
	Administrators	
Roland, 1953	34.33	Yes
Hawk, 1960	26.93	Yes
Rydzik, 1972	684.92	Yes
Kumpf, 1974	83.00	Yes

TABLE 53

Teaching Experience of Respondents By Part-time/Full-time
(in percent and mean years)

	Teaching Experience							
	Elemen	Second	Bus Trade	Vo-Tec	Comm College	4 yr. College	Grad Assist	Non-Teaching
Full-time	12.4[a]	46.9	3.5	7.3	22.4	22.5	19.4	23.7
	3.9[b]	6.5	4.8	4.6	4.7	3.8	2.1	7.7
Part-time	38.2	35.3	11.8	8.8	11.7	26.5	23.5	23.5
	4.5	7.3	4.3	3.0	8.5	3.7	1.6	10.0
Total Sample	13.6	46.4	3.9	7.4	21.9	22.7	19.6	23.7
	4.0	6.5	4.3	4.5	4.8	3.9	2.0	7.8

[a]percent of respondents

[b]mean years experience

Chi-square = 27.22* df = 7 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

The differences in teaching experience between part-time and full-time respondents were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

As was expected, the teaching experiences of respondents of the different degree groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. TABLE 54 presents this information. Respondents with less than a bachelors had the highest percentage with teaching experience in business or trade school and vocational-technical schools and the longest experience in non-teaching work situations. Respondents with the doctorate had the highest percentage with experience in the public schools, other community colleges, the four-year college, and non-teaching work situations. Over half the respondents with masters and doctors degrees had experience in the secondary school.

Teaching experience of respondents pursuing a higher degree and those not pursuing a degree was compared. As TABLE 55 shows, respondents not currently taking classes and not planning to do so had the highest percentage with experience in the public schools, other community colleges, and four-year colleges. The differences among these groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

The differences in teaching experience between respondents with and without experience as a community college student are presented in TABLE 56. These differences were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. Thus, there are no differences in the teaching

TABLE 54

Teaching Experience of Respondents By Degree Groups
(in percent and mean years)

Degree	Teaching Experience							
	Elemen	Second	Bus Trade	Vo-Tec	Comm College	College	Teach Assist	Non-Teach
Less than	0.0[a]	10.0	12.0	16.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	26.0
Bachelors	0 [b]	1.6	4.8	5.3	5.3	3.0	0	14.8
Bachelors	9.6	28.8	6.7	10.6	11.5	9.6	3.8	25.0
	4.8	6.2	5.6	4.3	5.9	5.9	1.0	10.4
Masters	15.4	50.8	3.3	6.6	23.6	20.1	20.3	21.7
	4.3	6.7	4.4	4.1	4.5	3.5	1.9	6.1
Doctorate	16.9	60.3	0.7	2.9	29.4	48.5	36.8	27.9
	2.6	6.6	2.0	2.0	5.3	3.9	2.3	7.9
Total	13.6	46.4	3.9	7.4	21.9	22.7	19.6	23.7
Sample	4.0	6.5	4.3	4.5	4.8	3.9	2.0	7.8

[a] percent of respondents

[b] Mean years experience

Chi-square = 139.48* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

experience of respondents who have attended a community college and those who have not.

Length of Service

Respondents indicated how long they had been employed at the college and how long in their present position. TABLE 57 presents the distribution of respondents by the length of service. Nearly seventy-

TABLE 55

Teaching Experience of Respondents By Those Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent and mean years)

Taking Courses	Teaching Experience							
	Elemen	Second	Bus Trade	Vo-Tec	Comm College	4 yr College	Teach Assist	Non-Teach
Yes	10.7[a]	37.1	2.9	11.4	20.0	15.7	15.7	25.7
	4.9[b]	6.0	6.3	3.5	4.2	2.9	2.4	8.1
No	15.9	51.6	3.8	6.1	24.3	29.4	20.3	22.3
	4.1	7.1	4.8	4.7	5.0	3.9	2.1	8.3
No But Plan To	10.9	42.1	4.9	7.1	18.0	13.7	21.3	25.1
	2.8	5.4	3.9	5.5	4.8	4.1	1.7	6.6
Total Sample	13.6	46.4	3.9	7.4	21.9	22.7	19.6	23.7
	4.0	6.5	4.3	4.5	4.8	3.9	2.0	7.8

[a] percent of respondents

[b] mean years experience

Chi-square = 25.64* df = 14 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

five percent of the respondents had been at their present school less than ten years. The average length of service for all respondents was 8.0 years. The average time in present position was 6.5 years.

The length of service of respondents from each state is presented in TABLE 58 and TABLE 59. For the chi-square analysis, the two groups with over fifteen years service were combined because of the small number in each category. The differences in the length of service

TABLE 56

Teaching Experience of Respondents By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent and mean years)

Community College Student	Teaching Experience							
	Elemen	Second	Bus Trade	Vo-Tec	Comm College	4 yr College	Grad Assist	Non-Teach
Yes	13.9[a]	41.3	4.0	7.6	25.1	18.5	19.1	23.4
	3.9[b]	6.2	4.7	3.3	4.5	3.8	1.7	7.9
No	13.5	50.1	3.9	7.2	19.5	25.8	20.0	23.9
	4.0	6.8	4.7	5.4	5.1	8.8	2.3	7.7
Total Sample	13.6	46.4	3.9	7.4	21.9	22.7	19.6	23.7
	4.0	6.5	4.3	4.5	4.8	3.9	2.0	7.8

[a]percent of respondents

[b]mean years experience

Chi-square = 8.45 df = 7

of respondents among the states were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected for both comparisons.

Nevada and Alaska had respondents who had been at the present college the shortest time. In Nevada 86.7% and in Alaska 86.8% had been employed less than six years. Alaska's average employment was 3.3 years and Nevada's was 3.7 years. No one had been employed over 10 years in Nevada notably because the two colleges responding were established in 1969 and 1971 making it impossible to have anyone with

TABLE 57

Distribution of Respondents By Length of Service

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Present School						
Number	267	256	142	35	18	8.0
Percent	37.2	35.7	19.8	4.9	2.5	
Present Position						
Number	380	209	96	21	12	6.5
Percent	52.9	29.1	13.4	2.9	1.7	

TABLE 58

Length of Service At Present School By State (in percent)

Years	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
0-5	86.8	20.0	36.8	86.7	35.2	39.1	29.2	52.2	37.2
6-10	10.5	32.9	36.8	13.3	48.8	35.9	33.8	33.3	35.7
11-15	2.6	37.1	26.3	0.0	15.4	10.9	26.0	7.2	19.8
16-20	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	6.3	7.8	2.9	4.9
Over 20	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	3.2	4.3	2.9
Mean Years	3.3	10.1	7.4	3.7	7.0	8.4	9.1	7.0	8.0

Chi-square = 126.72* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 59

Length of Service in Present Position By State (in percent)

Years	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
0-5	89.5	38.6	42.1	93.3	54.3	57.8	46.3	60.9	52.9
6-10	7.9	31.4	36.8	6.7	36.4	26.6	28.8	27.5	29.1
11-15	2.6	21.4	21.1	0.0	8.6	9.4	18.1	7.2	13.4
16-20	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	1.6	4.6	1.4	2.9
Over 20	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	1.8	2.9	1.7
Mean Years	2.9	8.0	6.9	2.9	5.6	6.2	7.3	6.0	6.5

Chi-square = 66.82* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

more than ten years experience. Utah had the highest proportion with over twenty years experience. 7.8%.

Alaska with 89.5% and Nevada with 93.3% had the highest proportion of respondents with less than six years experience in their present position. Respondents from both states had been in their present position an average of 2.9 years. Utah had the greatest number of respondents, 4.7%, who had been in their present position over twenty years. Idaho had the longest average length of service with 8.0 years in the present position.

The length of service of administrator/faculty groups is displayed in TABLE 60 and TABLE 61. The differences in the length of

service at the present school for these groups were significant and the differences in the length of service in present positions were significant. The null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 60

Length of Service at Present School By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Years	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
0-5	34.7	48.3	32.4	32.1	37.2
6-10	36.7	33.7	32.4	46.4	35.7
11-15	20.3	13.4	25.7	17.9	19.8
16-20	5.5	3.5	5.6	3.6	4.9
Over 20	2.9	1.2	3.9	0.0	2.9
Mean Years	8.2	6.8	8.8	7.8	8.0

Chi-square = 22.68* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

The faculty teaching in terminal programs had the shortest length of service, 48.3%, with less than six years service and an average of 6.8 years. This supported earlier findings which suggest an increased emphasis on terminal programs in the last five to ten years. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had the longest service, an average of 8.8 years.

TABLE 61

Length of Service in Present Position By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Years	Administrators	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
0-5	62.4	58.1	36.9	35.7	52.9
6-10	26.0	28.5	30.2	44.6	29.1
11-15	8.4	11.0	24.0	16.1	13.4
16-20	2.3	1.7	5.0	3.6	2.9
Over 20	1.0	1.2	3.9	0.0	1.7
Mean Years	5.5	5.9	8.4	7.4	6.5

Chi-square = 57.17* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

Administrators had the shortest time in their present position with an average of 5.5 years and 62.4% had less than six years. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had been in their present position the longest, an average of 8.4 years and 3.9% over twenty years.

TABLE 62 and TABLE 63 show the length of service of part-time and full-time respondents. The differences in the length of service at their present school between these groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. The differences in the length of service in present position between these groups were significant and the null

TABLE 62

Length of Service at Present School By Part-time/Full-time
(in percent)

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Full-time	35.5	36.5	20.6	5.0	2.3	8.1
Part-time	70.6	17.6	2.9	2.9	5.9	5.8
Total Sample	37.2	35.7	19.8	4.9	2.9	8.0

Chi-square = 20.96* df = 4 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 63

Length of Service in Present Position By Part-time/Full-time
(in percent)

	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Full-time	51.6	30.0	13.9	2.9	1.6	6.5
Part-time	79.4	11.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	4.7
Total Sample	52.9	29.1	13.4	2.9	1.7	6.5

Chi-square = 11.67* df = 4 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

hypothesis was rejected.

Part-time employees had been at their present school a shorter time than full-time personnel, 5.8 years average compared to 8.1 years average. The proportion of part-timers with less than six years service was nearly twice that of full-time people, 70% compared to 35.5%. This was anticipated because part-time personnel would have a high turnover rate. The surprising fact about this finding was that part-time personnel had been employed at the school as long as they had. Nearly six percent had been at the college over twenty years.

Length of service in present position was similar to length of service at present school. Part-time personnel had an average of 4.7 years service while full-time personnel had 6.5 years average. Of the part-time employees, 79.4% had been in their present position less than six years while 2.9% had served over twenty years.

The length of service of respondents in each degree group is presented in TABLE 64 and TABLE 65. The differences among degree groups concerning length of service at present school were significant and the differences in length of service in present position were significant. The null hypotheses were rejected.

Respondents with less than a bachelors degree had the shortest length of service, 6.4 years average and sixty percent with less than six years. Respondents with a bachelors degree had only slightly longer experience with an average of 6.5 years and 46.2% less than six

TABLE 64

Length of Service at Present School By Degree Groups (in percent)

Years	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
0-5	60.0	46.2	31.0	9.7	37.2
6-10	24.0	38.5	38.0	31.6	35.7
11-15	12.0	9.6	24.1	17.6	19.8
16-20	2.0	4.8	4.5	7.4	4.9
Over 20	2.0	1.0	2.4	3.7	2.9
Mean Years	6.4	6.5	8.5	8.2	8.0

Chi-square = 33.2* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

years. Respondents with a masters degree had the longest average service, 8.5 years.

Respondents with less than a bachelors degree also had the shortest service in their present position, 4.7 years and 74.0% with less than six years. Persons with the masters degree had the longest, 6.9 years and 2.1% with over twenty years service.

The distributions of the length of service data for respondents pursuing a higher degree are presented in TABLE 66 and TABLE 67. Both these distributions were significant and the null hypotheses were rejected and it was concluded that significant differences did exist

TABLE 65

Length of Service in Present Position By Degree Groups (in percent)

Years	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
0-5	74.0	58.7	48.5	53.7	52.9
6-10	16.0	32.7	20.5	27.9	79.1
11-15	5.0	5.8	15.8	13.2	13.4
16-20	0.0	1.9	3.1	4.4	2.9
Over 20	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.7	1.7
Mean Years	4.7	5.4	6.9	6.4	6.5

Chi-square = 22.35* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

in the length of service at present school and in present position among respondents pursuing a higher degree and those not pursuing a higher degree.

As TABLE 66 shows, respondents not pursuing a higher degree and not planning to do so had a longer length of service, 9.2 years, than those who were either presently taking courses, 6.8 years, or who planned to do so, 6.3 years. Personnel who have been employed longer have already completed a higher degree and planned no further education. Newly hired personnel are continuing their education so they can improve their positions.

TABLE 66

Length of Service at Present School By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent)

Taking Courses	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Yes	43.6	39.3	13.6	2.9	0.7	6.8
No	29.1	34.9	24.8	7.3	3.8	9.2
No But Plan To	49.7	34.4	13.7	1.1	1.1	6.3
Total Sample	37.2	35.7	19.8	4.9	2.9	8.0

Chi-square = 45.44* df = 8 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

Differences in the length of service in the present position were similar to those in length of service at present school. Respondents not currently taking courses toward a higher degree had the longest service with an average of 7.4 years compared to 5.6 years and 5.1 years for the other two groups.

TABLE 68 and TABLE 69 compare the length of service and experience as a community college student. Neither of these comparisons was significant. The null hypotheses were retained and it was concluded that no differences existed in the length of service in present position or at present school between respondents who had attended a community

TABLE 67

Length of Service in Present Position By Respondents Pursuing a Higher Degree (in percent)

Taking Courses	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Yes	57.1	31.4	9.3	1.4	0.7	5.6
No	46.1	29.4	17.5	4.6	2.5	7.4
No But Plan To	64.5	26.8	7.7	0.5	0.5	5.1
Total Sample	52.9	29.1	13.4	2.9	1.7	6.5

Chi-square = 32.50* df = 8 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 68

Length of Service at Present School By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Community College Student	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Yes	38.3	37.6	17.2	4.3	2.6	7.6
No	36.4	34.2	21.7	5.3	2.4	8.3
Total Sample	52.9	29.1	13.4	2.9	1.7	6.5

Chi-square = 3.39 df = 4

TABLE 69

Length of Service in Present Position By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Community College Student	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	Mean Years
Yes	54.5	29.0	12.9	2.0	1.7	6.2
No	51.8	29.2	13.7	3.6	1.7	6.7
Total Sample	52.9	29.1	13.4	2.9	1.7	6.5
	Chi-square = 3.39 df = 4					

college and those who had not.

Supervised Teaching Experience

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had a supervised teaching experience in the public schools, student teaching, or in a higher education setting, a teaching internship. TABLE 70 presents the responses to this question. Of the respondents, 55.2% had student teaching experience while only 19.4% had a teaching internship in higher education.

The distributions of respondents in each state with the supervised teaching experiences is displayed in TABLE 71 and TABLE 72. Neither of these distributions was significant and the null hypotheses were retained. Thus, it was concluded that no differences existed among the states in the student teaching experience and teaching internship

TABLE 70

Distribution of Respondents By Supervised Teaching Experience

	Student Teaching		Teaching Internship	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Number	396	322	139	579
Percent	55.2	44.8	19.4	80.6

TABLE 71

Student Teaching Experience By State (in percent)

Student Teach	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Yes	57.9	58.6	57.9	53.3	56.2	54.7	52.3	59.4	55.2
No	42.1	41.4	42.1	46.7	43.8	45.3	47.3	40.6	44.8

Chi-square = 2.02 df = 7

experience of the respondents.

The responses of administrator/faculty groups concerning supervised teaching experience is presented in TABLE 73 and TABLE 74. The differences among administrator/faculty groups regarding student teaching was significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. The differences among the groups concerning the teaching internship were not

TABLE 72

Teaching Internship Experience By State (in percent)

Teach Intern	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Yes	15.8	20.0	10.5	20.0	14.8	23.4	21.7	20.3	19.4
No	84.2	80.0	89.5	80.0	85.2	76.6	78.3	79.7	80.6
	Chi-square = 5.14 df = 7								

TABLE 73

Student Teaching Experience By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Student Teach	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
Yes	64.0	38.4	54.2	60.7	55.2
No	36.0	61.6	45.8	39.3	44.8
	Chi-square = 30.6* df = 3 $p < .05$ *significant at the .05 level				

significant. The null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there were no differences among administrator/faculty groups in teaching internship experience.

Faculty teaching in terminal programs had the lowest proportion of respondents with student teaching experience, 38.4%, while

TABLE 74

Teaching Internship Experience By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Teach Intern	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
Yes	20.9	14.5	21.8	19.6	19.4
No	79.8	85.5	78.2	80.4	80.6
	Chi-square = 3.54		df = 3		

administrators had the highest proportion, 64.0%. These figures correspond closely with highest degree earned by respondents and teaching experience of respondents. Faculty teaching in terminal programs had fewer advanced degrees and thus fewer of them had student teaching experience.

Although a lower proportion of faculty teaching in terminal programs had a teaching internship experience, the differences were not significant.

The authors listed in TABLE 14, page 59, recommended the teaching internship as a necessary part of the professional preparation for community college faculty. As more faculty members participate in formal programs designed to prepare faculty members more of them may take a teaching internship as a part of their preparation program. As this takes place, the differences among these groups will become

more significant for the same reasons that the differences in highest degree attained in teaching experience and in student teaching experience are significant.

TABLE 75 and TABLE 76 compare the student teaching experience and teaching internship experience of part-time and full-time respondents. Neither of these comparisons was significant and the null hypotheses were retained. Thus, it was concluded that there are no differences in the student teaching experience and teaching internship experience of part-time and full-time employees.

TABLE 75

Student Teaching Experience By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

Student Teach	Part-time	Full-time	Total Sample
Yes	47.1	55.6	55.2
No	52.9	44.4	44.8
	Chi-square = .17	df = 1	

The comparison of student teaching experience of the degree groups is presented in TABLE 77. Respondents with less than a masters degree have a much lower proportion with student teaching experience than did those with a masters, specialist, or doctors degree. Only 12.0% of those with less than a bachelors degree had student taught and

TABLE 76

Teaching Internship Experience By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

Teach Intern	Part-time	Full-time	Total Sample
Yes	23.5	19.2	19.4
No	76.5	80.8	80.6
	Chi-square = .17 df = 1		

TABLE 77

Student Teaching Experience By Degree Groups (in percent)

Student Teach	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Yes	12.0	37.5	60.5	69.1	55.2
No	88.0	62.5	39.5	30.9	44.8
	Chi-square = 66.45* df = 3 $p < .05$				
	*significant at the .05 level				

37.5% of those with a bachelors degree had student taught. These compare to 60.5% and 69.1% respectively for those persons with a masters or teaching specialist degree and persons with a doctorate. These differences were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

The comparison of teaching internship experience of the degree groups is presented in TABLE 78. This comparison was significant and

TABLE 78

Teaching Internship Experience By Degree Groups (in percent)

Teach Intern	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Yes	10.0	15.4	18.9	27.9	19.4
No	90.0	84.6	81.1	72.1	80.6

Chi-square = 10.26* df = 3 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

the null hypothesis was rejected. The respondents had the same pattern as the previous comparison. The proportion of respondents in each group with teaching internship experience increased with each higher degree. The percentages were 10.0%, 15.4%, 18.9% and 27.9% for the four groups. It appeared evident that more respondents with a doctorate had participated in programs designed to prepare them to teach.

The comparisons of the supervised teaching experiences of respondents pursuing a higher degree are shown in TABLE 79 and TABLE 80. The differences among these groups in their student teaching experience were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. The differences in teaching internship experience were not significant. The null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that no differences in teaching internship experience existed among respondents pursuing a higher degree, those planning to pursue a higher degree, and those not

TABLE 79

Student Teaching Experience By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent)

Student Teach	Yes	No	No But Plan To	Total Sample
Yes	44.3	60.5	51.9	55.2
No	55.7	39.5	48.1	44.8

Chi-square = 12.04* df = 2 $p <$.
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 80

Teaching Internship Experience By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent)

Teach Intern	Yes	No	No But Plan To	Total Sample
Yes	15.7	19.2	22.4	19.4
No	84.3	80.8	77.6	80.6

Chi-square = 2.28 df = 2

pursuing a higher degree. As TABLE 79 shows, respondents who were not taking courses toward a higher degree and not planning to had the highest proportion with student teaching experience, 60.5%. This finding corresponded closely with the results reported in TABLE 47

page 111 and TABLE 77 , page 140. A large percentage of respondents with advanced degrees were not taking courses. More respondents with advanced degrees had student teaching experience. Therefore, it should follow, as it did, that a high percentage of respondents who were not taking courses would have student teaching experience.

The comparison of the supervised teaching experience of respondents who had attended a community college and those who had not is shown in TABLE 81 and TABLE 82. The differences in student teaching experience between these groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. The differences in the teaching internship experience between these groups were not significant. The null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there were no differences in the teaching internship experience of respondents who had attended a community college and those who had not.

Number of Courses in Education

The number of courses a person has taken in the education department is one indication of the professional preparation of that person. TABLE 83 presents the number of courses in education the respondents in this study had taken. Of the respondents, 30.6% had taken three or fewer courses; 32.3% had taken from four to ten courses; and 37.1% had taken more than ten courses. The average for all respondents was 10.9 courses.

TABLE 81

Student Teaching Experience By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Student Teach	Yes	No	Total Sample
Yes	49.5	59.3	55.2
No	50.5	40.7	44.8
	Chi-square = 6.37* df = 1 $p < .05$		
	*significant at the .05 level		

TABLE 82

Teaching Internship Experience By Experience As A Community College Student (in person)

Teach Intern	Yes	No	Total Sample
Yes	19.5	19.3	19.4
No	80.5	80.7	80.6
	Chi-square = .0009 df = 1		

TABLE 84 presents the distribution of the number of courses taken in education by respondents from each state. The differences among the states were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. Thus, it was concluded that there were no differences among

the states in the number of courses taken in education by the respondents. As TABLE 85 shows, the differences among administrator/faculty groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Administrators had taken the most courses in education with an average of 14.2 courses. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had the lowest average with 7.5 courses.

TABLE 83

Number of Courses in Education Taken By Respondents

	0-3	4-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
Number	230	232	166	63	37
Percent	30.6	32.3	23.1	8.8	5.2

The mean number of courses taken was 10.9

The finding that faculty teaching in transfer programs had taken fewer courses in education than faculty teaching in terminal programs was unexpected. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had a much higher proportion of respondents with the masters degree and higher. The higher the degree the more the opportunity to take courses in education. It would, therefore, be expected that faculty teaching in transfer programs would have taken more courses in education. However, this was not found to be true. Faculty teaching in transfer programs

TABLE 84

Number of Courses in Education Taken By Respondents By State (in percent)

Number of Courses	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
0-3	44.7	21.4	31.6	40.0	29.0	23.4	33.1	33.1	30.6
4-10	28.9	35.7	31.6	33.3	34.6	35.9	31.3	26.1	32.3
11-20	18.4	31.4	21.1	20.0	22.8	26.6	21.4	23.2	23.1
21-30	7.9	7.1	5.3	6.7	8.6	12.5	8.9	8.7	8.8
Over 30	5.3	4.3	10.5	0.0	4.9	1.6	5.3	8.7	5.2
Mean Courses	9.3	11.3	11.5	8.5	10.7	11.2	10.6	12.9	10.9
	Chi-square = 18.46 df = 28								

have emphasized the subject matter in their advanced work more than the professional preparation. Some of the comments made by respondents indicated their desire to avoid education courses. The findings of this section confirm that the faculty teaching in transfer programs have successfully avoided professional teacher preparation courses.

Administrators and faculty teaching in both the terminal and transfer program had taken a greater number of education courses because administration courses and counseling courses are usually taught by the education department. Therefore, these two groups in the necessary preparation for their positions had taken education courses.

TABLE 85

Number of Courses in Education Taken By Respondents
By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Number of Courses	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
0-3	21.9	37.8	42.5	19.6	30.6
4-10	24.8	30.8	33.5	37.5	32.3
11-20	27.3	18.0	19.9	32.1	23.1
21-30	13.8	5.2	4.5	5.4	8.8
Over 30	9.0	1.7	1.7	5.4	5.2
Mean Courses	14.2	8.1	7.5	11.7	10.9

Chi-square = 66.55* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

The number of courses in education taken by part-time and full-time respondents is presented in TABLE 86. The differences between these groups were not significant. The null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there were no differences in the number of courses taken in education by part-time and full-time employees.

The differences in the number of courses in education taken by respondents in each degree group were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. TABLE 87 shows this distribution. Respondents with the doctorate had taken an average of 16.7 courses while respondents with

TABLE 86.

Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents
By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

	0-3	4-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30	Mean Courses
Full-time	29.8	32.6	23.1	9.2	5.0	10.9
Part-time	47.1	20.6	23.5	0.0	8.8	9.4
Total Sample	30.6	32.3	23.1	8.8	5.2	10.9
	Chi-square = 8.73 df = 4					

less than a bachelors had taken only 4.9 courses.

TABLE 88 shows the distribution of courses taken in education by respondents pursuing a higher degree. The differences among the three groups were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. It was concluded that there were no differences in the number of courses taken in education by those pursuing a higher degree and those not pursuing a higher degree. The distribution of the number of courses taken in education by respondents who had attended a community college is presented in TABLE 89. The differences between groups were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. It was concluded that there were no differences in the number of courses taken in education by those who had attended a community college and those who had

TABLE 87

Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents
By Degree Groups (in percent)

	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
0-3	42.0	45.2	27.9	22.8	30.6
4-10	50.0	36.5	34.0	17.8	32.3
11-20	8.0	15.4	25.1	28.7	23.1
21-30	0.0	1.9	9.2	16.2	8.8
Over 30	0.0	1.0	3.8	14.7	5.2
Mean Courses	4.9	6.2	10.4	16.7	10.9

Chi-square = 119.73* df = 12 p<.05
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 88

Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents
By Those Pursuing a Higher Degree (in percent)

Taking Courses	0-3	4-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30	Mean Courses
Yes	23.0	24.0	19.7	7.1	2.7	11.1
No	32.7	28.1	23.8	9.4	6.1	11.3
No But Plan To	26.8	42.1	19.7	7.1	4.4	9.7
Total Sample	30.6	32.3	23.1	8.8	5.2	10.9

Chi-square = 12.79 df = 8

TABLE 89

Number of Education Courses Taken By Respondents By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Community College Student	0-3	4-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30	Mean Courses
Yes	30.7	31.0	24.8	8.9	4.6	10.8
No	30.6	33.3	21.9	8.7	5.5	10.9
Total Sample	30.6	32.3	23.1	8.8	5.2	10.9

Chi-square = 1.17 df = 4

not.

Degree of Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with their present position. They indicated whether they were very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied or dissatisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied. TABLE 90 shows the responses to that question. Over half, 59.2%, said they were very satisfied and 32.9% said they were satisfied in their present position. Only 7.9% of the respondents were less than satisfied with their position.

The percentage of people who were satisfied was higher than expected and especially in light of the number of negative comments made by respondents.

TABLE 90

Degree of Satisfaction of Respondents

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Number	425	236	33	18	6
Percent	59.2	32.9	4.6	2.5	0.8

The degree of satisfaction reported by respondents from each state is shown in TABLE 91. For the chi-square analysis, respondents in the three groups who said they were less than satisfied were collapsed into one group. The differences among the states were not significant. The null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there were no differences in the degree of job satisfaction of respondents from each of the states.

Responses of the administrator/faculty groups concerning their degree of satisfaction are shown in TABLE 92. The three groups who said they were less than satisfied were combined. The differences among the groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Administrators were the most satisfied and 95.4% stated they were either satisfied or very satisfied. Only 87.2% of the faculty teaching in transfer programs were satisfied with their present position.

TABLE 91

Degree of Satisfaction By State (in percent)

Degree of Satisfaction	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Very Satisfied	55.3	74.3	68.4	66.7	60.5	50.0	58.0	52.2	59.2
Satisfied	34.2	22.9	26.3	26.7	33.3	43.8	32.0	37.7	32.9
Neither	5.3	1.4	0.0	6.7	2.5	3.1	6.8	5.8	4.6
Dissatisfied	2.6	0.0	5.3	0.0	3.1	3.1	2.8	1.4	2.5
Very Satisfied	2.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.4	2.9	0.8
	Chi-square = 6.02 df = 7								

The responses of part-time and full-time respondents concerning their degree of satisfaction is presented in TABLE 93. After the three groups who were less than satisfied were combined, the differences among groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Full-time respondents were more satisfied than part-time respondents. Of the full-time respondents, 92.8% said they were satisfied while 76.4% of the part-timers were satisfied.

As TABLE 94 shows, the differences in the degree of satisfaction of respondents in each degree group were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. Thus, it was concluded that there were no differences in the degree of job satisfaction of respondents with

TABLE 92

Degree of Satisfaction By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

Degree of Satisfaction	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
Very Satisfied	65.6	54.7	52.0	60.7	59.2
Satisfied	29.6	36.6	35.2	32.1	32.9
Neither	3.5	5.2	6.1	3.6	4.6
Dissatisfied	0.6	2.9	5.0	3.6	2.5
Very Dissatisfied	0.6	0.6	1.7	0.0	0.8

Chi-square = 16.84* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 93

Degree of Satisfaction By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

	Degree of Satisfaction				
	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Full-time	60.2	32.6	4.1	2.2	0.9
Part-time	38.2	38.2	14.7	8.8	0.0
Total Sample	59.2	32.9	4.6	2.5	0.8

Chi-square = 13.89* df = 2 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 94

Degree of Satisfaction By Degree Groups (in percent)

Degree of Satisfaction	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Very Satisfied	64.0	53.8	59.3	61.0	59.2
Satisfied	30.0	39.4	31.7	33.1	32.9
Neither	6.0	4.8	4.8	4.4	4.6
Dissatisfied	0.0	1.0	3.8	0.7	2.5
Very Dissatisfied	0.0	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.8
	Chi-square = 4.19		df = 6		

different degrees. For the chi-square analysis, all those who said they were less than satisfied were combined into one group.

The differences in the degree of satisfaction among the groups taking courses toward a higher degree were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. Thus, it was concluded that there were no differences in the degree of job satisfaction of respondents who were taking courses toward a higher degree and those who were not taking courses. The three groups in TABLE 95 who stated they were less than satisfied were combined for the chi-square test.

TABLE 96 shows the degree of satisfaction of those who had attended a community college and persons who had not. More respondents who had not attended a community college, 93.7%, said they were

TABLE 95

Degree of Satisfaction By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent)

Taking Courses	Degree of Satisfaction: Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Yes	59.3	30.7	5.7	2.9	1.4
No	59.5	32.9	4.8	2.0	0.8
No But Plan To	58.5	34.4	3.3	3.3	0.5
Total Sample	59.2	32.9	4.6	2.5	0.8

Chi-square = 1.32 df = 4

TABLE 96

Degree of Satisfaction By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Community College Student	Degree of Satisfaction: Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Yes	61.1	28.7	6.3	2.6	1.3
No	57.8	35.9	3.4	2.4	0.5
Total Sample	59.2	32.9	4.6	2.5	0.8

Chi-square = 6.53* df = 2 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

satisfied than respondents who had attended a community college, 89.8%. With all those who were less than satisfied combined into one group, the differences among the groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Choice of Employment

Respondents were asked to indicate from seven alternatives either one or two choices of where they would prefer to be employed. The seven alternatives were: elementary school, secondary school, another community college, the same community college, a four-year college, a non-teaching academic situation and a non-academic, non-teaching work situation.

TABLE 97 presents the distribution of the responses concerning the choice of employment. Not all respondents indicated a second choice so the total does not equal 718 in the second choice row. Eighty percent of the respondents stated they preferred to stay at the same college. An additional 20.8% would move to another community college. Only twenty-four percent of the respondents stated that they would choose to move to the four-year college. No respondent indicated a preference to move to the secondary school as a first choice. This was surprising because over forty-six percent of the respondents had previously been employed in the secondary school.

The choice of employment of respondents from each state is presented in TABLE 98. For the chi-square test, respondents who chose

TABLE 97

Choice of Employment By Respondents

	Elemen	Second	Another Comm. College	Same Comm College	Four Year College	Non-Teaching	Non-Academic
First Choice							
Number	5	0	36	528	80	35	34
Percent	0.7	0.0	5.0	73.5	11.1	4.9	4.7
Second Choice							
Number	5	5	113	32	92	44	36
Percent	0.7	0.7	15.7	4.5	12.8	6.1	5.0
Combined							
Number	10	5	149	560	172	79	70
Percent	1.4	0.7	20.8	80.0	24.0	11.0	9.7

either the elementary or secondary school were not included. The differences among the states were not significant. The null hypothesis was retained and it was concluded that there were no differences in the choice of employment of the respondents from each state. The chi-square test was computed only for the first choice.

TABLE 99 shows the choice of employment of administrator/faculty groups. The differences among these groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Faculty teaching in transfer programs had the highest proportion of respondents who preferred the four-year college, 16.2%. Faculty teaching in both transfer and terminal programs had the highest proportion of respondents who chose either

TABLE 98

Choice of Employment By States (in percent)

	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
	2.6[a]	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7
Elementary	2.6[b]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.7
	5.3[c]	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.7	4.3	1.4
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.7
	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.7
Another	5.3	1.4	0.0	6.7	4.9	3.1	6.8	4.3	5.0
Community	10.5	5.7	26.3	20.0	20.4	9.4	16.0	18.8	15.7
College	15.8	7.1	26.3	26.7	25.3	12.5	22.8	23.2	20.7
Same	63.2	80.0	78.9	66.7	76.5	73.4	72.2	71.0	73.5
Community	2.6	11.4	10.5	0.0	2.5	3.1	4.3	4.3	4.5
College	65.8	91.4	89.5	66.7	79.0	76.6	76.5	75.4	78.0
Four	13.2	8.6	15.8	6.7	8.0	14.1	12.1	13.0	11.1
Year	10.5	21.4	0.0	6.7	9.9	10.9	13.5	15.9	12.8
College	23.7	30.0	15.8	13.3	17.9	25.0	25.6	29.0	23.9
	7.9	2.9	5.3	13.3	6.8	4.7	2.8	7.2	4.9
Non-Teaching	10.5	8.6	0.0	6.7	5.6	6.3	5.7	5.8	6.1
	18.4	11.4	5.3	20.0	12.3	10.9	8.5	13.0	11.0
	7.9	7.1	0.0	6.7	2.5	4.7	5.3	4.3	4.7
Non-Academic	5.3	2.9	0.0	0.0	9.3	6.3	2.8	7.2	5.0
	13.2	10.0	0.0	6.7	11.7	10.9	8.2	11.6	9.7

[a]first choice

[b]second choice

[c]combination of first and second choice

First choice chi-square = 22.59 df = 28

TABLE 99

Choice of Employment By Administrator/Faculty Groups (in percent)

	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
	0.6[a]	0.6	1.1	0.0	0.7
Elementary	1.6[b]	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
	2.3[c]	0.6	1.1	0.0	1.4
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.8	0.7
	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.8	0.7
Another	3.2	6.4	5.6	8.9	5.0
Community	15.8	15.7	16.8	10.7	15.7
College	19.0	22.3	22.3	19.6	20.7
Same	72.3	76.2	72.1	76.8	73.5
Community	5.5	2.3	3.9	7.1	4.5
College	77.8	78.5	76.0	83.9	78.0
Four-	8.0	10.5	16.2	14.3	11.1
Year	8.7	9.9	21.8	16.1	12.8
College	16.2	20.3	38.0	30.4	23.9
	8.0	4.1	1.7	0.0	4.9
Non-Teaching	9.6	2.3	3.9	5.4	6.1
	17.7	6.4	5.6	5.4	11.0
	7.7	2.3	3.4	0.0	4.7
Non-Academic	4.8	4.7	5.6	5.4	5.0
	12.5	7.0	8.9	5.4	9.7

[a]first choice

[b]second choice

[c]combination of first and second choice

First choice chi-square = 36.60* df = 12 $p<.05$

*significant at the .05 level

the same or another community college in which to be employed. Faculty teaching in terminal programs had only a slightly lower proportion of respondents who chose either the same or another community college. Administrators had the lowest proportion of respondents who selected to stay in a community college. Administrators also had the lowest proportion of respondents who would like to move to the four-year college and the largest percentage who preferred leaving the teaching and academic situations.

The choice of employment of part-time and full-time respondents is presented in TABLE 100. The differences between these groups were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. That is, there were no differences in the choice of employment of part-time and full-time respondents.

TABLE 101 presents the choice of employment of respondents in each degree group. The differences among the degree groups were significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Ninety-six percent of the respondents with less than a bachelors degree preferred to stay at the same community college. Respondents with the doctorate had the highest proportion who preferred the four-year college, 16.9%, and the lowest proportion who wanted to stay in a community college, 71.3%.

TABLE 102 presents the choice of employment of respondents pursuing a higher degree and TABLE 103 shows the choice of employment of respondents with experience as a community college student. Neither

TABLE 100

Choice of Employment By Part-time/Full-time (in percent)

	Elemen	Second	Another Comm College	Same Comm College	Four-Year College	Non-Teaching	Non-Academic
Full-time	0.6[a]	0.0	5.0	74.3	11.0	4.5	4.7
	0.7[b]	0.7	16.2	4.7	12.7	6.3	4.7
	1.3[c]	0.7	21.2	78.9	23.7	10.8	9.4
Part-time	2.9	0.0	5.9	58.8	14.7	11.8	5.9
	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	14.7	2.9	11.8
	2.9	0.0	8.8	58.8	29.4	14.7	17.6
Total Sample	0.7	0.0	5.0	73.5	11.1	4.9	4.7
	0.7	0.7	15.7	4.5	12.8	6.1	5.0
	1.4	0.7	20.7	78.0	23.9	11.0	9.7

[a]first choice
[b]second choice
[c]combination of first and second choice

First choice chi-square = 5.8 df = 4

of these comparisons was significant. Both null hypotheses were retained and it was concluded that there were no differences in the choice of employment of respondents who were pursuing a higher degree and those who were not nor in the choice of employment of respondents who had attended a community college and those who had not.

TABLE 101

Choice of Employment By Degree Groups (in percent)

	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
	0.0[a]	1.9	0.7	0.0	0.7
Elementary	0.0[b]	1.9	0.7	0.0	0.7
	0.0[c]	3.8	1.4	0.0	1.4
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7
	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7
Another	0.0	4.8	6.4	2.9	5.0
Community	22.0	13.5	16.5	13.2	15.7
College	22.0	18.3	22.9	16.1	20.7
Same	96.0	68.3	74.0	68.4	73.5
Community	2.0	2.9	4.5	6.6	4.5
College	98.0	71.2	78.5	75.0	78.0
Four-	0.0	10.6	10.6	16.9	11.1
Year	0.0	8.7	14.4	16.2	12.8
College	0.0	19.2	25.1	33.1	23.9
Non-	2.0	3.8	4.0	9.6	4.9
Teaching	4.0	4.8	6.1	8.1	6.1
	6.0	8.7	10.2	17.6	11.0
Non-	2.0	10.6	4.3	2.2	4.7
Academic	0.0	4.8	6.1	3.7	5.0
	2.0	15.4	10.4	5.9	9.7

[a]first choice

[b]second choice

[c]combination of first and second choice

First choice chi-square = 37.58* df = 12 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 102

Choice of Employment By Respondents Pursuing A Higher Degree (in percent)

Taking Classes	Elemen	Second	Another Comm College	Same Comm College	Four-Year College	Non-Teaching	Non-Academic
	0.7[a]	0.0	7.1	71.4	10.0	2.9	7.9
Yes	1.4[b]	0.0	19.3	4.3	11.4	4.3	5.7
	2.1[c]	0.0	26.4	75.7	21.4	7.1	13.6
	1.0	0.0	5.3	73.4	10.1	5.6	4.6
No	0.8	0.8	15.4	4.8	12.2	7.3	4.3
	1.8	0.8	20.8	78.2	22.3	12.9	8.9
No But	0.0	0.0	2.7	75.4	14.2	4.9	2.7
Plan To	0.0	1.1	13.1	3.8	15.3	4.9	6.0
	0.0	1.1	15.8	79.2	29.5	9.8	8.7
Total	0.7	0.0	5.0	73.5	11.1	4.9	4.7
Sample	0.7	0.7	15.7	4.5	12.8	6.1	5.0
	1.4	0.7	20.7	78.0	23.9	11.0	9.7

[a]first choice

[b]second choice

[c]combination of first and second choice

First choice chi-square = 11.46 df = 8

Summary

The previous sections have presented the findings of the descriptive data section of this study. The tables have presented a profile of the faculty and administrators at participating community

TABLE 103

Choice of Employment By Experience As A Community College Student (in percent)

Community College Student	Elemen	Second	Another Comm College	Same Comm College	Four-Year College	Non-Teaching	Non-Academic
	0.7[a]	0.0	5.3	73.9	7.6	6.3	5.6
Yes	0.3[b]	0.0	15.5	4.3	12.5	4.6	5.9
	1.0[c]	0.0	20.8	78.2	20.1	10.9	11.6
	0.7	0.0	4.8	72.3	13.7	3.9	4.1
No	1.0	1.2	15.7	4.6	13.0	7.2	4.3
	1.7	1.2	20.5	76.9	26.7	11.1	8.4
Total	0.7	0.0	5.0	73.5	11.1	4.9	4.7
Sample	0.7	0.7	15.7	4.5	12.8	6.1	5.0
	1.4	0.7	30.7	78.0	23.9	11.0	9.7

[a]first choice

[b]second choice

[c]combination of first and second choice

First choice chi-square = 9.02 df = 4

colleges in the Northwest. The data was examined by dividing the sample into groups and comparing the responses of those groups on fifteen different variables. TABLE 104 presents a summary of the significance of each of the comparisons. When mutual entries were eliminated, sixty-nine comparisons were made. Forty of the comparisons were significant.

TABLE 104

Summary of Chi-square Tests

	State	Admin/ Faculty Groups	Part-time/ Full-time	Degree Groups	Pursuing Higher Degree	Comm College Student
Admin/ Faculty	47.41 n.s.					
Part-time/ Full-time	19.48 p .05	18.26 p .05				
Degree Groups	36.42 p .05	139.84 p .05	15.19 p .05			
Pursuing Degree	18.92 n.s.	28.27 p .05	2.71 n.s.	116.66 p .05		
Comm College Student	7.22 n.s.	9.72 n.s.	.0029 n.s.	28.72 p .05	10.60 p .05	
Teaching Experience	82.46 p .05	118.21 p .05	27.22 p .05	139.48 p .05	25.64 p .05	8.45 n.s.
Service at Present School	126.72 p .05	22.68 p .05	20.96 p .05	33.12 p .05	45.44 p .05	2.96 n.s.
Service Present Position	66.82 p .05	57.17 p .05	11.67 p .05	22.35 p .05	32.50 p .05	3.39 n.s.
Student Teaching	2.02 n.s.	30.16 p .05	0.63 n.s.	66.45 p .05	12.04 p .05	6.37 p .05
Teaching Internship	5.14 n.s.	3.54 n.s.	0.17 n.s.	10.26 p .05	2.28 n.s.	.0009 n.s.
Courses in Education	18.46 n.s.	66.55 p .05	8.73 n.s.	119.73 p .05	12.79 n.s.	1.17 n.s.
Degree of Satisfaction	6.02 n.s.	15.84 p .05	13.89 p .05	4.19 n.s.	1.32 n.s.	6.53 p .05
Choice of Employment	22.59 n.s.	36.60 p .05	5.18 n.s.	37.58 p .05	11.46 n.s.	9.02 n.s.

The responses of the highest degree attained groups had the most significant differences. Thirteen of the fourteen variables were significant. The differences between respondents who had attended a community college and those who had not were the least significant. Only four of the variables were significant.

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Information concerning the training respondents had received and the amount of training respondents judged to be necessary for faculty members was gathered from the Professional Preparation section of the questionnaire. Three separate types of information were gathered. First, the percentage of respondents who had received training in each of thirty-seven skill or knowledge areas was determined. This information was used to establish differences in the professional preparation of subgroups of the sample. The percentages of each subgroup who have received training in each skill area are shown in TABLE 202, TABLE 203, TABLE 204 TABLE 205, in APPENDIX I, pages 291-294. This information was also used to determine the training needs of the faculty and administrators at the participating schools.

Approximately half the respondents had received training in the skills listed. More people had received training in teaching techniques than any other skill, 74.0%. Only 13.3% of the respondents had had a teaching internship in a community college. Any training program

involving these thirty-seven would fill a need for nearly half the people. Only small differences were found in any of the subgroups. It was therefore concluded that training was needed in all skills by all groups. The greatest need was for a teaching internship in the community college.

The second type of information was gathered by asking the respondents to recommend how much training faculty teaching in transfer programs and faculty teaching in terminal programs should receive in each skill area. No differences in the recommended training were found between faculty teaching in transfer and faculty teaching in terminal programs. Therefore, only one set of recommendations is reported. The recommendations suggested by each of the subgroups of the sample are presented in TABLE 206, TABLE 207, TABLE 208, and TABLE 209, in APPENDIX I, pages 295-298.

An in-service training program of up to one day was the recommended training for most skills. A college course was recommended for the following eight skills: developing individualized programs of learning, how to develop new courses, how to construct or develop tests, learning theory and its application for adults, motivating students, teaching to community college students, teaching techniques, and theories of learning and remembering. The training recommended for three additional skills was split between a college course and no training needed. These three were: teaching internship in a community

college, how to conduct basic research, and how to conduct applied research.

The third type of information was gathered by asking the respondents to identify the five most important and the five least important of thirty-seven skill or knowledge areas listed. To determine the five most important skill areas, a value of +5 was assigned to a selection as most important, +4 was assigned to a selection as the second most important, +3 for the third, +2 for the fourth, and +1 for the selection as the fifth most important. The five skill areas with the highest number of points were considered to be the five most important. This process was used to determine the five most important skill areas identified by each subgroup.

The five least important skill areas were determined in a similar method. A value of -5 was assigned to a selection of the skill as the least important. A value of -4 was assigned to a selection as the second least important. A selection as third least was given a -3, fourth least -2, and fifth least -1. The skill areas with the highest number of negative points were considered to be the least important.

TABLE 105 lists the professional skills which were identified by state groups as the five most important and the numbers of times each was selected as one of the five most important. TABLE 106 displays the actual rankings of the important skills by state groups. A total of twelve skills were identified among the top five by some states. Five

TABLE 105

Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Most Important By States

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five most important
16	How to deal with students with weak academic preparation	8
26	Motivating students	7
29	Teaching to community college students	7
31	Teaching techniques	7
25	Learning theory and its application for adults	5
4	Community college philosophy	3
3	Background and problems of community college students	3
5	Developing individualized programs of learning	2
18	How to fit a curriculum to the needs of the community	2
37	Writing learning objectives	2
1	Advising and placement of the academically disadvantaged	1
7	Functions and roles of the community college	1

of those twelve were identified more often than others as most important. Teaching techniques, motivating students, how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, learning theory and its application for adults, and teaching to community college students were ranked in the top five by more than two-thirds of the states.

TABLE 106

State Rankings Of The Five Most Important Professional Skills

Ranking	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	5[a]	31	4	29	31	31	31	31	31
2	4	26	3	31	26	16[b]	26	26	26
				4[b]		26			
3	16[b]	29	16	25	29		25	29	29
	25			26					
4		16	29		16	37	29	16	16
			1[b]						
5	3	37	7		25	3[b]	16	18	25
			18			5			

[a]number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 105

[b]indicates a tie ranking

These five are all methods type skills. Of the twelve skills shown, only community college philosophy, functions and roles of the community college, and background and problems of community college students were not methods related skills.

Many of the negative comments made by respondents referred to education courses as "a bunch of worthless methods courses". However, nine of the twelve skills identified by some group as the five most important were methods courses. This contradiction seems to represent a conflict present in community colleges and education departments in four-year colleges. The contradiction may also reflect inadequate or

inappropriate preparation programs of education departments. The negative attitudes indicate that, although over half of the respondents had received training in these skills, the training they received had not adequately prepared some faculty for the tasks with which they now find themselves confronted.

Of the top five skills, Montana ranked only one of them in its top five and Alaska ranked only two. These two states had opinions somewhat different from the other states.

The skill areas identified by administrator/faculty groups as the five most important professional skills are presented in TABLE 107 page 172. The actual rankings of these skills is shown in TABLE 108 page 173. Five skills were identified more often than the others. These five were the same five identified by the state groups. The ten skills identified by the faculty and administrator groups were all among the twelve listed by the states.

TABLE 109 page 173 presents the skill areas identified by part-time and full-time respondents as the five most important. The ranking of each skill is shown in TABLE 110 page 174. These groups identified the same skills as the previously mentioned groups.

As TABLE 111, page 175, shows, the degree groups identified the same five skills as the most important as did the earlier groups. TABLE 112, page 176, shows the rankings by the degree groups.

Although different groups ranked the skills in slightly

TABLE 107

Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Most Important By Administrator/Faculty Groups

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five most important
31	Teaching techniques	5
26	Motivating students	4
16	How to deal with students with weak academic preparation	4
25	Learning theory and its application for adults	4
29	Teaching to community college students	3
5	Developing individualized programs of learning	2
18	How to fit a curriculum to the needs of the community	1
17	Developing new courses	1
1	Advising and placement of the academically disadvantaged	1
4	Community college philosophy	1

different orders, they all identified the same skills as the five most important.

TABLE 113, page 177, shows the percent of respondents in each subgroup who had received training in the professional skill areas ranked as the five most important. Nearly three fourths, 74%, of the respondents had training in skill number 29, teaching to community

TABLE 108

Administrator/Faculty Group Rankings Of The Five Most Important Professional Skills

Ranking	Administrator	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
1	31[a]	26	31	25	31
2	29	31	16	16[b] 31	26
3	26	16	26		29
4	25	5	29		16
5	5	25	4	17[b] 18	25

[a]the number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 107

[b]indicates a tie

TABLE 109

Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Most Important By Part-time/Full-time

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five most important
31	Teaching techniques	3
26	Motivating Students	3
29	Teaching to community college students	3
16	How to deal with students with weak academic preparation	2
25	Learning theory and its application for adults	2
5	Developing individualized programs of learning	1
37	Writing learning objectives	1

TABLE 110

Part-time/Full-time Rankings Of The Five Most Important Professional Skills

Ranking	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	31[a]	29	31
2	26	16	26
3	29	26	29
4	25	31[b] 37	16
5	5		25

[a]the numbers in each block represent the skill numbers shown in TABLE 109

[b]indicates a tie ranking

college students. Administrators had the highest proportion, 50.0%, to receive training in this skill area. Respondents from Nevada had the lowest proportion, 16.7%, who had received training in this skill area.

Approximately half of the respondents had received training in skill number 16, how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, and skill number 25, learning theory and its application for adults. Over 60% had received training in skill number 26, motivating students.

TABLE 114 , page 178, presents the training recommended by each group in the five professional skills ranked as most important. A

TABLE 111

Professional Skills Ranked As Five Most Important By Degree Groups

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five most important
31	Teaching techniques	5
26	Motivating Students	4
16	How to deal with students with weak academic preparation	4
25	Learning theory and its application for adults	3
29	Teaching to community college students	3
37	Writing learning objectives	2
5	Developing individualized programs of learning	2
4	Community college philosophy	1
18	How to fit a curriculum to the needs of the community	1

three credit college course was recommended by most of the groups for all the skills except number 16, how to deal with students with weak academic backgrounds. A one to two-day in-service training session was the training most often recommended for skill number 16. There were no consistent differences in the training recommended by any of these subgroups.

TABLE 115, page 179, shows the skills identified by the respondents from each state as the five least important. TABLE 116, page 180,

TABLE 112

Degree Group Rankings Of The Five Most Important Professional Skills

Ranking	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	26[a]	31	31	29	31
2	31	5	26	31	26
3	16	16	16	25	29
4	37	25	29	26	16
5	18	37	4	5	25

[a]the number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 111

presents the actual rankings of those skills. As with the most important skills, five skills were identified more often than others. The five skills were: how and where to get textbooks, how to conduct basic research, history and role of the community college, how the community college is financed, and how to conduct applied research. Montana and Nevada each identified only two of those five in their five least important. As with the ranking of the five most important, Montana respondents had opinions which were different from other respondents.

The skills identified as the five least important by administrator/faculty groups are presented in TABLE 117, page 181, and the

TABLE 113

Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training In The Five Most Important Professional Skill Areas

	Skill Number 16	31	26	29	25
Administrator	54.4	76.8	66.0	50.0	64.4
Faculty Terminal	41.5	75.4	62.0	37.3	46.5
Faculty Transfer	35.4	67.3	45.6	19.7	42.9
Faculty Term & Tran	63.2	76.1	76.1	34.8	65.2
Full-time	47.5	74.0	60.8	38.5	55.2
Part-time	44.4	74.1	59.3	29.6	44.4
Less than Bachelors	40.5	78.4	54.1	35.1	21.6
Bachelors	48.3	71.3	65.5	33.3	50.6
Masters & Specialist	48.1	73.6	59.9	36.1	55.0
Doctorate	45.9	75.2	60.6	48.6	58.8
Alaska	57.1	75.0	54.1	28.6	53.6
Idaho	57.9	86.0	64.9	42.1	59.6
Montana	64.7	88.2	70.6	41.2	58.8
Nevada	33.3	66.7	25.0	16.7	50.0
Oregon	58.8	72.3	66.2	42.3	59.2
Utah	48.0	70.0	56.0	48.0	52.0
Washington	42.3	72.2	58.5	35.0	52.6
Wyoming	35.1	73.7	63.2	36.8	50.9
Total Sample	47.4	74.0	60.7	38.1	54.7

actual rankings of those skills are shown in TABLE 118 , page 182. TABLE 119, page 183 , shows the skills ranked as the five least important by part-time/full-time respondents. The actual rankings of those skills are presented in TABLE 120, page 184. Part-time and full-time respondents had different opinions about least important skills. Only two

TABLE 114

Recommended Training For Faculty in The Five Most Important Professional Skill Areas

	Skill Number				
	16	31	26	29	25
Administrator	2	4	4	4	4
Faculty Terminal	2-1[a]	4	4-2	4-2	4
Faculty Transfer	2-1	4	2	0-1	4
Faculty Term & Tran	2	4-5	4-3	4	4
Full-time	2	4	4	4	4
Part-time	2	5	3-4-1	2	4
Less than Bachelors	2-1	3-5-4	4	3	4
Bachelors	2	4	4-2	4	4
Masters & Specialist	2	4	2-4	4	4
Doctorate	4	4	4	4	4
Alaska	4-2	4-5	4	4	4
Idaho	2	5-4	2-4	4	4
Montana	4-1	4	2-4-0	4	4
Nevada	3-2	4	3-2	2-1-3	4-2
Oregon	2-1-3	4	2-4	4	4-1
Utah	2-3-4	4	4	4-2	4
Washington	2-1	5-4	2-4	4	4
Wyoming	2	4	1-4-3	2-1-4	4
Total Sample	2-3	4-5	4-2	4-2-3	4

[a] more than one entry indicates a tie or near tie

0 = no training needed in this area
1 = 1-4 hour in-service training
2 = 1-2 day in-service training
3 = 3-10 day in-service training
4 = 1-3 credit college course
5 = more than 3 college credits

TABLE 115

Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Least Important By States

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five least important
14	How to conduct basic research.	9
10	How and where to get textbooks	8
9	History and role of the community college	7
11	How the community college is financed	6
13	How to conduct applied research	6
2	Administrative structure and operation of the community college	3
6	Duties of a faculty	3
8	Group dynamics	1
33	Time management	1
34	What to teach in a particular class	1

of the five skills were identified by both groups.

The five least important skills identified by respondents in degree groups are shown in TABLE 121, page 185, and their actual rankings are presented in TABLE 122, page 186. It is interesting to note that respondents with less than a bachelors degree did not identify as least important any of the five skills identified as least important when all respondents were considered. Their views of what was important

TABLE 116

State Rankings of the Five Least Important Professional Skills

Ranking	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
33	6[a]	14	6	6[b] 33	9	11	11	2	11
34	9	11	8		11	2	9	13	13
35	11	2	13	34	13	9	13	9	9
36	13[b] 14	10	14	10	10	14	14	14	14
37		9	10	14	14	10	10	10	10

[a]the number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 115

[b]indicates a tie ranking

were different from the other groups.

TABLE 123, page 187 , shows the percent of each group who had received training in each of the five skills identified as least important. Except for skill number ten, how and where to get textbooks, approximately fifty percent of the respondents had received training in these skills. Only 27.9% had received training in skill number ten. These figures are almost the same as for the five most important skills discussed earlier. As TABLE 123 , page 187, shows, proportions of each subgroup who had received training varied greatly for skills fourteen, nine, and thirteen. The percentages for skill fourteen varied from a low of 18.9% for respondents with less than a bachelors to 81.7% for

TABLE 117

Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Least Important By Administrator/Faculty Groups

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five least important
11	How the community college is financed	5
13	How to conduct applied research	5
14	How to conduct basic research	5
9	History and role of the community college	4
10	How and where to get textbooks	3
2	Administrative structure and operation of the comm. coll.	2
6	Duties of a faculty member	1

respondents with a doctorate. The proportion for skill nine varied from 18.5% for part-time respondents to 61.2% for administrators, and for skill thirteen from 10.8% for respondents with less than a bachelors to 75.2% for those persons with a doctorate.

The recommended training for faculty members in each of the five skills ranked as least important is shown in TABLE 124, page 188. Although some differences exist, the subgroups recommended similar training for all faculty. Comparing TABLE 114, page 178, and TABLE 124, page 188, it can be seen that less training was recommended for the least important skill than for the most important skills.

TABLE 118

Administrator/Faculty Group Rankings of The Five Least Important Professional Skills

Ranking	Administrator	Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
33	6[a]	2	13	11	11
34	11	11	11	2	13
35	13	13	14	13	9
36	14	14	9	14	14
37	10	9	10	9	10

[a]the number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 117

To determine if administrators were either training faculty or hiring faculty with the desired training in each of the skill areas, the desired training for faculty expressed by administrators was compared with the percentage of faculty who had received training in each skill. This comparison is presented in TABLE 125, page 189. This comparison shows little relationship between the percent of faculty who have received training and the training recommended by administrators. It would appear that if administrators really wanted faculty members to have training in particular skills, they would have arranged for in-service programs to meet those desires or needs. This would especially

TABLE 119

Professional Skill Areas Ranked As Five Least Important By Part-time/Full-time

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five least important
10	How and where to get textbooks	3
11	How the community college is financed	3
9	History and role of the community college	2
13	How to conduct applied research	2
14	How to conduct basic research	2
12	How to assign grades	1
2	Administrative structure and operation of the comm. coll.	1
33	Time management	1
34	What to teach in a particular class	1

have been true of the skills in which administrators recommended a one to four hour in-service program. The evidence indicated that this had not happened. Administrators have not demanded by either their hiring practices or in-service training programs that faculty receive training in accordance with their recommended training for faculty.

To summarize the findings of this section, the following statements are made:

1. A slightly higher percentage of administrators than faculty

TABLE 120

Part-time/Full-time Rankings of the Five Least Important Professional Skills

Ranking	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
33	2[a]	12[b]	11
		34	
34	11	10	13
35	13	11	9
36	14	9	14
37	10	33	10

[a]the number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 119

[b]indicates a tie ranking

have received training in most of the thirty-seven professional skills.

2. No consistently large differences existed in the percentages of respondents in each of the subgroups who had received training in professional skills. Large differences did exist among certain subgroups on some skills, but the differences were not consistent.

3. The recommended training for faculty was similar for all subgroups.

4. Administrators are not requiring faculty to receive training consonant with the training they recommend.

5. Five skills were identified more often than others as the

TABLE 121

Professional Skill Areas Ranked as Five Least Important By Degree Groups

Skill Number	Skill Area	Number of groups identifying skill in the five least important
11	How the community college is financed	4
13	How to conduct applied research	4
14	How to conduct basic research	4
10	How and where to get textbooks	3
9	History and role of the community college	3
2	Administrative structure and operation of the comm. coll.	2
6	Duties of a faculty member	1
8	Group dynamics	1
30	Teaching internship in the community college	1
33	Time management	1
34	What to teach in a particular class	1

most important. The five most important skills were: how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, teaching techniques, motivating students, learning theory and its application for adults, and teaching to community college students. The five most important skills were all teaching methods skills.

6. Five skills were identified more often than others as the

TABLE 122

Degree Group Rankings of the Five Least Important Professional Skills

Ranking	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialists	Doctorate	Total Sample
33		14[a]	11	33	11
34	30[a] 34	11	13	13	13
35		2	9	11	9
36	6	13	14	14	14
37	8	9	10	10	10

[a]the number in each block represents the skill numbers shown in TABLE 121

[b]indicates a tie ranking

least important. The five least important skills were: how and where to get textbooks, how to conduct basic research, how to conduct applied research, history and role of the community college, and how the community college is financed. The five least important skills were informational type skills.

TABLE 123

Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training In The Five Least Important Professional Skill Areas

	Skill Number				
	10	14	9	11	13
Administrator	27.7	64.4	61.2	63.5	55.8
Faculty Terminal	31.0	43.0	42.3	40.1	34.5
Faculty Transfer	23.8	61.9	31.3	38.1	47.6
Faculty Term & Trans	32.6	58.7	39.1	47.8	54.3
Full-time	27.8	58.6	48.7	51.2	48.8
Part-time	29.6	48.1	18.5	29.6	40.7
Less than Bachelors	40.5	18.9	45.9	45.9	10.8
Bachelors	31.0	31.0	49.4	46.5	29.9
Masters & Specialist	25.0	61.3	43.6	49.3	48.6
Doctorate	29.4	81.7	59.6	56.0	75.2
Alaska	28.6	46.4	42.9	39.3	39.3
Idaho	30.4	63.2	38.6	50.9	54.4
Montana	29,4	70.6	58.8	75.0	58.8
Nevada	25.0	66.7	50.0	50.0	58.3
Oregon	33.1	48.5	49.2	58.5	41.9
Utah	28.0	60.0	50.0	50.0	38.0
Washington	23.1	57.3	47.4	44.9	49.1
Wyoming	33.3	75.4	47.4	50.9	63.2
Total Sample	27.9	58.1	48.7	50.2	48.5

TABLE 124

Recommended Training For Faculty In The Five Least Important Professional Skill Areas

	Skill Number				
	10	14	9	11	13
Administrator	1	0	1	1	0
Faculty Terminal	1	0-4[a]	1	1	4-0
Faculty Transfer	0-1	0	0-1	1	0
Faculty Term & Trans	1	0-1-4	1	1	0-1-4
Full-time	1	0	1	1	0
Part-time	1	2-4-5	1	1	0-1-4
Less than Bachelors	1	0	1	1	0
Bachelors	1	4-0	1	1	0
Masters & Specialist	1	0	1	1	0
Doctorate	1	0	4-1-0	1	0
Alaska	1-0	4-0	1-0-4	1	4
Idaho	1-0	4-1-2	0-1	1	4-2
Montana	1	0	1-2	1	0
Nevada	1	0	1	1	4-2
Oregon	1-0	0-4	1-0	1	0-4
Utah	1	4-1	1	1	4-1
Washington	1-0	0	1-0	1-0-2	0
Wyoming	1	0	1	1	0
Total Sample	1-0	0-4	1-0	1	0-4

[a]more than one entry indicates a tie or near tie

0 = no training needed in this area
1 = 1-4 hour in-service training
2 = 1-2 day in-service training
3 = 3-10 day in-service training
4 = 1-3 credit college course
5 = more than 3 college credits

TABLE 125

Comparison of Training Recommended and Received in Professional Skills

Skill Number	Administrator Recommendation	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty
1	1-2	34.5	28.6	56.5
2	1	48.6	38.8	39.1
3	2-1	36.6	30.6	43.5
4	1	56.3	49.0	56.5
5	4	59.0	47.6	67.4
6	1	55.6	44.9	52.2
7	1	51.4	46.3	45.7
8	4	35.9	37.4	58.7
9	1	42.3	31.3	39.1
10	1	31.0	23.8	32.6
11	1	40.1	38.1	47.8
12	1	59.1	36.7	56.5
13	0	34.5	47.6	54.3
14	0	43.0	61.9	58.7
15	4-2-1	35.9	32.7	56.5
16	2	41.5	35.4	63.2
17	3-4	64.8	39.5	52.2
18	3-2	51.4	24.5	45.7
19	2-4	34.5	34.0	52.2
20	4	30.3	38.1	47.8
21	4	52.1	49.7	63.0
22	4-1	51.4	41.5	65.2
23	4-2-3	71.1	56.5	84.8
24	4	69.7	50.3	69.6
25	4	46.5	42.9	65.2
26	4	62.0	45.6	76.1
27	2	32.4	19.7	32.6
28	2	37.3	28.6	41.3
29	4	37.3	19.7	34.8
30	5-4-0	12.0	7.4	10.9
31	4	75.4	67.3	76.1
32	4	49.3	55.1	60.9
33	2-1	35.2	25.2	58.7
34	0-4-2	38.0	26.5	43.5
35	1	52.1	41.5	56.5
36	1	50.0	34.7	56.5
37	3-4	79.7	59.2	74.0

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS

The third section of the questionnaire concerned the desired qualifications for faculty at community colleges. Respondents were given a list of degrees, teaching experiences, non-teaching work experiences, and professional activities. They were asked to indicate whether they thought that each of four community college faculty subgroups should have each qualification prior to being employed, whether they could complete the qualification after employment, whether it would be desirable but not necessary that they have complete the qualification prior to employment, whether it was not necessary that faculty have the qualification, or whether it was undesirable that faculty have the qualification.

The second task respondents were asked to complete in this section was to rank order eleven combinations of degree, experience, professional education courses, and professional or trade certification by the desirability of the combination as qualifications for community college faculty. Using the rank ordering of the individual respondents a rank ordering was computed for all respondents and for each of the subgroups: respondent location by state, administrator or faculty member, part-time or full-time employee in education, and highest degree attained by the respondent.

The discussion of the data in this section is centered in the

responses to the questionnaire. It is assumed that these responses represent the beliefs of the respondents and will be reported as the recommendation of the respondents.

The most desirable combination of degree field, work experience, professional courses, and professional or trade certification was determined from the rank ordering of the eleven combinations of these qualifications. APPENDIX J, pages 300-325, presents the complete ranking of all the subgroups. TABLE 126 presents the three combinations of qualifications ranked as most desirable by all subgroups. TABLE 127 presents the ranking of the qualifications by the respondents in each state and the ranking established for all respondents.

TABLE 126

Three Qualifications Ranked as Most Desired

Qualification Number	Qualification Description
8	Degree in subject field with professional or trade certification with work experience
4	Degree in subject field with professional education courses with work experience.
2	Degree in subject field with work experience.

TABLE 127

Ranking By State of The Three Most Desired Qualifications

Faculty Subgroup
Terminal - Vocational

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	8[a]	8	4	8	8	8	8	8	8
2	4	2[b] 4	8	4	4	4	4	4	4
3	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2

[b] indicates a tie ranking

Faculty Subgroup
Terminal - Academic

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2	8	2	2	8	2	8	2	8	8
3	2	8	8	2	8	2	8	2	2

Faculty Subgroup
Transfer - Vocational

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	8	4	4	8	8	4	8	8	8
2	4	8	8	4	4	8	4	4	4
3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Faculty Subgroup
Transfer - Academic

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2	8	2	2	8	8	8	2	2	2
3	2	8	8	2	2	2	8	8	8

[a] the number in each block represents the qualification number shown in TABLE

Examination of this data revealed three important facts. First, the three qualifications which were ranked as the three most important were identical for all the states. Slight differences occurred within the top three, but only these three qualifications were ranked as the most important. The three qualifications were: degree in subject field with professional or trade certification with work experience, degree in subject field with professional education courses with work experience, and degree in subject field with work experience. Second, the same qualifications were ranked as the three most important for all four of the faculty subgroups. Third, degree in subject field and work experience were common to all these qualifications. The desirability of work experience was further emphasized by the data from the other part of the Desired Qualifications section of the questionnaire. All the states except Montana indicated that all faculty subgroups should have completed more than one year of work experience prior to employment. Montana alone identified work experience as not necessary for the academic subgroups. As was shown in TABLE 50, page114 , Montana had the lowest percentage of its respondents with non-teaching experience, 21.1%, but those who had this experience had the longest average experience, 10.0 years.

TABLE128 , TABLE129 , and TABLE 130 present the ranking of the three most desired qualifications by administrator/faculty groups, part-time/full-time, and degree groups. These tables show that all

TABLE 128

Ranking By Administrator/Faculty Groups of The Three Most Desired Qualifications

Rank	Administrator	Faculty Subgroup Terminal - Vocational Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
1	8[a]	8	8	8	8
2	4	4	4	4	4
3	2	2	2	2	2
Rank	**Administrator**	**Faculty Subgroup Terminal - Academic Faculty Terminal**	**Faculty Transfer**	**Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer**	**Total Sample**
1	4	4	4	4	4
2	8	2	8	8	8
3	2	8	2	2	2
Rank	**Administrator**	**Faculty Subgroup Transfer - Vocational Faculty Terminal**	**Faculty Transfer**	**Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer**	**Total Sample**
1	8	4	8	8	8
2	4	8	4	4	4
3	2	2	2	2	2
Rank	**Administrator**	**Faculty Subgroup Transfer - Academic Faculty Terminal**	**Faculty Transfer**	**Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer**	**Total Sample**
1	4	4	4	4	4
2	2	2	2	8	2
3	8	8	8	2	8

[a]the number in each block represents the qualification number shown in TABLE

TABLE 129

Ranking By Part-time/Full-time Of The Three Most Desired Qualifications

Faculty Subgroup
Terminal - Vocational

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	8[a]	8	8
2	4	4	4
3	2	2	2

Faculty Subgroup
Terminal - Academic

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	8	4	4
2	2	8	8
3	4	2	2

Faculty Subgroup
Transfer - Vocational

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	8	8	8
2	4	4	4
3	2	2	2

Faculty Subgroup
Transfer - Academic

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	4	4	4
2	2	8	2
3	8	2	8

[a] the number in each block represents the qualification number shown in TABLE

TABLE 130

Ranking By Degree Groups Of The
Three Most Desired Qualifications

Rank	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
	Faculty Subgroup Terminal - Vocational				
1	8[a]	8	8	8	8
2	4	4	4	4	4
3	2	2	2	2	2
	Faculty Subgroup Terminal - Academic				
1	4	4	4	4	4
2	8	2	8	2	8
3	2	8	2	8	2
	Faculty Subgroup Transfer - Vocational				
1	8	8	8	8	8
2	4	4	4	4	4
3	10	2	2	2	2
	Faculty Subgroup Transfer - Academic				
1	4	4	4	4	4
2	8	8	2	2	2
3	2	2	8	8	8

[a]the number in each block represents the qualification number shown in TABLE

subgroups ranked the same three qualifications as the most important except those with less than a bachelors degree, who included the qualification of no degree with professional or trade certification with work experience instead of degree in subject field with work experience for terminal vocational and transfer vocational faculty. This was not surprising when the background of these respondents was considered. They had a high degree of satisfaction with their present position and did not see that a degree was required for success or satisfaction in their positions. Work experience was common to all qualifications ranked as the three most desired.

The qualifications ranked as the least desired are presented in TABLE 131 TABLES 132, 133, 134 and 135 show the actual rankings by subgroups of the least desired qualifications. These tables show a difference in the qualifications ranked as least important for faculty teaching vocational subjects and faculty teaching academic subjects. The three qualifications most often ranked as the least important for the faculty that teach in the vocational subjects were: degree in subject field with no work experience, degree in education with no work experience, and no degree with professional or trade certification with no work experience. The three qualifications most often ranked as the least important for faculty teaching academic subjects were: degree in education with no work experience, no degree with professional or trade certification with no work experience, and no degree and no professional

TABLE 131

Qualifications Ranked As The Three Least Desired

Qualification Number	Qualification Description
1	Degree in subject field with no work experience
3	Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with no work experience
5	Degree in education with no work experience
6	Degree in education with work experience
9	No degree with professional or trade certification with no work experience
10	No degree with professional or trade certification with work experience
11	No degree and no professional or trade certification with lengthy work experience

or trade certification with lengthy work experience.

A common factor in the qualifications ranked as least important for those teaching vocational subjects was lack of work experience. A degree in something other than education was more valued than work experience for faculty teaching academic subjects.

A few respondents refused to answer this section. They stated that, for them, it was impossible to generalize and each case would have to be judged by its own set of circumstances. It was recognized that even within a subdivision such as Transfer-Academic, many

TABLE 132

Ranking By State Of The Three
Least Desired Qualifications

Faculty Subgroup
Terminal – Vocational

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
9	1[a]	11	1	6	1	1	1	1	1
10	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
11	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Faculty Subgroup
Terminal – Academic

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
9	5	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5
10	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Faculty Subgroup
Transfer – Vocational

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
9	1	11	1	11	1	1	1	11	1
10	9	9	9	5	9	5	9	9	9
11	5	5	5	9	5	9	5	5	5

Faculty Subgroup
Transfer – Academic

Rank	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
9	5	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	5
10	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
11	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

[a]the number in each block represents the qualification number in TABLE 131

TABLE 133

Ranking By Administrator/Faculty Groups of
The Three Least Desired Qualifications

Rank	Administrator	Faculty Subgroups Terminal - Vocational Faculty Terminal	Faculty Transfer	Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer	Total Sample
9	1[a]	1	1	11	1
10	9	9	9	5	9
11	5	5	5	9	5
Rank	**Administrator**	**Faculty Subgroups Terminal - Academic Faculty Terminal**	**Faculty Transfer**	**Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer**	**Total Sample**
9	5	5	11	5	5
10	11	11	5	11	11
11	9	9	9	9	9
Rank	**Administrator**	**Faculty Subgroups Transfer - Vocational Faculty Terminal**	**Faculty Transfer**	**Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer**	**Total Sample**
9	1	1	11	11	1
10	9	9	9	5	9
11	5	5	5	9	5
Rank	**Administrator**	**Faculty Subgroups Transfer - Academic Faculty Terminal**	**Faculty Transfer**	**Faculty Terminal/ Faculty Transfer**	**Total Sample**
9	10	5	5	10	5
10	11	11	11	11	11
11	9	9	9	9	9

[a] the number in each block represents the qualification number shown in TABLE 131

TABLE 134

Ranking By Part-time/Full-time Of The Three Least Desired Qualification

Faculty Subgroups
Terminal - Vocational

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
9	1[a]	1	1
10	9	9	9
11	5	5	5

Faculty Subgroups
Terminal - Academic

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
9	5	10	5
10	11	11	11
11	9	9	9

Faculty Subgroups
Transfer - Vocational

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
9	1	3	1
10	9	9	9
11	5	5	5

Faculty Subgroups
Transfer - Academic

Rank	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
9	5	5	5
10	11	11	11
11	9	9	9

[a]the number in each block represents the qualification number shown in TABLE 131

TABLE 135

Ranking By Degree Groups Of The Three
Least Desired Qualifications

Rank	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
	Faculty Subgroups Terminal - Vocational				
9	1	1	1	1	1
10	9	9	9	9	9
11	5	5	5	5	5
	Faculty Subgroups Terminal - Academic				
9	5	11	5	5	5
10	11	5	11	11	11
11	9	9	9	9	9
	Faculty Subgroups Transfer - Vocational				
9	1	1	1	11	1
10	5	5	9	9	9
11	9	9	5	5	5
	Faculty Subgroups Transfer - Academic				
9	5	11	5	10	5
10	11	5	11	9	11
11	9	9	9	11	9

[a]the number in each block represents the skill number shown in TABLE 131

differences can and do exist. However, the responses indicated that:

1. Work experience was valued for all faculty.
2. A degree in a subject field was valued for all groups.
3. A degree in education was not perceived as high in value by any group.
4. Professional or trade certification was more valued for faculty teaching in vocational subjects than faculty teaching in academic subjects.

TABLES 210,211,212, and 213 in APPENDIX J, pages 302-317, show the recommendations of the various subgroups for the qualification of faculty. All the subgroups recommended professional or trade certification prior to being employed, and a bachelors degree was desirable for Terminal-Vocational Faculty. Neither a degree higher than a bachelors nor teacher certification were viewed as necessary. Respondents with less than a bachelors degree did not view the bachelors degree as necessary. Public school teaching experience was not viewed as necessary. Experience teaching in a trade school, vocational-technical school or a community college was thought desirable. Teaching experience in a four-year college was not seen as necessary, however an internship was recommended as desirable. The recommendation concerning non-academic teaching was split between desirable and not necessary. It was recommended that faculty complete more than one year of non-teaching work experience before being employed. Writing books or articles and doing research were recommended as not necessary.

Belonging to professional organizations was recommended as desirable.

The recommended qualifications for Transfer-Vocational Faculty were similar to those for Terminal-Vocational Faculty as discussed in the previous paragraph with the following exceptions. A bachelors degree should be completed prior to employment. The recommendation for a masters degree was equally split between being desirable and not necessary. Teacher certification was not perceived as necessary.

The differences in the recommended qualifications for these two faculty groups were only in the importance of advanced academic degrees. Respondents with advanced degrees recommended advanced degrees as more important than did respondents with lower degrees or no degree.

All subgroups recommended similar qualifications for Terminal-Academic Faculty. The recommendations were as follows: Professional or trade certification should be obtained prior to employment. A specialist degree, a doctorate and teacher certification were not necessary but a masters degree should be required. Public school teaching experience and teaching experience in trade school and vocational technical school were not deemed necessary. Two-year college teaching experience was thought to be desirable, however four-year college teaching was not viewed as necessary. An internship was thought desirable but non-academic teaching experience was not believed to be necessary. More than one year of non-teaching experience was seen as desirable. Writing books and doing research were not thought to be necessary and belonging

to professional organizations was viewed as desirable.

The recommended qualifications for Transfer-Academic Faculty were identical to the recommendation for Terminal-Academic Faculty with the exception that the recommendation for teacher certification was equally divided between being not necessary and being desirable. Respondents with less than a bachelors degree recommended that teacher certification be completed prior to employment. They also recommended teaching experience in the vocational technical school, two-year college, four-year college and an internship be completed prior to employment, and recommended that non-academic teaching experience would be desirable.

Some respondents commented on their responses that they did not or would not divide the faculty into the four subgroups used in this study. The responses to the questionnaire in the current study indicate that in most areas the recommended qualifications for all faculty were the same. Slight differences in the recommended degree existed which divided the faculty into two groups: persons who teach vocationally oriented subjects and persons who teach academically oriented subjects. The recommended professional training discussed in the previous section made no distinction in the training needs of faculty teaching in terminal programs and faculty teaching in transfer programs.

The degree recommended as most appropriate for faculty corresponded closely with the actual degree that had been attained by respondents. There were important and unforseen differences between the

teaching experience of respondents and the teaching experience recommended for faculty. As TABLE 50, page 114, indicates, 13.6% of the respondents had taught in elementary schools and 46.4% had taught in secondary schools. However, all the subgroups except faculty teaching in both terminal and transfer programs recommended that the public school teaching experience not be necessary. Respondents evidently did not find that the preparation for public school teaching or the experience of teaching in public schools was helpful in preparing them for their positions within the community college. This feeling about the public school system is further emphasized by the data in TABLE 104, page 164, which shows only 2.1% of the respondents expressed either a first or second choice preference of the public school as a place of employment.

A similar situation existed concerning four-year college teaching experience. TABLE 55, page 123, indicates that 22.7% of the respondents had experience teaching in four-year college. TABLE 98 , page158 , shows that 23.9% of the respondents indicated their first or second choice of employment was the four-year college. However, only part-time respondents with less than a bachelors degree recommended four-year college teaching experience as desirable. Again, respondents evidently did not feel that four-year college experience was valuable preparation for the community college.

An internship was another qualification which illicited unusual

responses. TABLE 202 page 291 shows that 13.3% of the respondents had an internship in a community college. The recommended training for that skill was either no training needed, a one to three credit college course, or more than three college credits as TABLES 206, 207, 208 and 209 pages 295-298, show. The recommendations of the subgroups were not always the same for this item when it was considered as a professional skill as when it was described as a qualification. Most subgroups indicated an internship was desirable. Only faculty teaching in terminal programs and respondents with less than a bachelors degree, many of which were faculty in terminal programs, recommended that an internship was not necessary.

The desired qualifications were a bachelors degree in a subject field with professional or trade certification for faculty teaching in terminal programs and a masters degree in the subject field for faculty teaching in transfer programs. Teaching experience in a trade school or vocational-technical school was desirable for faculty teaching in terminal programs. Teaching experience in a two-year college and an internship were desirable for all faculty. More than one-year of non-teaching work experience was considered mandatory for all faculty. Writing and doing research were not considered important, but membership in professional organizations was desirable.

Work experience was the most desired qualification for community college faculty. A degree was desirable, but was less important than

work experience and a degree in the subject field was more desirable than a degree in education. Although the responses of different subgroups varied slightly, the summary above represents the majority of the responses.

Summary

This study gathered descriptive data and data concerning the professional preparation and desired qualifications from the faculty and administrators at fifty-nine community colleges in eight states in the northwest. Descriptive data was compiled and is presented for six different groupings of the data. Each of these groupings was compared on fifteen variables. Sixty-nine comparisons were made. Forty of the comparisons were found to be significant at the .05 level or greater. The most significant differences were among the respondents with different degrees.

The findings of this study were compared to the findings reported by previous studies. The findings of the current study were found to be significantly different than almost all previous studies which suggested that faculty and administrators in the northwest were different from their counterparts in other parts of the country and that faculty and administrators were changing as predicted by some earlier writers. The current study found higher proportions of respondents with the doctorate and higher proportions with less than a masters degree than was reported in earlier studies. More faculty in the

current study had four-year college teaching experience than was reported by earlier studies.

Information was gathered concerning thirty-seven professional preparation skills. The proportion of respondents who had received training in each skill varied from a low of 13.3% for teaching internship in a community college to a high of 74.0% for teaching techniques. The amount of training recommended in each skill was the same for all faculty. An in-service program was the recommended training for twenty-six of the thirty-seven skills. A college course was recommended for eight of the skills: developing individualized programs of learning, how to develop new courses, how to construct or develop tests, learning theory and its application for adults, motivating students, teaching to community college students, teaching techniques, and theories of learning and remembering. The recommended training for three other skills was split between a college course and no training needed. Those three were: teaching internship in a community college, how to conduct basic research, and how to conduct applied research.

The skills ranked by subgroups as the five most important were: teaching techniques, motivating students, how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, learning theory and its application for adults, and teaching to community college students. The skills most often ranked as the five least important were: how and where to get textbooks, how to conduct basic research, how to conduct applied

research, history and role of the community college, and how the community college is financed. The five skills rated as most important were all methods skills despite many negative comments which were made concerning education methods courses.

The desired qualifications for faculty as perceived by the respondents included a degree in a subject field, a bachelors degree with professional or trade certification for faculty teaching in terminal programs, and a masters degree for faculty teaching in transfer programs. Teaching experience in a two-year college and an internship were recommended as desirable for all faculty. Non-teaching but job related experience was the most desired qualification for all faculty and it was recommended that more than one year be completed prior to employment. Writing and doing research were recommended as not necessary while membership in professional organizations was considered desirable for all faculty members.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The number of faculty at some four-year colleges has been reduced during the 1970's. This reduction has provided a new supply of experienced college teachers whose preparation has been for teaching in the four-year college. Coincidently, the growth of vocational and community education programs has brought faculty to community colleges who have had little or no formal higher education or professional training. Given this unique situation, an interesting question is posed. What professional training should this new type of faculty have in order to be most effective, and what qualifications are viewed as best for community college faculty? Furthermore, what academic background, experience, and degrees do faculty and administrators in the northwest actually have?

This study has attempted to provide information which will help answer these questions.

Purpose of The Study

The purpose of this study was to obtain descriptive information about faculty and administrators at community colleges in the northwest, to obtain data concerning the professional preparation of those faculty, and in addition to determine the desired qualifications for community

college faculty. The study answered the following questions:

1. What is the academic background, experience, and degree of job satisfaction of the faculty and administrators in the northwest?

2. What academic preparation, work experience, and professional education qualifications are perceived as desired by currently employed faculty teaching in terminal and transfer programs in the northwest?

3. What professional preparation have community college faculty and administrators in the northwest actually had?

4. What professional preparation is most important for community college faculty as perceived by currently employed faculty members?

5. How much training should presently employed and new faculty receive in professional skills?

6. How do faculty and administrator responses to questions concerning training compare?

7. How do the training of currently employed faculty and the ideal training for faculty as expressed by administrators compare?

Background

An extensive review of community college literature revealed an abundance of descriptive studies of community colleges. The recommendations and conclusions of the selected studies lacked agreement concerning the desired qualifications and professional preparation for community college faculty, and the preferred content of pre-service or

in-service programs for community college faculty. The literature on the community college surveyed in this study is summarized by the following statements.

1. The primary function of the community college is teaching.

2. The community college should attempt to meet the educational needs of the local community.

3. Community college faculty must have a greater interest in teaching and in students than their colleagues in four-year institutions.

4. The major weakness of community college faculty are too narrow a specialization in subject matter, lack of understanding of the community, and lack of understanding of the community college philosophy and role.

5. Lack of time is the greatest problem of the community college instructor.

6. The masters degree is the degree held by most faculty members, and is considered by administrators to be the most suitable degree for community college faculty.

7. Although historically, many faculty members have been recruited from secondary schools, the recent trend is toward seeking faculty with previous teaching experience at the community college level.

8. Experience as a community college student is perceived as advantageous for faculty members and other factors being equal, persons

with that experience should be given preference.

9. Having taken a course dealing with the community college is a significant factor in helping a faculty member understand the philosophy of the community college. Nationwide, only about one quarter of the faculty have taken such a course.

10. There are 104 colleges and universities nationwide offering some pre-service preparation for community college faculty. The capability of these programs to produce new faculty is well below the predicted requirements of community colleges.

11. The teaching internship, a special course on the community college, characteristics of community college students, and teaching techniques are the courses most often identified as desirable in preparation programs for community college faculty.

12. In-service education programs are needed to fill the present needs for professional preparation of faculty members at community colleges.

Methodology

The population of this study was the faculty and administrators at the fifty-nine community colleges who agreed to participate in the eight northwest states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming during the 1977-78 academic year.

Two random samples were drawn from that population using a random numbers table. The sample of administrators included 348

individuals who represented the 914 administrators in the population. The faculty sample included 542 individuals who presented the 5010 faculty members in the population. Each person in the sample was mailed a questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed by the investigator and pretested at three community colleges in Illinois and Missouri. The questionnaire had three sections. The first section, Descriptive Data, asked questions about the academic background and experience of the respondents. The second section, Professional Preparation, asked respondents to indicate in which of thirty-seven professional skills they had received training, what training they recommended faculty have, and which of the thirty-seven skills were the five most important and which were the five least important. In the third section, Desired Qualifications, respondents were asked to indicate which degree(s), type of teaching experience(s), and professional activities they considered important. They were given eleven combinations of degree, work experience, professional education courses, and professional or trade certification from which to choose and were asked to rank order the eleven choices by their importance as qualifications for community college faculty. Usable questionnaires were returned by 315 administrators, 90.5%, and 403 faculty, 74.4%.

The responses to the Descriptive Data section were divided into the following six groupings: respondent location by state, administrator or faculty member, part-time or full-time employee in education,

highest degree attained by the respondent, respondents taking classes toward a higher degree, and respondent's previous experience as a community college student. Each of these groups was compared on fifteen variables. Each comparison was tested for significance of difference by a chi-square test. The .05 level was set to determine significance. In addition, non-statistical analyses were made of the responses to the Professional Preparation and Desired Qualifications sections of the questionnaire of the following four groupings: respondent location by state, administrator or faculty member, part-time or full-time employee in education, and highest degree attained by the respondent.

Findings of the Study

The analysis of the responses to the questionnaire resulted in the following findings:

1. The highest degree attained by faculty and administrators in the current study was significantly different from that reported by previous studies. This study found a higher proportion of respondents with a doctorate and a higher proportion with less than a masters degree.

2. Respondents in this study had teaching experience significantly different from that reported in previous studies. Of the respondents, 46.4% had secondary school teaching experience, 13.6% had elementary school teaching experience, 21.9% had taught previously in

other community colleges, 22.7% had taught in four-year colleges, 23.7% had non-teaching work experiences, and 14.7% reported no teaching or non-teaching work experience prior to their current position.

3. Of all respondents, 19.4% had had a teaching internship in their training program, 42.2% had attended a community college or junior college as a student, 19.5% were presently taking courses which would lead to a higher degree, and 25.5% planned to take courses which would lead to a higher degree at a later time.

4. Nearly ninety percent of the faculty and over ninety-five percent of the administrators were either satisfied or very satisfied with their present employment. Ninety-four percent of the respondents with less than a bachelors degree and over ninety-four percent with a doctorate were either satisfied or very satisfied with their present employment.

5. Of all respondents, 73.5% selected their present community college as a first choice for place of employment while none chose the secondary school as a first choice.

6. The average respondent had taken 10.9 courses in education. Administrators had taken 14.2 courses in education while faculty teaching in transfer programs had taken 7.5 courses.

7. Of the sixty-nine comparisons in the present study, forty were significant. When the results of the current study were compared with previous studies in the field, significant differences were found

as noted in CHAPTER 4. Thus, either community college personnel in the northwest were different from those in other locations or the experience and educational preparation of community college personnel have changed in the last five to ten years.

8. The training received in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas was statistically similar for all the subgroups. However, a higher proportion of administrators than faculty had received training in the thirty-seven skill areas. Seventy-four percent of all respondents had received training in the skill area "teaching techniques."

9. The training respondents recommended in each of the thirty-seven professional skill areas was the same for both the faculty teaching in terminal programs and for the faculty teaching in transfer programs. In-service training was recommended by the respondents as most appropriate for twenty-six of the thirty-seven professional skill areas included in the questionnaire. A college course was recommended as most appropriate for the following eight skill areas: developing individualized programs of learning, how to develop new courses, how to construct or develop tests, learning theory and its application for adults, motivating students, teaching to community college students, teaching techniques, and theories of learning and remembering. Paradoxically, the recommendations were divided as to whether a college course or no training was needed for three other skill areas: teaching internship

in a community college, how to conduct basic research, and how to conduct applied research.

10. The professional skills most often identified as the five most important were: teaching techniques, motivating students, how to deal with students with weak academic preparation, learning theory and its application of adults, and teaching to community college students. It is interesting to note that despite the many negative comments concerning education methods courses, the five skill areas chosen as most important are typically regarded as methods skills.

11. The skills most often ranked as the five least important were: how and where to get textbooks, how to conduct basic research, how to conduct applied research, the history and role of the community college, and how the community college is financed.

12. The qualifications desired for Terminal-Vocational and Transfer-Vocational faculty were similar and the qualifications desired for Terminal-Academic and Transfer-Academic were similar.

13. The qualification expressed as most desirable for all faculty was non-teaching work experience. It was further recommended that more than one year of non-teaching work experience be completed prior to employment. A degree in a subject area was seen as preferable to a generalists degree in education. Professional education courses and professional or trade certification were viewed as a desirable addition to the preparation of community college faculty.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data provided by the questionnaire and the results of the data analysis presented in CHAPTER 4, the following conclusions are made concerning community college faculty in the northwest:

1. The proportion of faculty with the doctorate and the proportion of faculty with less than a bachelors degree have increased compared to earlier studies.

2. Nearly half the faculty had public school teaching experience prior to coming to the community college. Slightly under twenty-two percent had taught in a four-year college.

3. Nearly ninety percent of the faculty and nearly ninety-five percent of the administrators were either satisfied or very satisfied in their present position.

4. Nearly three fourths of the respondents preferred their present community college as a place of employment. None of the respondents wanted to return to the secondary school as a preferred place of employment.

The following conclusions were made concerning the professional preparation of community college faculty in the northwest:

1. The same training in professional skills was recommended for faculty teaching in terminal programs and faculty teaching in transfer programs. The proportion of faculty who have not received training in

each of the professional skills was similar for both groups.

2. Faculty members and administrators shared a common perspective of the professional training needs of faculty. Furthermore, faculty and administrators identified the same skills as the most and least important. It is interesting to note that the skills ranked as the most important were all methods skills.

3. The pre-service and in-service training programs have not been adequately meeting the trainining needs of the faculty. Only about half the faculty had received training in the thirty-seven professional skill areas. The actual training received by faculty members was found to be different from what was recommended by the responding administrators in this study. Administrators have not actually been hiring people with the qualifications they reportedly feel are desirable nor have they provided in-service programs which would provide the training identified as desirable.

4. Of those who made comments, more made negative comments about departments of education than made positive comments.. The comments varied considerably from state to state: Poorly run pre-service programs in some locations were reported as hindering rather than assisting community colleges.

The following conclusions are made from the analysis of the data concerning the qualifications most desired for faculty:

1. Work experience was viewed as the most important qualification for faculty regardless of whether they taught in terminal or transfer programs.

2. The masters degree was the appropriate degree for faculty teaching in transfer programs. Professional or trade certification was desired for all faculty. A degree in a subject field was preferable to a degree in education.

3. Although a higher percentage of respondents had public school teaching experience, a teaching internship and teaching experience in a community college were viewed as better preparation for community college faculty than either public school or four-year college experience.

THE MODEL

The following model pre-service program for community college faculty is presented based on the literature search and the analysis of the data from the current investigation. The model pre-service program was designed primarily for prospective faculty members for transfer programs.

A basic assumption of this model is that the candidate possesses, is enrolle in, or plans to enroll in a masters degree program in a subject field. The professional preparation in the pre-service model could be accomplished as a minor discipline, or as training

beyond the masters degree.

A useful alternative for faculty who possess a masters degree would be to obtain a doctorate with a major in the education field and a minor in the subject field. This alternative would allow the candidate to pursue the doctorate without the intensive subject field research which the subject field doctorate demand and which community college administrators report as unnecessary for their faculty.

The following skills would be included in a pre-service program for community college faculty. College courses would include the following:

1. History and philosophy of the community college.
2. Learning theory especially as related to adults.
3. Teaching techniques with emphasis on the problems encountered by community college students.
4. Curriculum development with emphasis on the procedures and problems of developing new courses.
5. Applied research with the emphasis on using research findings rather than performing research.
6. Evaluation - methods and procedures and problems associated with testing, especially instructor composed tests.
7. Motivation - theory and practice of motivation of people, especially students.
8. Basic counseling and guidance - the goal would be to recognize and refer problems.

9. Teaching with media - sources of and possibilities and problems associated with using video equipment, tape recorders, guests, and other teaching aids.

10. Teaching internship in a community college - a minimum of one term full-time.

The following topics would be presented as weekly seminars with a different topic discussed each week. The same topics could be presented as in-service training programs for all faculty.

1. The community college student.

2. Duties of faculty members.

3. Community college finance.

4. Community-College relations and involvement.

5. Sources of educational resources.

6. Determining and writing objectives.

7. The role of the community college in higher education.

IMPLICATIONS

The high response rate to the questionnaire indicated considerable interest in the subject. Seventeen respondents asked for information concerning the results of the study. Because a number of responses received after the analysis had been done indicated that those respondents had been on vacation when the questionnaire was mailed, it is assumed that the return rate for faculty would have been higher if the questionnaires had been mailed earlier in the school year and if more time had been allowed between the follow-up letters. This interest in the subject by both faculty and administrators may be an

indication that changes in training requirements and in preparation programs may be possible and desirable.

The highest degree attained by the respondents has followed the predictions of Phair (1975), Phair (1977), and Cheit (1971). The continued emphasis on community and vocational education has increased employment opportunities for persons with less than a masters degree. The rise in the number of faculty with less than a masters degree has also created a need for additional professional training of faculty, especially in-service training. The continuation and expansion of this trend will further accentuate the need for professional training of faculty. In-service training appears to be the only viable means of meeting the need for professional preparation of faculty at this time.

The in-service training format is flexible enough to allow for the differences which exist between states, community colleges, and even the different groups of faculty within each community college. The thirty-seven skill areas listed in this study could be presented in in-service training programs for faculty in a multitude of combinations using a variety of methods designed to meet the professional training needs of a particular community college or faculty group.

The increase in the percentage of doctorates in the professional labor pool coupled with the higher proportion of respondents with teaching experience in four-year colleges implies that more faculty members from colleges and universities are available and desire

employment with the community college. Although the doctorate is not seen as a necessary degree for community college faculty, the availability of applicants with the doctorate puts an increased pressure on faculty members without that degree to involve themselves in training activities which will keep them competitive in the job market.

Both faculty and administrators shared similar views of the professional training most appropriate for faculty. Their views were realistic in that the training they recommended was available and possible for all faculty. The responses of faculty teaching in terminal programs and faculty teaching in transfer programs indicated that each group had a realistic view of the training needs of the other. This implies that each group understands the role of the other group in the community college, even if they may not agree with that role.

The responses of persons from different states suggests that different philosophies of community college education exist among the states.

In some cases these differing philosophies seem to be impeding community colleges in their efforts to fulfill their unique educational role.

It is interesting to note that administrators apparently do not hire faculty members with the professional training they recommend that they have. In addition, they seem not to be providing means by which current faculty members can obtain the desired professional skills

through in-service training.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The results of this study indicated that the highest degree attained and the teaching experience of the faculty in the northwest were significantly different from that reported by earlier studies. A study similar to the current study needs to be done nationwide to determine the extent of the differences and to determine the professional preparation training needs of community college throughout the nation.

As stated in CHAPTER 3, many earlier studies have reported a need for professional training and have made recommendations concerning the content of preparation programs. However, little research has been done to verify the effect of training or to compare the results of different types of training. This study indicated a need for additional training for faculty which must come from some type of in-service programs, but, raises the question do in-service programs have the desired effect, and if so how do they compare to pre-service programs or formal courses in improving the ability of a teacher?

This study revealed that administrators were not hiring faculty with the qualifications and training they reportedly felt were desirable nor were they demanding that faculty obtain those qualifications. The extent and reasons for the differences between the ideal qualifications of faculty as stated by administrators and the actual qualifications of

the faculty they employ needs further study.

The relationship of: a community college's philosophy and stated goals, the training that the faculty and administrators receive and the effectiveness of the community college organization should be studied systematically. Studies need to be conducted which will find these relationships and help communities and administrators to be able to use the community college faculty and facilities as tools to improve the community.

The philosophy of a college of education which is providing pre-service preparation for community college faculty and administrators will effect the attitudes of the students it accepts and graduates. The fact that many negative comments were made about education courses indicated possible problems in this area. The problem of teaching methods and student attitudes toward the course need further investigation. Are the attitudes graduates have toward education courses, especially methods courses, a function of the teaching in the course, the age of the student, the experience of the student, a combination of these, or some other factor? Carefully designed systematic studies may provide some answers to these questions.

One of the main goals of most in-service and pre-service programs is to improve the effectiveness of the participants in the program. An area which needs more study is how to measure teacher effectiveness. Are there measureable qualities which make good or

excellent teachers, or are teachers effective because of some inherent, undetectable, and unmeasurable factors? The effectiveness of teacher training programs at all levels will remain questionable until these questions are answered.

APPENDIX A

COLLEGES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY

Sheldon Jackson College
Sitka, Alaska

Juneau-Douglas Community College
Auke Bay, Alaska

Ketchikan Community College
Ketchikan, Alaska

Kodiak Community College
Kodiak, Alaska

Kuskokwin Community College
Bethel, Alaska

Northwest Community College
Nome, Alaska

Sitka Community College
Sitka, Alaska

Tanana Valley Community College
Fairbanks, Alaska

College of Southern Idaho
Twin Falls, Idaho

North Idaho College
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

Ricks College
Rexburg, Idaho

Flathead Valley Community College
Kalispell, Montana

Miles Community College
Miles City, Montana

Clark County Community College
North Las Vegas, Nevada

Northern Nevada Community College
Elko, Nevada

Blue Mountain Community College
Pendleton, Oregon

Central Oregon Community College
Bend, Oregon

Chemeketa Community College
Salem, Oregon

Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, Oregon

Clatsop Community College
Astoria, Oregon

Judson Baptist College
Portland, Oregon

Lane Community College
Eugene, Oregon

Linn-Benton Community College
Albany, Oregon

Mt. Hood Community College
Gresham, Oregon

Rogue Community College
Grants Pass, Oregon

College of Eastern Utah
Price, Utah

Dixie College
St. George, Utah

Snow College
Ephraim, Utah

Utah Technical College at Provo
Provo, Utah

Utah Technical College at Salt Lake
Salt Lake City, Utah

Bellevue Community College
Bellevue, Washington

Big Bend Community College
Moses Lake, Washington

Centralia Community College
Centralia, Washington

Clark College
Vancouver, Washington

Edmonds Community College
Lynnwood, Washington

Fort Steilacoom Community College
Tacoma, Washington

Grays Harbor College
Aberdeen, Washington

Green River Community College
Auburn, Washington

Highline Community College
Midway, Washington

Lower Columbia College
Longview, Washington

Olympia Community College
Olympia, Washington

Olympic College
Bremerton, Washington

Peninsula College
Port Angeles, Washington

Seattle Central Community College
Seattle, Washington

Shoreline Community College
Seattle, Washington

South Seattle Community College
Seattle, Washington

Spokane Community College
Spokane, Washington

Tacoma Community College
Tacoma, Washington

Walla Walla Community College
Walla Walla, Washington

Wenatchee Valley College
Wenatchee, Washington

Whatcom Community College
Bellingham, Washington

Yakima Valley Community College
Yakima, Washington

Casper College
Casper, Wyoming

Central Wyoming College
Riverton, Wyoming

Eastern Wyoming College
Torrington, Wyoming

Laramie County Community College
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Sheridan College
Sheridan, Wyoming

Northwest Community College
Powell, Wyoming

Western Wyoming Community College
Rock Springs, Wyoming

APPENDIX B

COLLEGES WHICH DID NOT PARTICIPATE

Colleges Who Refused to Participate

Portland Community College
Portland, Oregon

Umpqua Community College
Roseburg, Oregon

North Seattle Community College
Seattle, Washington

Colleges Who Failed to Respond to Requests to Participate

Anchorage Community College
Anchorage, Alaska

Kenai Peninsula Community College
Soldotna, Alaska

Matanuska Susitna Community College
Palmer, Alaska

College of St. Gertrude
Cottonwood, Idaho

Dawson College
Glendive, Montana

Western Nevada Community College
Carson City, Nevada

Southwestern Oregon Community College
Coos Bay, Oregon

Treasure Valley Community College
Ontario, Oregon

Columbia Basin College
Pasco, Washington

Everett Community College
Everett, Washington

Spokane Falls Community College
Spokane, Washington

Skagit Valley Community College
Mount Vernon, Washington

APPENDIX C

PRE-TEST LETTER

P.O. Box 425
Scott AFB, IL 62225

Too little is known about the preparation of community college faculty. I have chosen this subject as the topic for my doctoral dissertation. I hope to find information which will help both community and four-year colleges plan ways to appropriately meet the training needs of the community college faculty. Your president has given me permission to ask you to participate in this study.

The questionnaire enclosed should only take a few minutes to complete. The information obtained will be treated collectively. Please note that no identification is required on the questionnaire so all information will remain confidential. There is a code number on the return envelope. This is so that I can know who has responded for statistical purposes. The number was put on the envelope only so that the questionnaires would not be marked.

This is a pilot test of the questionnaire. Would you please take a few minutes to fill it out and make any recommendations or comments about the questionnaire.

If you would like an abstract of the study please feel free to contact me.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your assistance is needed since only a random sample was chosen to receive the questionnaire. The input of you, the employees of community colleges, is needed to understand and assess this vital area. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE HARSHA

APPENDIX D

PRE-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. In what state are you now employed? _____
2. Are you: ____Faculty ____Administration ____Other (specify)_____
3. If you are faculty, do you teach primarily in: ____Terminal subjects ____Transfer subjects
4. Are you: ____Full-time ____Part-time
5. Are you involved in the process of hiring faculty members? ____Yes ____No
6. Which academic degrees do you hold and when did you receive them?
   ____Associate ____Bachelors ____Masters ____Specialist ____Doctorate ____None
7. How many credits have you earned beyond the highest degree? _____
8. Have you ever attended a community or junior college as a student? ____Yes ____No
9. How many years have you taught at each level:
   ____Elementary ____Community college (not including present school)
   ____Secondary ____Four-year college (not including as a graduate assistant)
   ____Non-teaching work ____Graduate Assistant
10. How long have you been employed at this community college? ____Yrs
    In your present position? ____Yrs
11. Have you had: student teaching (public school) ____Yes ____No
    teaching internship (community college) ____Yes ____No
12. Are you taking courses which will lead to a higher degree?
    ____Yes, I am currently taking courses
    ____No, I am not taking courses
    ____No, I am not now taking courses, but I plan to
13. How many graduate professional education courses have you taken? _____
14. How satisfied would you say you are with teaching in the community college?
    ____Very Satisfied ____Satisfied ____Neither satisfied or dissatisfied
    ____Dissatisfied ____Very Dissatisfied
15. Where would you rather teach?
    ____Elementary school ____Community College
    ____Secondary school ____Four-year college
    ____Non-teaching

Comments:

16. Your age is:
    _____20-25 _____26-30 _____31-35 _____36-40 _____40-45 _____46-50
    _____51-55 _____56-60 _____61-65 _____Over 65
17. Sex _____M _____F

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Below is a list of skill areas in which a faculty member might receive training. In column 1, mark with a X those areas in which you have received training either as an in-service program or as a formal college course. In column 2, mark the amount of time that you think should be spent by terminal faculty training in each area. In column 3, mark the amount of time you think should be spent by transfer faculty in training in the area. Please mark each block. Use the following code:

0: doesn't need training in this area.
1: 1-4 hour in-service program
2: 1-2 day in-serve workshop
3: 3-10 day in-service program
4: 1-3 credit college course
5: more than 3 college credits

Finally, in column 1, please mark 1 through 5 for the five most important skill areas which should be included in the preparation of community college faculty. Mark 6 through 10 (10 being least important) for the five least important areas to be included in the preparation of community college teachers.

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Skill Area
_____	_____	_____	Administrative structure and operation of the community college
_____	_____	_____	Adult Education
_____	_____	_____	Background and Problems of community college students
_____	_____	_____	Community college philosophy
_____	_____	_____	Developing individualized programs of learning
_____	_____	_____	Functions and roles of the community college
_____	_____	_____	Group dynamic
_____	_____	_____	History of the community college
_____	_____	_____	How adolescents learn
_____	_____	_____	How adults learn
_____	_____	_____	How and where to get text books
_____	_____	_____	How the community college is financed
_____	_____	_____	How to conduct research
_____	_____	_____	How to deal with students with emotional problems
_____	_____	_____	How to deal with students with weak secondary school preparation
_____	_____	_____	How to fit a curriculum to the needs of the community
_____	_____	_____	How to help students choose a career or major field of study
_____	_____	_____	How to interpret research findings and apply the results in class
_____	_____	_____	How to interpret test results
_____	_____	_____	How to use standardized tests
_____	_____	_____	How to use TV, video tape, and other equipment in the classroom
_____	_____	_____	How to write tests
_____	_____	_____	Motivating students
_____	_____	_____	Place of the community college in the American educational system
_____	_____	_____	Resources available in the community
_____	_____	_____	Speed reading
_____	_____	_____	Teaching to community college students

____	____	____	Teaching internship in the community college
____	____	____	Teaching techniques
____	____	____	Theories of learning and remembering
____	____	____	Time management
____	____	____	Where to find educational resources
____	____	____	Where to refer students with special problems
____	____	____	Writing behavioral objectives
____	____	____	Others (specify) _____

If you are an administrator, please answer the following questions.

1. Have there been sufficient number of applicants for faculty positions that you have been able to be selective in your hiring? _____Yes _____No.

2. Have you, in the last two years, hired faculty which you felt were not fully qualified because of a lack of applicants? _____Yes _____No.

3. Would you have hired faculty with different qualifications if applicants with your desired qualifications had been available? _____Yes _____No.

Please identify any areas which were not clear or which you did not understand.
Any suggestions for improvement will be appreciated.

Comments or Suggestions:

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS

Below are listed some qualifications which faculty could possess. The faculty are divided into four subdivisions: Terminal Vocation, those who teach vocational courses in programs designed to offer a degree or certification at the completion of the program or course; Terminal Academic, those who teach traditional academic subjects in programs designed to offer a degree or certification at the completion of the program; Transfer Vocational, those who teach vocationally oriented subjects to students who are enrolled in programs designed to transfer to four-year institutions; Transfer Academic, those who teach courses whose primary purpose is to transfer to four-year institutions.

Please indicate what qualifications you believe are the minimum that community college faculty should possess. Please mark each block. Use the following code: N = the teacher must have this qualification completed prior to being employed; D = it would be desirable that a teacher have this qualification prior to being employed; O = it is not necessary that a teacher have this qualification; A = the teacher should have this qualification but can complete it after being employed; U = it is undesirable that a community college teacher have this qualification.

		Faculty			
		Terminal		Transfer	
		Vocational	Academic	Vocational	Academic
Degree:	Bachelors				
	Masters				
	Specialist				
	Doctorate				
	Other (Specify)				
Experience: Teaching:	Secondary				
	Elementary				
	Two-year college				
	Four-year college				
	Internship				
Non-teaching:	One year of work				
	Do research				
	Belong to professional organizations				
Please rank the following qualifications for each of the four groups of faculty. Mark 1 for the most important qualification, 2 for the second most important, etc.					
Degree in subject field with no work experience					
Degree in subject field with work experience					
Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with no work experience					
Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with work experience					
Degree in education with no work experience					
Degree in education with work experience					

APPENDIX E

LETTERS SENT WITH QUESTIONNAIRES

msu

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BOZEMAN 59715

The community college is one of the fastest growing institutions in American education. Research concerning the community college has often been limited. For instance here in the northwest, little is known about the community college faculty, their background, experiences, and preparation.

Effective planning in higher education to meet the needs of the community college is dependent on obtaining a base of information about the community college. Only you, the faculty and administrators currently working at community colleges, can provide the information necessary to build that base.

The preparation of community college faculty in the northwest is the topic of my dissertation. The president of your college has given me permission to ask you to participate in this study. We need your help to compile the needed information for effective planning. The enclosed questionnaire should take only a few minutes to complete. All information obtained will be treated collectively. The questionnaire requires no identification. The return envelope has a code number on it. This will be used only for statistical purposes. The mark was put on the envelope so that the information on the questionnaire would remain anonymous.

Would you please take a few minutes from your busy schedule to answer the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. You are part of a random sample and your assistance is needed in this area. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

WAYNE HARSHA
Graduate Student
Department of Education
Montana State University
Bozeman, MT 59717

Approved:

John W. Kohl

DR. JOHN KOHL
Project Supervisor
Asst Dean of the College of Education
Montana State University
Bozeman, MT 59717

TELEPHONE (406)994-4731

msu

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION · MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BOZEMAN 59715

About three weeks ago I mailed you a questionnaire concerning the professional preparation of community college faculty. The response so far has been gratifying. However, I find that yours has not been returned.

If I am to find useful information, I need participation from a broad cross-section of faculty and administrators. I have chosen only a random sample to receive the questionnaire. This method makes your contribution even more important. Your responses will represent many others who have similar feelings.

I know that this is a busy time for you, but won't you take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire. Let me reemphasize that all information will be strictly confidentiala nd will be treated and reported collectively.

In case you have lost the questionnaire, I have enclosed another. If you would like an abstract of the results please let me know.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

WAYNE HARSHA
Graduate Student
Montana State University
Bozeman, MT 59717

TELEPHONE (406)994 4731

msu

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BOZEMAN 59715

I have been anxiously awaiting your reply to the questionnaire I mailed you, but have not yet received it. You have opinions different from other community college staff members. Your opinions are important and need to be heard by planners in education. However, if your opinions are not included in the sample, this report may end up like so many others, interesting but of no significance. I do not want that to happen and I trust neither do you.

It would be unrealistic and unnecessary for me to question every staff member at your school. Therefore, I need a good response rate from those selected for the sample in order to have the report be of any significance. Won't you help me and community college education by taking a few minutes of your valuable time to fill out the questionnaire and return it. In case you have misplaced the one I sent previously, I am enclosing another.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Harsha
Graduate Student
College of Education
Montana State University
Bozeman, MT 59717

TELEPHONE (406)994 4731

msu
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BOZEMAN 59715

Despite three previous attempts, I have been unable to persuade you to complete my questionnaire. I need your help. Please reconsider and complete the questinnnaire today.

Because of the method I have used to select the recipients of the questionnaire, I must account for all copies of it. I must establish the degree of similarity between those who responded and those who did not. If you have decided not to answer the questionnaire, I need to have you at least fill out the descriptive data page and return it. This is the only means I have of verifying the data.

If I have not heard from you by July 20th, I will contact you by phone to obtain the data necessary to complete my study. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Wayne Harsha
Graduate Student
College of Education
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59717

TELEPHONE (406)994 4731

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE

DESCRIPTIVE DATA

1. In what state are you now employed?_____

2. Are you: _____Administrator _____Faculty teaching primarily in terminal program

   _____Faculty teaching primarily in transfer program.

3. Are you employed: ___Full-time ___Part-time in education?

4. Which academic degrees do you hold and in what year did you receive them?

   19___Associate 19___Bachelors 19___Masters 19___Specialist 19___Doctorate ___None

5. How many college credits have you earned beyond your highest degree? _____

6. Are you taking courses which will lead to a higher degree?

   ___Yes, I am currently taking courses

   ___No, I am not taking courses

   ___No, I am not now taking courses, but I plan to

7. Have you ever attended a community or junior college as a student? ___Yes ___No

8. How many years have you taught at each level of education?

   ____Elementary ___Community college (other than present school)

   ____Secondary ___Four-year college (other than as a graduate assistant)

   ____Business or trade school ___Graduate Assistant

   ____Vo-Tec Institute ___Non-teaching work

9. How long have you been employed in your present community college? ____Years

   In your present position? ____Years

10. Have you ever had: Student teaching (public school) ___Yes ___No

    Teaching internship (college) ___Yes ___No

11. How many college courses in the education department have you taken? _____

12. How satisfied would you say you are with your employment in the community college?

    ____Very Satisfied ____Satisfied ____Neither satisfied or dissatisfied

    ____Dissatisfied ____Very Dissatisfied

13. Would you rather teach in one of the following situations? (Mark 1 or 2)

    ____Elementary school ____Four-year college

    ____Secondary school ____Non-teaching academic situation

    ____Another community college ____Non-teaching, non-academic, work situation

    ____This community college

PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Below is a list of knowledge or skill areas in which a faculty member might receive training. In column 1, mark with an X those areas in which you have received training either in an in-service program or through a formal college course.

In column 2, mark the amount of time that you THINK should be spent by faculty teaching in terminal programs in training in each area, using the code below.

In column 3, mark the amount of time that you THINK should be spent by faculty teaching in transfer programs in training in each area, using the code below.

Please mark each skill or knowledge area in column 2 and column 3 using the following code:

0= no training needed in this area
1= 1-4 hour in-service training
2= 1-2 day in-service training
3= 3-10 day in-service training
4= 1-3 credit college course
5= more than 3 college credits

In column 4, please rank 1 through 5 the five most important skill areas which should be included in the preparation of community college faculty. Rank 6 through 10 (10 being the least important) the five least important areas in the preparation of community college faculty.

Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Skill or Knowledge Area
____	____	____	____	Advising and placement of academically disadvantaged students
____	____	____	____	Administrative structure and operation of the community college
____	____	____	____	Background and problems of community college students
____	____	____	____	Community college philosophy
____	____	____	____	Developing individualized programs of learning
____	____	____	____	Duties of a faculty member
____	____	____	____	Functions and roles of the community college
____	____	____	____	Group dynamics
____	____	____	____	History and role of the community college
____	____	____	____	How and where to get text books
____	____	____	____	How the community college is financed
____	____	____	____	How to assign grades
____	____	____	____	How to conduct applied research
____	____	____	____	How to conduct basic research
____	____	____	____	How to deal with students with emotional problems
____	____	____	____	How to deal with students with weak academic preparation
____	____	____	____	How to develop new courses
____	____	____	____	How to fit a curriculum to the needs of the community
____	____	____	____	How to help students choose a career or major field of study
____	____	____	____	How to interpret research and apply the findings in class
____	____	____	____	How to interpret and use the results of standardized tests
____	____	____	____	How to interpret the results of teacher made tests
____	____	____	____	How to use TV, video tape, and other equipment in the classroom
____	____	____	____	How to construct or develop tests
____	____	____	____	Learning theory and its application for adults
____	____	____	____	Motivating students
____	____	____	____	How to assess the educational needs of the community
____	____	____	____	Resources available in the community
____	____	____	____	Teaching to community college students
____	____	____	____	Teaching internship in the community college
____	____	____	____	Teaching techniques
____	____	____	____	Theories of learning and remembering
____	____	____	____	Time management
____	____	____	____	What to teach in a particular class
____	____	____	____	Where to find educational resources
____	____	____	____	Where to refer students with special problems
____	____	____	____	Writing learning objectives
____	____	____	____	Others (specify)_____

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS

Below are listed some qualifications which faculty could possess. The faculty are divided into four subdivisions:

Terminal Vocational: those who teach vocational or trade courses in programs designed to offer a degree or certification upon completion of the program or courses.

Terminal Academic: those who teach traditional academic subjects in programs designed to offer a degree or certification at the completion of the program or course.

Transfer Vocational: those who teach vocationally or trade oriented courses to students enrolled in programs designed to transfer to four-year institutions.

Transfer Academic: those who teach courses whose primary purpose is to transfer to four-year institutions.

Please indicate what qualifications YOU BELIEVE are the minimum that community college faculty in each subdivision should possess. Please mark each block in each column using the following code:

M = the faculty members must have this qualification completed prior to being employed.

D = it would be desirable that the faculty member have this qualification completed prior to being employed.

N = it is not necessary that a faculty member have this qualification.

A = a faculty member should have this qualification, but can complete it after being employed.

U = it is undesirable that a faculty member have this qualification.

	Faculty			
	Terminal		Transfer	
Degree:	Vocational	Academic	Vocational	Academic
Professional or trade certification				
Bachelors				
Masters				
Specialist				
Doctorate				
Teacher certification				
Other (specify)				
Teaching Experience:				
Elementary (include junior high)				
Secondary				
Trade school or college				
Vocational-Technical institute				
Two-year college				
Four-year college				
Internship				
Non-academic teaching				
Other (specify)				
Non-teaching Experience:				
One year of subject field related work				
Over one year of subject field related work				
Professional:				
Write books or journal articles				
Conduct applied research				
Belong to professional organizations				

Please rank order the following eleven qualifications separately for each of the four subdivisions of faculty. Mark 1 for the most desirable qualification, 2 for the second most desirable, . . ., and 11 for the least desirable qualification. (Work experience means non-teaching work related to the field such as accountant, auto mechanic, nurse, manager, etc.)

Degree in subject field with no work experience				
Degree in subject field with work experience				
Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with no work experience				
Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with work experience				
Degree in education with no work experience				
Degree in education with work experience				
Degree in subject field with professional or trade certification with no work experience				
Degree in subject field with professional or trade certification with work experience				
No degree with professional or trade certification with no work experience				
No degree with professional or trade certification with work experience				
No degree and no professional or trade certification with lengthy work experience				

APPENDIX G

HOW PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION SKILLS DERIVED

The knowledge or skill areas listed in the questionnaire were derived from the literature cited in Chapter II. The areas can be divided into six basic categories. Each skill or knowledge is listed below with the citation of writer or writers who recommended the area for inclusion in a community college faculty pre-service program or who have found the skill or knowledge identified as important by the faculty. Citations of a table includes all authors listed in that table in Chapter II.

Foundations

Backgrounds and Problems of Community College Students
(Bogue,1950) (Table VI)

Community College Philosophy
(Conley,1939) (Loomis,1964) (Medsker,1960) (Table V)

Functions and Roles of the Community College
(Stone,1958) (Table V)

History and Role of the Community College
(Loomis,1964) (Litton,1953) (Table V) (Stone,1958)

How To Conduct Applied Research
(Mead,1941)

How To Conduct Basic Research
(Mead,1941)

How To Interpret Research and Apply the Findings in Class
(Siehr,1962)

Learning Theory and Its Application to Adults
(Stone,1958) (Table X)

Teaching Internship
(Stone,1958) (Table XIII)

Theories of Learning and Remembering
(Stone,1958) (Table X)

Administration

Administrative Structure and Operation of the Community College
(Siehr,1962)

Duties of a Faculty Member
(Bogue,1950)

How and Where to Get Textbooks
(Siehr,1962)

How the Community College is Financed
(Siehr,1962)

How to Assign Grades
(Siehr,1962)

Resources Available in the Community
(Siehr,1962)

Time Management
(Siehr,1962) (Garrison,1967)

Guidance

Advising and Placement of Academically Disadvantaged Students
(Siehr,1962) (Bogue,1950)

Group Dynamics
(Siehr,1962) (Table VII)

How To Deal With Students With Emotional Problems
(Hollis,1941) (Siehr,1962) (Table VII)

How To Deal With Students With Weak Academic Preparation
(Blake,1943) (Siehr,1962)

How To Help Students Choose a Career or Major Field of Study
(Siehr,1962) (Table VII)

How To Interpret and Use The Results of Standardized Tests
(Siehr,1962)

Where To Refer Students With Special Problems
(Siehr,1962) (Table VII)

Instructional Methods

Developing Individualized Programs of Learning
(Siehr,1962)

How To Motivate Students
(Mead,1941) (Trabue,1950) (Melvin,1957) (Siehr,1962)

How To Use TV, Video Tape, and Other Equipment In The Classroom
(Siehr,1962) (Eells,1931) (Montgomery,1962)

Teaching To Community College Students
(Siehr,1962)

Teaching Techniques
(Eells,1931) (Montgomery,1962)

Writing Learning Objectives
(Siehr,1962)

Instructional Evaluation

How To Construct or Develop Tests
(Carter,1965) (Table XII)

How To Interpret the Results of Teacher Made Tests
(Carter,1965) (Table XII)

Curriculum Development and Implementation

How To Develop New Courses
(Table XI)

How To Assess the Communities Educational Needs
(Siehr,1962)

How To Fit a Curriculum To The Needs Of The Community
(Blake,1943) (Table XI)

What To Teach In A Particular Course
(Blake,1943) (Siehr,1962) (Table XI)

APPENDIX H

TABLES FROM DESCRIPTIVE DATA SECTION

TABLE 136

Raw Numbers from TABLE 27

	States							
	18	23	6	6	62	25	90	22
	8	12	2	5	38	24	70	13
	4	20	9	4	37	10	74	21
Administrator/	1	3	1	0	4	3	11	4
Faculty Groups	1	6	0	0	3	1	8	5
	6	5	1	0	16	1	24	3
	0	1	0	0	2	0	4	1

Chi-square = 47.41 df = 35

TABLE 137

Raw Numbers from TABLE

	Administrator/Faculty Groups						
Part-time/	246	160	172	26	24	48	8
Full-time	6	12	7	1	0	8	0

Chi-squares = 18.26* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 138

Raw Numbers from TABLE 30

	States							
Part-time/	31	68	19	14	157	62	266	67
Full-time	7	2	0	1	5	2	15	2

Chi-square = 19.48* df = 7 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 139

Raw Numbers from TABLE 31

	Administrator/Faculty Groups						
Part-time/	246	160	172	26	24	48	8
Full-time	6	12	7	1	0	8	0

Chi-square = 18.26* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 140

Raw Numbers from TABLE 32

	Degree Groups					
Part-time/	29	18	98	370	36	133
Full-time	1	3	10	13	4	3

Chi-square = 15.19* df = 5 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 141

Raw Numbers from TABLE 34

	States							
	1	4	0	2	7	5	11	0
	1	0	1	0	8	3	6	2
Degree	11	8	2	1	19	15	46	6
Groups	12	45	12	7	96	31	141	39
	1	2	0	0	6	1	25	5
	12	11	4	5	26	9	52	17

Chi-square = 36.42* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 142

Raw Numbers from TABLE 35

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
	9	18	3	0
	5	14	1	1
Degree	36	53	11	8
Groups	153	67	124	39
	18	11	9	2
	90	9	31	6

Chi-square = 139.84* df = 15 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 143

Raw Numbers from TABLE 36

	Degree Groups					
Part-time/	29	18	98	370	36	133
Full-time	1	3	10	13	4	3

Chi-square = 15.19* df = 5 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 144

Raw Numbers from TABLE 38

	States							
Community College	18	32	6	6	69	24	127	21
Student Experience	20	38	13	9	93	40	154	48

Chi-square = 7.22 df = 7

TABLE 145

Raw Numbers from TABLE 39

	Administrator/Faculty Groups						
Community College	106	82	79	10	5	18	3
Student Experience	146	90	100	17	19	38	5

Chi-square = 9.72 df = 6

TABLE 146

Raw Numbers from TABLE 40

	Part-time/Full-time	
Community College	15	288
Student Experience	19	396

Chi-square = .0029 df = 1

TABLE 147

Raw Numbers from TABLE 41

	Degree Groups					
Community College	20	17	50	142	22	52
Student Experience	10	4	58	241	18	84

Chi-square = 28.72* df = 5 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 148

Raw Numbers from TABLE 42

Those Pursuing a Higher Degree			
Community College	76	153	74
Student Experience	64	242	109

Chi-square = 10.60* df = 2 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 149

Raw Numbers from TABLE 44

States								
Those	11	12	2	4	34	19	47	11
Pursuing a	19	39	8	7	90	26	169	37
Higher Degree	8	19	9	4	38	19	65	21

Chi-square = 18.92 df = 14

TABLE 150

Raw Numbers from TABLE 45

Administrator/Faculty Groups				
Those	54	49	30	7
Pursuing a	194	69	103	29
Higher Degree	63	54	46	20

Chi-square = 28.27* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 151

Raw Numbers from TABLE 46

	Those Pursuing a Higher Degree		
Part-time/	137	373	174
Full-time	3	22	9

Chi-square = 2.71 df = 2

TABLE 152

Raw Numbers from TABLE 47

	Degree Groups			
Those	26	33	76	5
Pursuing a	13	35	228	119
Higher Degree	12	40	119	12

Chi-square = 116.67* df = 6 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 153

Raw Numbers from TABLE 48

	Those Pursuing a Higher Degree		
Community College	76	153	74
Student Experience	64	242	109

Chi-square = 10.60* df = 2 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 154

Raw Numbers From TABLE 50

	States							
	13	12	3	3	17	6	34	10
	18	40	11	7	77	29	119	32
	2	2	0	0	5	8	10	1
Teaching	2	3	0	0	11	14	21	2
Experience	9	11	3	5	47	8	59	15
	13	15	4	4	38	10	59	20
	11	7	4	7	31	9	46	26
	10	18	4	4	37	15	66	16

Chi-square = 82.46* df = 49 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 155

Raw Numbers from TABLE 51

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
	56	15	17	10
	178	44	75	36
	9	16	2	1
Teaching	26	23	0	4
Experience	91	23	35	8
	83	17	52	11
	57	21	57	6
	80	43	33	14

Chi-square = 118.21* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 156

Raw Numbers From TABLE 53

	Teaching Experience							
Part-time/	85	321	24	50	153	154	133	162
Full-time	13	12	4	3	4	9	8	8

Chi-square = 21.22* df = 7 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 157

Raw Numbers From TABLE 54

	Teaching Experience							
	0	5	6	8	4	2	0	13
Degree	10	30	7	11	12	10	4	26
Groups	65	215	14	28	100	85	86	92
	23	82	1	4	40	66	50	38

Chi-square = 139.48* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 158

Raw Numbers From TABLE 55

	Teaching Experience							
Those	15	52	4	16	28	22	22	36
Pursuing a	63	204	15	24	96	116	80	88
Higher Degree	20	77	9	13	33	25	39	46

Chi-square = 25.64* df = 14 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 159

Raw Numbers From TABLE 56

	Teaching Experience							
Community College	42	125	12	23	76	56	58	71
Student Experience	56	208	16	30	81	107	83	99

Chi-square = 8.45 df = 7

TABLE 160

Raw Numbers from TABLE 58

	States							
	33	14	7	13	57	25	82	36
Length	4	23	7	2	79	23	95	23
of	1	26	5	0	25	7	73	5
Service	0	6	0	0	1	4	22	2
	0	1	0	0	0	5	9	3

Chi-square = 126.72* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 161

Raw Numbers from TABLE 59

	States							
	34	27	8	14	88	37	130	42
Length	3	22	7	1	59	17	81	19
of	1	15	4	0	14	6	51	5
Service	0	5	0	0	1	1	13	1
	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	2

Chi-square = 66.82* df = 21 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 162

Raw Numbers from TABLE 60

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
	108	83	58	18
Length	114	58	58	26
of	63	46	46	10
Service	17	10	10	2
	9	7	7	0

Chi-square = 22.68* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 163

Raw Numbers from TABLE 61

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
	194	100	66	20
Length	81	49	54	25
of	26	19	43	9
Service	7	3	9	2
	3	2	7	0

Chi-square = 57.17* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 164

Raw Numbers from TABLE 62

	Length of Service				
Part-time/	243	250	141	34	16
Full-time	24	6	1	1	2

Chi-square = 20.96* df = 4 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 165

Raw Numbers from TABLE 63

	Length of Service				
Part-time/	353	205	95	20	11
Full-time	27	4	1	1	1

Chi-square = 11.67* df = 4 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 166

Raw Numbers from TABLE 64

	Degree Groups			
Length of Service	30	48	131	54
	12	40	161	43
	6	10	102	24
	1	5	19	10
	1	1	10	5

Chi-square = 33.12* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 167

Raw Numbers from TABLE 65

	Degree Groups			
	37	61	205	73
Length of Service	8	34	139	38
	5	6	67	18
	0	2	13	6
	0	1	9	1

Chi-square = 22.35* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 168

Raw Numbers from TABLE 66

	Length of Service				
Those	61	55	19	4	1
Pursuing a	115	138	98	29	15
Higher Degree	91	63	25	2	2

Chi-square = 45.44* df = 8 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 169

Raw Numbers from TABLE 67

	Length of Service				
Those	80	44	13	2	1
Pursuing a	182	116	69	18	10
Higher Degree	118	49	14	1	1

Chi-square = 32.50* df = 8 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 170

Raw Numbers from TABLE 68

	Length of Service				
Community College	116	114	52	13	8
Student Experience	151	142	90	22	10

Chi-square = 2.96 df = 4

TABLE 171

Raw Numbers from TABLE 69

	Length of Service				
Community College	165	88	39	6	2
Student Experience	215	121	57	15	7

Chi-square = 3.39 df = 4

TABLE 172

Raw Numbers from TABLE 71

	States							
Student	22	41	11	8	91	35	147	41
Teaching	16	29	8	7	71	29	134	28

Chi-square = 2.02 df = 7

TABLE 173

Raw Numbers from TABLE 72

	States							
Teaching	6	14	2	3	24	15	61	14
Internship	32	56	17	12	138	49	220	55

Chi-square = 5.14 df = 7

TABLE 174

Raw Numbers from TABLE 73

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
Student	199	66	97	34
Teaching	112	106	82	22

Chi-square = 30.16* df = 3 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 175

Raw Numbers from TABLE 74

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
Teaching	64	25	39	11
Internship	247	147	140	45

Chi-square = 3.54 df = 3

TABLE 176

Raw Numbers from TABLE 75

Part-time/Full-time		
Student	16	380
Teaching	18	304

Chi-square = .63 df = 1

TABLE 177

Raw Numbers from TABLE 76

Part-time/Full-time		
Teaching	8	131
Internship	26	553

Chi-square = .16 df = 1

TABLE 178

Raw Numbers from TABLE 77

Degree Groups				
Student	6	39	256	94
Teaching	44	45	167	42

Chi-square = 66.45* df = 3 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 179

Raw Numbers from TABLE 78

	Degree Groups			
Teaching	5	16	80	38
Internship	45	88	343	98

Chi-square = 10.26* df = 3 $p<.05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 180
Raw Numbers from TABLE 79

	Those Pursuing a Higher Degree		
Student	62	239	95
Teaching	78	156	88

Chi-square = 12.04* df = 2 $p<.05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 181

Raw Numbers from TABLE 80

	Those Pursuing a Higher Degree		
Teaching	22	76	41
Internship	118	319	142

Chi-square = 2.28 df = 2

TABLE 182

Raw Numbers from TABLE 81

Experience as a Community College Student		
Student	150	246
Teaching	153	169

Chi-square = 6.37* df = 1 $p<.05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 183

Raw Numbers from TABLE 82

Experience as a Community College Student		
Teaching	59	80
Internship	244	335

Chi-square = .0009 df = 1

TABLE 184

Raw Numbers from TABLE 84

	States							
	17	15	6	6	47	15	93	23
Number	11	25	6	5	56	23	88	18
of	7	22	4	3	37	17	60	16
Courses	3	5	1	1	14	8	25	6
	2	3	2	0	8	1	15	6

Chi-square = 18.46 df = 28

TABLE 185

Raw Numbers from TABLE 85

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
	68	65	76	11
Number	77	53	60	21
of	85	31	32	18
Courses	43	9	8	3
	28	3	3	3

Chi-square = 66.55* df = 12 $p<.05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 186

Raw Numbers from TABLE 86

	Number of Courses				
Part-time/	204	225	158	63	34
Full-time	16	7	8	0	3

Chi-square = 8.73 df = 4

TABLE 187

Raw Numbers from TABLE 87

	Degree Groups			
	21	47	48	31
Number	25	38	144	24
of	4	16	106	39
Courses	0	2	39	22
	0	1	16	20

Chi-square = 119.73* df = 12 $p<.05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 188

Raw Numbers from TABLE 88

	Number of Courses				
Those	42	44	36	13	5
Pursuing a	129	111	94	37	24
Higher Degree	49	77	36	13	8

Chi-square = 12.79 df = 8

TABLE 189

Raw Numbers from TABLE 89

	Number of Courses				
Community College	93	94	75	27	14
Student Experience	127	138	91	36	23

Chi-square = 1.17 df = 4

TABLE 190

Raw Numbers from TABLE 90

	States							
	21	52	13	10	98	32	163	36
Degree	13	16	5	4	54	28	90	26
of	2	1	0	1	4	2	19	4
Satisfaction	1	0	1	0	5	2	8	1
	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	2

Chi-square = 6.02 df = 7

TABLE 191

Raw Numbers from TABLE 92

	Administrator/Faculty Groups			
	214	94	93	34
Degree	92	63	63	18
of	11	9	11	2
Satisfaction	2	5	9	2
	2	1	3	0

Chi-square = 15.84* df = 6 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 192

Raw Numbers from TABLE 93

	Degree of Satisfaction				
Part-time/	412	223	28	15	6
Full-time	13	13	5	3	0

Chi-square = 13.89* df = 2 $p < .05$

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 193

Raw Numbers from TABLE 94

	Degree Groups			
	32	56	251	83
Degree	15	41	134	45
of	3	5	18	6
Satisfaction	0	1	16	1
	0	1	4	1

Chi-square = 4.19 df = 6

TABLE 194

Raw Numbers from TABLE 95

	Degree of Satisfaction				
Those	83	43	8	4	2
Pursuing a	235	130	19	8	3
Higher Degree	107	63	6	6	1

Chi-square = 1.32 df = 4

TABLE 195

Raw Numbers from TABLE 96

	Degree of Satisfaction				
Community College	185	87	19	8	4
Student Experience	240	149	14	10	2

Chi-square = 6.53* df = 2 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 196

Raw Numbers from TABLE 98

	State							
	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	0
	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	0
	2	1	0	1	8	2	19	3
	4	4	5	3	33	6	45	13
Choice	6	5	5	4	41	8	64	16
	24	56	15	10	121	47	203	49
of	1	8	2	0	4	2	12	3
	25	64	17	10	125	49	215	52
Employment	5	6	3	1	13	9	34	9
	4	15	0	1	16	7	38	11
	9	21	3	2	29	16	72	20
	3	2	1	2	11	3	8	5
	4	6	0	1	9	4	16	4
	7	8	1	3	20	7	24	9
	3	5	0	1	4	3	15	3
	2	2	0	0	15	4	8	5
	5	7	0	1	19	7	23	8

* First choice chi-square = 22.59 df = 28

TABLE 197

Raw Numbers from TABLE 99

	Administrator Faculty Groups			
	2	1	2	0
	5	0	0	0
	7	1	2	0
	0	0	0	0
	2	1	1	3
	2	1	1	3
	10	11	10	5
	49	27	30	6
Choice	59	38	40	11
	225	131	129	43
of	17	4	7	4
	242	135	136	47
Employment	25	18	29	8
	27	17	39	9
	52	35	68	17
	25	7	3	0
	30	4	7	3
	55	11	10	3
	24	4	6	0
	15	8	10	3
	39	12	16	3

First choice chi-square = 36.60* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 198

Raw Numbers from TABLE 100

	Choice of Employment						
	1	0	2	20	5	4	2
	0	0	1	0	5	1	4
Part-time/	1	0	3	20	10	5	6
Full-time	4	0	34	508	75	31	32
	5	5	111	32	87	43	32
	9	5	145	540	162	74	64

First choice chi-square = 5.18 df = 4

TABLE 199

Raw Numbers from TABLE 101

	Degree Groups			
	0	2	3	0
	0	2	3	0
	0	4	6	0
	0	0	0	0
	0	1	3	1
	0	1	3	1
	0	5	27	4
	11	14	70	18
Choice	11	19	97	22
	48	71	313	93
of	1	3	19	9
	49	74	332	102
Employment	0	11	45	23
	0	9	61	22
	0	20	106	45
	1	4	17	13
	2	5	26	11
	3	9	43	24
	1	11	18	3
	0	5	26	5
	1	16	44	8

First choice chi-square = 37.58* df = 12 $p < .05$
*significant at the .05 level

TABLE 200

Raw Numbers from TABLE 102

		Choice of Employment					
	1	0	10	100	14	4	11
	2	0	27	6	16	6	8
Those	3	0	37	106	30	10	19
Pursuing	4	0	21	290	40	22	18
	3	3	61	19	48	29	17
a Higher	7	3	82	309	88	51	35
Degree	0	0	5	138	26	9	5
	0	2	24	7	28	9	11
	0	2	29	145	54	18	16

First choice chi-square = 11.46 df = 8

TABLE 201

Raw Numbers from TABLE 103

		Choice of Employment					
	2	0	16	224	23	19	17
Community	1	0	47½	13	38	14	18
College	3	0	63	237	61	33	35
Student	3	0	20	300	57	16	17
Experience	4	5	65	19	54	30	18
	7	5	85	319	111	46	35

First choice chi-square = 9.02 df = 4

APPENDIX I

TABLES FROM PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION SECTION

The Tables in this APPENDIX are presented with the skill number in the left column and the ranking of that skill by a group in the other columns. The number for each of the Professional Preparation skills is shown below.

Skill Number	Skill
1	Advising and placement of academically disadvantaged students
2	Administrative structure and operation of the community college
3	Background and problems of community college students
4	Community college philosophy
5	Developing individualized programs of learning
6	Duties of a faculty member
7	Functions and roles of the community college
8	Group dynamics
9	History and role of the commnity college
10	How and where to get text books
11	How the community college is financed
12	How to assign grades
13	How to conduct applied research
14	How to conduct basic research
15	How to deal with students with emotional problems
16	How to deal with students with weak academic preparation
17	How to develop new courses
18	How to fit a curriculum to the needs of the community
19	How to help students choose a career or major field of study
20	How to interpret research and apply the findings in class
21	How to interpret and use the results of standardized tests
22	How to interpret the results of teacher made tests
23	How to use TV, video tape, and other equipment in the classroom
24	How to construct or develop tests
25	Learning theory and its application for adults
26	Motivating students
27	How to assess the educational needs of the community
28	Resources available in the community
29	Teaching to community college students
30	Teaching internship in the community college
31	Teaching techniques
32	Theories of learning and remembering
33	Time management
34	What to teach in a particular class
35	Where to find educational resources
36	Where to refer students with special problems
37	Writing learning objectives

The recommended training tables use the code from the questionnaire.

0= no training needed in this area

1= 1-4 hour in-service training

2= 1-2 day in-service training

3= 3-10 day in-service training

4= 1-3 credit college course

5= more than 3 college credits

More than one number for a skill indicates that the responses were a tie or near tie. The numbers are rank ordered where the results were a near tie.

TABLE 202

Percent of Respondents In Each State Who Have Received Training in Professional Skill Areas

Skill Number	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	42.9	54.4	29.4	41.7	40.0	42.0	38.9	33.3	40.3
2	32.1	50.9	70.6	50.0	60.8	60.0	55.6	61.4	56.4
3	42.9	45.6	64.7	58.3	51.5	48.0	41.0	49.1	46.3
4	42.9	50.9	82.4	66.7	66.2	72.0	60.7	64.9	62.2
5	71.4	59.6	70.6	58.3	64.6	72.0	54.1	43.9	58.9
6	42.9	57.9	52.9	58.3	59.2	52.0	44.4	59.6	51.6
7	42.9	52.6	76.5	41.7	62.3	62.0	56.8	64.9	58.5
8	42.9	54.4	58.8	66.7	55.0	50.0	47.2	42.1	49.9
9	42.9	38.6	58.8	50.0	49.2	50.0	47.4	47.4	47.4
10	28.6	30.4	29.4	25.0	33.1	28.0	23.1	33.3	27.9
11	39.3	50.9	75.0	50.0	58.5	50.0	44.9	50.9	50.2
12	50.0	57.9	70.6	41.7	55.4	62.0	41.5	45.6	49.6
13	39.3	54.4	58.8	58.3	41.9	38.0	49.1	63.2	48.5
14	46.4	63.2	70.6	66.7	48.5	60.0	57.3	75.4	58.1
15	32.1	57.9	47.1	50.0	36.2	50.0	40.6	42.1	42.2
16	57.1	57.9	64.7	33.3	58.8	48.0	42.3	35.1	47.4
17	57.1	57.9	58.8	58.3	62.3	64.0	53.0	49.1	56.6
18	53.6	40.4	64.7	33.3	51.5	42.0	45.3	43.9	46.5
19	39.3	66.7	52.9	41.7	45.4	50.0	40.6	38.6	45.1
20	42.9	45.6	58.8	50.0	42.3	32.0	42.7	50.9	43.4
21	53.6	78.9	64.7	67.7	56.6	56.0	52.6	59.6	57.7
22	57.1	70.2	70.6	50.0	50.0	62.0	46.2	52.6	52.6
23	67.9	77.2	70.6	66.7	68.5	66.0	66.7	68.4	68.4
24	60.7	75.4	82.4	66.7	66.2	70.0	61.1	64.3	65.4
25	53.6	59.6	58.8	50.0	59.2	52.0	52.6	50.9	54.7
26	57.1	64.9	70.6	25.0	66.2	56.0	58.5	63.2	60.7
27	42.9	38.6	58.8	33.3	40.3	38.0	35.0	49.1	39.2
28	50.0	38.6	64.7	41.7	46.9	36.0	39.7	47.4	42.9
29	28.6	42.1	41.2	16.7	42.3	48.0	35.0	36.8	38.1
30	17.9	8.8	11.8	7.7	10.8	20.0	13.7	15.8	13.3
31	75.0	86.0	88.2	66.7	72.3	70.0	72.2	73.7	74.0
32	64.3	68.4	70.6	50.0	60.0	62.0	54.7	61.4	59.3
33	28.6	54.4	41.2	16.7	56.9	50.0	41.3	47.4	46.2
34	32.1	47.4	29.4	8.3	40.8	42.0	33.5	42.1	37.3
35	53.6	59.6	47.1	41.7	51.5	42.0	50.0	61.4	52.1
36	35.7	68.4	70.6	33.3	46.9	54.0	42.7	45.6	47.7
37	71.4	75.4	82.4	33.3	72.3	78.0	66.7	63.2	69.4

TABLE 203

Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in Professional Skill Areas By Administrator/Faculty Groups

Skill Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
1	47.6	34.5	28.6	56.5	40.3
2	74.4	48.6	38.8	39.1	56.4
3	61.6	36.6	30.6	43.5	46.3
4	74.4	56.3	49.0	56.5	62.2
5	58.2	59.0	47.6	67.4	58.9
6	52.2	55.6	44.9	52.2	51.6
7	72.0	51.4	46.3	45.7	58.5
8	63.5	35.9	37.4	58.7	49.9
9	61.2	42.3	31.3	39.1	48.7
10	27.7	31.0	23.8	32.6	27.9
11	63.5	40.1	38.1	47.8	50.2
12	50.0	59.1	36.7	56.5	49.6
13	55.8	34.5	47.6	54.3	48.5
14	64.4	43.0	61.9	58.7	58.1
15	48.8	35.9	32.7	56.5	42.2
16	54.4	41.5	35.4	63.2	47.4
17	62.8	64.8	39.5	52.2	56.6
18	56.8	51.4	24.5	45.7	46.5
19	56.4	34.5	34.0	52.2	45.1
20	53.2	30.3	38.1	47.8	43.4
21	64.8	52.1	49.7	63.0	57.7
22	57.6	51.4	41.5	65.2	52.6
23	70.8	71.1	56.5	84.8	68.4
24	71.1	69.7	50.3	69.6	65.4
25	64.4	46.5	42.9	65.2	54.7
26	66.0	62.0	45.6	76.1	60.7
27	55.8	32.4	19.7	32.6	39.2
28	54.8	37.3	28.6	41.3	42.9
29	50.0	37.3	19.7	34.8	38.1
30	18.0	12.0	7.4	10.9	13.3
31	76.8	75.4	67.3	76.1	74.0
32	67.2	49.3	55.1	60.9	59.9
33	62.5	35.2	25.2	58.7	46.2
34	42.2	38.0	26.5	43.5	37.3
35	57.6	52.1	41.5	56.5	52.1
36	50.0	50.0	34.7	56.5	47.7
37	69.6	79.7	59.2	74.0	69.4

TABLE 204

Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in Professional Skill Areas By Part-time/Full-time

Skill Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	40.3	40.7	40.3
2	58.4	14.8	56.4
3	47.7	18.5	46.3
4	63.3	40.7	62.2
5	59.8	40.7	58.9
6	51.6	51.9	51.6
7	59.7	33.3	58.5
8	49.6	51.9	49.9
9	48.7	18.5	47.4
10	27.8	29.6	27.9
11	51.2	29.6	50.2
12	49.1	59.3	49.6
13	48.8	40.7	48.5
14	58.6	48.1	58.1
15	41.6	48.1	42.2
16	47.5	44.4	47.4
17	56.8	41.9	56.6
18	46.8	40.7	46.5
19	45.9	29.8	45.1
20	43.5	40.7	43.4
21	57.8	55.6	57.7
22	52.3	59.3	52.6
23	68.1	74.1	68.4
24	65.5	63.0	65.4
25	55.2	44.4	54.7
26	60.8	59.3	60.7
27	40.0	22.2	39.2
28	43.0	40.7	42.9
29	38.5	29.6	38.1
30	13.2	14.8	13.3
31	74.0	74.1	74.0
32	59.9	48.1	59.3
33	46.7	37.0	46.2
34	37.2	40.7	37.3
35	52.2	51.9	52.1
36	47.8	44.4	47.7
37	69.9	59.3	69.4

TABLE 205

Percent of Respondents Who Have Received Training in Professional Skill Areas By Degree Groups

Skill Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	37.8	39.1	40.4	43.1	40.3
2	43.2	50.6	53.9	73.4	56.4
3	35.1	39.1	45.0	60.6	46.3
4	54.1	57.5	62.2	68.8	62.2
5	67.6	57.5	58.0	58.7	58.9
6	59.4	50.6	52.1	46.8	51.6
7	59.4	54.0	55.6	70.6	58.5
8	24.3	39.1	51.0	64.2	49.9
9	45.9	49.4	43.6	59.6	47.4
10	40.5	31.0	25.0	29.4	27.9
11	45.9	46.5	49.3	56.0	50.2
12	64.9	55.2	45.8	50.5	50.5
13	10.8	29.9	48.6	75.2	48.5
14	18.9	31.0	61.3	81.7	58.1
15	24.3	39.1	44.4	44.0	42.2
16	40.5	48.3	48.1	45.9	47.4
17	81.1	57.5	53.6	56.9	56.6
18	51.4	49.4	42.4	55.0	46.5
19	37.8	32.2	48.1	47.7	45.1
20	16.2	26.4	43.6	66.1	43.4
21	40.5	48.3	58.0	70.6	57.7
22	54.1	48.3	51.9	57.8	52.6
23	81.1	65.5	59.1	63.3	68.4
24	73.0	62.1	62.4	74.3	65.4
25	21.6	50.6	55.0	68.8	54.7
26	54.1	65.5	59.9	60.6	60.7
27	21.6	31.0	37.9	56.0	39.2
28	29.7	37.9	42.4	52.3	42.9
29	35.1	33.3	36.1	48.6	38.1
30	2.7	11.5	12.0	22.7	13.3
31	78.4	71.3	73.6	75.2	74.0
32	35.1	51.7	60.5	69.7	59.3
33	37.8	48.3	44.6	52.3	46.2
34	32.4	36.8	37.1	38.5	37.3
35	35.1	46.0	55.3	51.4	52.1
36	48.6	47.1	49.9	39.4	47.7
37	67.6	70.1	69.6	67.9	69.4

TABLE 206

Recommended Training For Faculty In Each Professional Skill By State

Skill No.	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	1-4-2	1	1-2	1	1-2	1-3	1-2	1	1-2
2	1	1-0	1	1-2	1	1-4	1	1	1
3	2-1-4	1	2-1	2-4	1-2	1-2-4	1-2	1-2	1-2
4	1	1-0	2-1-4	1-4	1	1-4	1	1	1
5	4-5	4-3	3	3-2	3-4-5	4	2-4-5	4-2	4-3-5
6	1-2	1-2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7	1-4	1-0	1-3	2-1	1	1	1	1	1
8	4-2	2-4-0	1-4-0	1	2-0-1	1-3-2	0-2-4	0	0-2-1
9	1-0-4	0-1	1-2	1	1-0	1	1-0	1	1-0
10	1-0	1-0	1	1	1-0	1	1-0	1	1-0
11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1-0-2	1	1
12	1	2-1	1	1-0	1-2	1	1-0-2	1	1-2
13	4	4-2	0	4-2	0-4	4-1	0	0	0-4
14	4-0	4-1-2	0	0	0-4	4-1	0	0	0-4
15	3-4	4-2	4-1-0	1-4	1-2	4-3	1	2-1	1-2-4
16	4-2	2	4-1	3-2	2-1-3	2-3-4	2-1	2	2-3
17	5	3-4	4	3-2-4	2-4-3	4-3	4-2	2	4-2-3
18	3-4-5	3-1	2-1-4	2-3-4	2-3	2-3-4	3-2	2	3-2
19	4	1-2	1-4	2-3-4	2-1	2-3	1-2	2	2-1
20	4	4-3	1	2-4	0-1	4-2-3	0-1	1-4-2	0-4-1
21	4	4	4-0	1-2	1-0	2-4-3	1-0	1	1-4-2
22	4-2	4	3	4-2	1	4	1	1	1-2-4
23	4	2-4	2	1	4-1	4	1-2-3	2	2-4-1
24	4-3	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	4-2
25	4	4	4	4-2	4-1	4	4	4	4
26	4	2-4	2-4-0	3-2	2-4	4	4-2	1-4-3	4-2
27	2-1	3-0	3-4	2	2-1	2	0-1	2-1	2-1
28	2-1	1	1-3	2-1	2-1	2	1	1-2	1-2
29	4	4	4	2-1-3	4	4-2	4	2-1-4	4-2-3
30	4-5	5-4-0	5	0-4	0	2	0	5-4	0-5-4
31	4-5	5-4	4	4	4	4	5-4	4	4-5
32	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
33	2	1-2	1-2-0	0-1-2	1-2	1-3-2	1	3-4	1-2
34	2-0-4	2-0	0	0-2-1	0	2	0	2	0-2-1
35	1-4	1-2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1-2
36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1-2
37	4-1-3	4-1-2	2-3-1	2-1-3	2-1	3-4	1	2	1-2-4

More than one entry indicates the responses were a tie or near tie

TABLE 207

Recommended Training For Faculty in Each Professional Skill Area By Administrator/Faculty Groups

Skill Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
1	1-2a	1	1	1	1-2
2	1	1	1	1	1
3	2-1	1	1-2	1	1-2
4	1	1	1	1	1
5	4	4	2-3	2	4-3-5
6	1	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1
8	4	2	0-1	3-1-2	0-2-1
9	1	1	0-1	1	1-0
10	1	1	0-1	1	1-0
11	1	1	1	1	1
12	1	1	1	1	1-2
13	0	4-0	0	0-1-4	0-4
14	0	0-4	0	0-1-4	0-4
15	4-2-1	4-2	1	1-2	1-2-4
16	2	2-1	2-1	2	2-3
17	3-4	4	2	4	4-2-3
18	3-2	2-3	2-1	4	3-2
19	2-4	2-1	1-2	1-2	2-1
20	4	4-2-0	0-1	1-4-2	0-4-1
21	4	1-4-2	1	1	1-4-2
22	4-1	2-4-1	1	3-2-4	1-2-4
23	4-2-3	2-4	2-1	1-2-4	2-4-1
24	4	4	1-4-2	3-4	4-2
25	4	4	4	4	4
26	4	4-2	2	4-3	4-2
27	2	1	2-0-1	3	2-1
28	2	1	1	2-1	1-2
29	4	4-2	0-1	4	4-2-3
30	5-4-0	0	0	4-0	0-5-4
31	4	4	4	4-5	4-5
32	4	4	4	4	4
33	2-1	2	1-0	1	1-2
34	0-4-2	2-1-0	0	2-0	0-2-1
35	1	1	1	1	1-2
36	1	1	1	1	1-2
37	3-4	4	1	1-2-3	1-2-4

a More than one number indicates the answers were a tie or near tie.

TABLE 208

Recommended Training For Faculty in Each Professional Skill Area By Part-time/Full-time

Skill Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	1	1	1-2
2	1	1	1
3	1	1-2	1-2
4	1	1	1
5	4-3-5a	2	4-3-5
6	1	1	1
7	1	1	1
8	0-2-1	2	0-2-1
9	1	1	1-0
10	1	1	1-0
11	1	1	1
12	1	1	1-2
13	0	2-5	0-4
14	0	2-4-5	0-4
15	1-2	4	1-2-4
16	2	2	2-3
17	3-2-1	2	4-2-3
18	2-3	1-3	3-2
19	2	1	2-1
20	1	2-4	0-4-1
21	1	3-4	1-4-2
22	1-4-2	2	1-2-4
23	2-4	2	2-4-1
24	4	4-2	4-2
25	4	4	4
26	4	3-4-1	4-2
27	2	0-2-1	2-1
28	1	1	1-2
29	4	2	4-2-3
30	0	0-4	0-5-4
31	4	5	4-5
32	4	4	4
33	1-2	2-1-3	1-2
34	0	2-0	0-2-1
35	1	1	1-2
36	1	1	1-2
37	1-2	1-3-4	1-2-4

a More than one number indicates the answers were a tie or near tie.

TABLE 209

Recommended Training For Faculty in Each Professional Skill Area By Degree Groups

Skill Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialists	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	1-2a	1	1	1-2	1-2
2	1	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	2	1-2
4	1	1	1	4	1
5	3	4	4	4-3-5	4-3-5
6	1	1	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1
8	0	2	2-0-1	4-0	0-2-1
9	1	1	1	4-1-0	1-0
10	1	1	1	1	1-0
11	1	1	1	1	1
12	1-2	1	1	1	1-2
13	0	0	0	0	0-4
14	0	4-0	0	0	0-4
15	2	2	1-2	1	1-2-4
16	2-1	2	2	4	2-3
17	4-3-2	4	3	2-4	4-2-3
18	3	3	2	3-4-5	3-2
19	2	4-1-2	2	4	2-1
20	2	4	1-2	4	0-4-1
21	2	4	1	4	1-4-2
22	2	4-2	1	4	1-2-4
23	3-2	4-2	2	4-3	2-4-1
24	4-2	4	4	4	4-2
25	4	4	4	4	4
26	4	4-2	2-4	4	4-2
27	3	1-3-2	2	2-1	2-1
28	2	2-1	1	2-1	1-2
29	3	4	4	4	4-2-3
30	0	0	0	5	0-5-4
31	3-5-4	4	4	4	4-5
32	4-2	4	4	4	4
33	3-2	2-1	1-2	1	1-2
34	3-2	0-2	0	0	0-2-1
35	1	1	1	1	1-2
36	1	1	1	1	1-2
37	4-2-3	4	1	2-3	1-2-4

a More than one number indicates the answers were a tie or near tie.

APPENDIX J

TABLES FROM DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS SECTION

The Tables in this APPENDIX are presented with the item or qualification number from the Desired Qualification section of the questionnaire in the left column and the choice of or ranking by a group in the other columns. The number for each item is shown below.

Item Number	Description
1	Professional or trade certification
2	Bachelors
3	Masters
4	Specialist
5	Doctorate
6	Teacher certification
7	Elementary (includes junior high)
8	Secondary
9	Trade school or college
10	Vocational-Technical institute
11	Two-year college
12	Four-year college
13	Internship
14	Non-academic teaching
15	One year of subject field related work
16	Over one year of subject field related work
17	Write books or journal articles
18	Conduct applied research
19	Belong to professional organizations

The number for each qualification is shown below.

Qualification Number	Description
1	Degree in subject field with no work experience
2	Degree in subject field with work experience
3	Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with no work experience
4	Degree in subject field plus professional education courses with work experience
5	Degree in education with no work experience
6	Degree in education with work experience
7	Degree in subject field with professional or trade certification with no work experience
8	Degree in subject field with professional or trade certification with work experience
9	No degree with professional or trade certification with no work experience
10	No degree with professional or trade certification with work experience
11	No degree and no professional or trade certification with lengthy work experience

The items in the recommended qualification tables use the code from the questionnaire.

M= the faculty member must have this qualification completed prior to being employed

D= it would be desirable that the faculty member have this qualification completed prior to being employed

N= it is not necessary that a faculty member have this qualification

A= a faculty member should have this qualification, but can complete it after being employed

U= it is undesirable that a faculty member have this qualification

More than one entry for an item number indicates that the responses were a tie or near tie. The entries are rank ordered where the results were a near tie.

TABLE 210

Recommended Qualifications For Faculty By State

Terminal - Vocational

Item No	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Degree									
1	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
2	M-D	M	D-M-N	D-M	D	D	D	D	D
3	N	D-N	N	N	N	N	N	N-D	N
4	N-D	N-D	N	D-N-A	N	N	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
6	D	N-M	M-D-N	N-M	N	D-M-N	N	N	N
Teaching Experience									
7	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
8	D-N	N	D-N	N	N	N	N	N	N
9	D	D	D-N	D	D	D-N	D	D	D
10	D	D-N	N-D	D	D	D	D	D	D
11	D	N-D	D-N	D	D	N-D	D	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
13	D	D-N	N-D	D	D	D-N	D-N	D	D
14	D	N	N	M	N-D	D-N	N	D	N-D
Non-Teaching Experience									
15	M	M-D	D	M	M	M	M	M	M
16	D	M-D	D	D	M	M	M	M	M
Professional									
17	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D	M-N-D	D	D	D-M	D-N	D-N	D

TABLE 21Q (continued)

Terminal - Academic

Item No	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Degree									
1	M	M	N-M	M-D-N	M	M	N-M	M	M
2	M	M	M	M-D	D	M	M	M	M
3	D	M	M	D	M	D-N	M	M	M
4	N-D	N	N	D	N	N-D	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
6	D-M	N	D-N-M	N-M	N-D	M	N	N	N
Teaching Experience									
7	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
8	D	N	N	N	N	N-D	N	N-D	N
9	D	N	N	D	D-N	N-D	N	D-N	N
10	N-D	N	N	D-N-M	N	N-D	N	N	N
11	D	N-D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
12	D-N	N	N	N	N	N-M	N	N	N
13	D	D-N	N-D	D	D	D-N-M	N-D	D-N	D
14	D	N	N	M	N	N	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience									
15	D	D	N-D	M	M-D	M	D	D	D
16	D	D-N	N-D	D	D	M-D	D	D	D
Professional									
17	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D	M-N-D	D-A	D	D	D	D	D

TABLE 210 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Item No	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Degree									
1	M	M	M	D-M	M	M	M	M	M
2	M-D	M	M	M	D	D-M	M	M	M
3	N	D	M	D-N	D-M-N	N-D	N	M-D	D-N
4	N-D	N	N	D	N	N-D	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
6	D	N	M-D-N	N-M	N	M-D-N	N	N	N
Teaching Experience									
7	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
8	N-D	N	N-D	N	N	N	N	D-N	N
9	D	D	D-N	D	D	N-D	D	D	D
10	D	D-N	N	D	D	D-N	D	D	D
11	D	N-D	D	D	D	D-N	D	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
13	D	N-D	N-D	D	D	D	D-N	D	D
14	D	N	N	M	N-D	N-D	N	N-D	N
Non-Teaching Experience									
15	M	D-M	D-M	M-D	M	M	M	M-D	M
16	D	D-M	D	D-M	M	M	M	D-M	M
Professional									
17	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N-D	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D	M-N-D	D	D	D	D-N	D	D

TABLE 210 (continued)

Transfer - Academic

Item No	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
Degree									
1	M	M	N	N-M-D	M-N	M	N	N	N-M
2	M	M	M	M	D	M	M	M	M
3	M-D	M	M	M-D	M	D-M	M	M	M
4	N-D	N	N	D	N	D	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
6	M-D	N	D-N-M	N-M	N	M	N	N	N
Teaching Experience									
7	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
8	D	N	D-N	N-D	N	N	N	N-D	N
9	D	N	N	D-N-M	N	N-D	N	D-N	N
10	N-D	N	N	N	N	N-D	N	N	N
11	D	D-N	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
12	N-D	N	N	N-D	N	N-M	N-D	N-D	N
13	D	D-N	N-D	D	D	D	D-N	D	D
14	D-N	N	N	N-M	N	N-D	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience									
15	D	D	N	D-M	D	M-D	D	D	D
16	D	D-N	N	D	D	M-D	D	D	D
Professional									
17	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N-D	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D	M-N-D	D	D	D	D	D	D

More than one entry indicates the responses were a tie or near tie

TABLE 211

Recommended Qualifications For Faculty
By Administrator/Faculty Groups

Item Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
		Terminal - Vocational			
Degree					
1	M	M	M	M	M
2	D	D	M-D	D	D
3	N	N	N	N	N
4	N	N-D	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	N	N-M	N	D	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	N	N
9	D	D	D	D	D
10	D	D	D	D	D
11	D	N-D	D-N	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N
13	D-N	N	D	D	D
14	N-D	N-D	D-N	N-D	N-D
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	M	M	M	M	M
16	M	M	M-D	D	M
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D-M	D	D	D

TABLE 211 (continued)

Terminal - Academic

Item Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
Degree					
1	M-N	N	N-M	M	M
2	M	M	M	M	M
3	M	D-M	M	M	M
4	N	N	N	D-N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	N	M-D	N	D	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	D	N
9	N-D	N	N	D	N
10	N	N	N	N	N
11	D	D-N	D	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N
13	D	D-N	N-D	D	D
14	N	N	N	N-D	N
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	D	M	D	D	D
16	D	D	D	D	D
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D	D	D	D

TABLE 211 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Item Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
Degree					
1	M	M	M	M	M
2	M	M	M	M	M
3	D	D-N	D-N	M	D-N
4	N	D-N	N	D-N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	N	M-N-D	N	D	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	N	N
9	D	D	D	D	D
10	D	D	D	D	D
11	D	D-N	D	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N
13	D	D-N	D-N	D	D
14	N	N-D	N-D	D-N	N
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	M	M	M	D-M	M
16	M	M	M-D	D	M
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D	D	D	D

TABLE 211 (continued)

Transfer - Academic

Item Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
Degree					
1	N	M-N	N	M	N-M
2	M	M	M	M	M
3	M	M-D	M	M	M
4	N	D-N	N	N-D	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	N	M	N	M-D	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	D	N
9	N-D	N-D	N	D-N	N
10	N	N	N	N	N
11	D	D	D	D	D
12	N	N	N-D	N	N
13	D	D-N	D-N	D	D
14	N	N	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	D	M-D	D	D	D
16	D	D	D	D	D
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N
19	D	D-M	D	D	D

More than one entry indicates the answers were a tie or near tie

TABLE 212

Recommended Qualifications For Faculty
By Part-time/Full-time

Terminal - Vocational

Item Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
Degree			
1	M	M	M
2	D	D	D
3	N	N	N
4	N	D-N	N
5	N	N	N
6	N	N	N
Teaching Experience			
7	N	N	N
8	N	N	N
9	D	D	D
10	D	D	D
11	D	D-N	D
12	N	N	N
13	D-N	D	D
14	N-D	D	N-D
Non-Teaching Experience			
15	M	M	M
16	M	M-D	M
Professional			
17	N	N	N
18	N	N	N
19	D	D	D

TABLE 212 (continued)

Terminal - Academic

Item Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
Degree			
1	M-N	M	M
2	M	M	M
3	M	M-D	M
4	N	N	N
5	N	N	N
6	N	M-N	N
Teaching Experience			
7	N	N	N
8	N	N	N
9	N-D	N	N
10	N	N	N
11	D	D	D
12	N	D	N
13	D-N	D	D
14	N	N-D	N
Non-Teaching Experience			
15	D	D	D
16	D	D	D
Professional			
17	N	N	N
18	N	N	N
19	D	D	D

TABLE 212 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational			
Item Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
Degree			
1	M	M	M
2	M	D-M	M
3	D	N	D-N
4	N	D	N
5	N	N	N
6	N	N	N
Teaching Experience			
7	N	N	N
8	N	N	N
9	D	D	D
10	D	D	D
11	D	D	D
12	N	N	N
13	D	D	D
14	N	D	N
Non-Teaching Experience			
15	M	M	M
16	M	M-D	M
Professional			
17	N	N	N
18	N	N	N
19	D	D	D

TABLE 212 (continued)

Transfer - Academic

Item Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
Degree			
1	N-M	M	N-M
2	M	M	M
3	M	M-D	M
4	N	N-D-M	N
5	N	N	N
6	N	M-N	N
Teaching Experience			
7	N	N	N
8	N	N-D	N
9	N	N	N
10	N	N	N
11	D	D-N	D
12	N	D	N
13	D	D	D
14	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience			
15	D	D	D
16	D	D	D
Professional			
17	N	N	N
18	N	N	N
19	D	D	D

More than one entry indicates the answers were a tie or near tie

TABLE 213

Recommended Qualifications For Faculty
By Degree Groups

Terminal - Vocational

Item Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Degree					
1	M	M	M	M	M
2	N	M-D	D	D	D
3	N	N	N	N	N
4	N	N	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	M	N	N	N	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	N	N
9	D	D	D	D	D
10	D	D	D	D	D
11	N	D-N	D	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N
13	N	D	D-N	D	D
14	N-D	D	N-D	N	N-D
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	M	M	M	M	M
16	M	M	M-D	M	M
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N	N	N	N	N
19	M-D-N	D	D	D	D

TABLE 213 (continued)

Item Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
		Terminal - Academic			
Degree					
1	M	M	M	N	M
2	M	M	M	M	M
3	M-D-N	D	M	M	M
4	N	N	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	M	M-D-N	N	N	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	N	N
9	D-N	N-D	N	N	N
10	N	N	N	N	N
11	M	D	D	D	D
12	N-M-D	N	N	N	N
13	M	D-N	D-N	D	D
14	D-N	N-D	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	M	M	D	D	D
16	M-D	D	D	D	D
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N-D	N	N	N	N
19	D-M	D-N	D	D	D

TABLE 213 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Item Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Degree					
1	M	M	M	M	M
2	N	M	M	M	M
3	N	N	N	M-D	D-N
4	N-D-M	N	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	D-M	N-M-D	N	N	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	N	N
9	D	D	D	D	D
10	M-D	D	D	D	D
11	D-N	D-N	D	D	D
12	N	N	N	N	N
13	M-D	D	D-N	D	D
14	N-D	D	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	M	M	M-D	M-D	M
16	M	M	M-D	M	M
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N-D	N	N	N	N
19	D-M	D-N	D	D	D

TABLE 213 (continued)

Transfer - Academic

Item Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
Degree					
1	M	M-N	M-N	N	N-M
2	M	M	M	M	M
3	D-M	D	M	M	M
4	N-M-D	N	N	N	N
5	N	N	N	N	N
6	M	M-D-N	N	N	N
Teaching Experience					
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	N	N	N	N
9	D-N	N	N	N	N
10	M-N	N	N	N	N
11	M-D	N	D	D	D
12	M	N-D	N	N-D	N
13	M	D-N	D	D	D
14	D-N	N	N	N	N
Non-Teaching Experience					
15	M	M	D	D	D
16	M	D	D	D	D
Professional					
17	N	N	N	N	N
18	N-D	N	N	N	N
19	D-M	N-D	D	D	D

More than one entry indicates the answers were a tie or near tie

TABLE 214

Ranking of Desired Qualifications
For Faculty Members By State

Terminal - Vocational

Qualification Number	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	9	8	9	8	9	9	9	9	9
2	3	2.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	6	6	5	6	6	7	7	5	6
4	2	2.5	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
5	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
6	8	5	8	9	7	4	6	8	7
7	4	4	6	5	5	5	5	4	5
8	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
10	5	7	4	4	4	6	4	6	4
11	7	9	7	7	8	8	8	7	8

Terminal - Academic

Qualification Number	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	7	6	7	6	7	6	6	6	7
2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	3
3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	9	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9
6	6	5	6	7	6	7	7	7	6
7	5	7	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
8	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2
9	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
10	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8
11	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

TABLE 214 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Qualification Number	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	9	7	9	8	9	9	9	8	9
2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
3	5	4	6	7	5	7	6	5	6
4	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
5	11	11	11	10	11	10	11	11	11
6	7	6	7	5	6	4	7	7	7
7	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	4
8	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
9	10	10	10	11	10	11	10	10	10
10	6	8	4	6	7	6	4	6	5
11	8	9	8	9	8	8	8	9	8

Transfer-Academic

Qualification Number	AK	ID	MT	NV	OR	UT	WA	WY	Total Sample
1	7	6	7	6	7	7	6	5	6
2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2
3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	4
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	9	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9
6	6	5	6	7	6	6	7	7	7
7	5	7	5	4	5	5	5	6	5
8	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3
9	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
10	8	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8
11	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10

TABLE 215

Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By Administrator/Faculty Groups

Terminal - Vocational

Qualification Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
1	9	9	9	8	9
2	3	3	3	3	3
3	7	7	5	5	6
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	11	11	11	10	11
6	6	5	7	6	7
7	5	6	4	4	5
8	1	1	1	1	1
9	10	10	10	11	10
10	4	4	6	7	4
11	8	8	8	9	8

Terminal - Academic

Qualification Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Faculty/ Transfer Faculty	Total Sample
1	7	7	6	7	7
2	3	2	3	3	3
3	4	4	4	4	4
4	1	1	1	1	1
5	9	9	10	9	9
6	6	5	7	6	6
7	5	6	5	5	5
8	2	3	2	2	2
9	11	11	11	11	11
10	8	8	8	8	8
11	10	10	9	10	10

TABLE 215 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Qualification Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Transfer	Faculty/ Faculty	Total Sample
1	9	9	7	8		9
2	3	3	3	3		3
3	7	6	5	4		6
4	2	1	2	2		2
5	11	11	11	10		11
6	6	7	8	6		7
7	4	5	4	5		4
8	1	2	1	1		1
9	10	10	10	11		10
10	5	4	6	7		5
11	8	8	9	9		8

Transfer - Academic

Qualification Number	Administrator	Terminal Faculty	Transfer Faculty	Terminal Transfer	Faculty/ Faculty	Total Sample
1	7	7	6	7		6
2	2	2	2	3		2
3	4	4	4	4		4
4	1	1	1	1		1
5	8	9	9	8		9
6	6	6	7	6		7
7	5	5	5	5		5
8	3	3	3	2		3
9	11	11	11	11		11
10	9	8	8	9		8
11	10	10	10	10		10

TABLE 216

Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By Part-time/Full-time

Terminal - Vocational

Qualification Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	9	9	9
2	3	3	3
3	6	8	6
4	2	2	2
5	11	11	11
6	7	7	7
7	5	4	5
8	1	1	1
9	10	10	10
10	4	5	4
11	8	6	8

Terminal - Academic

Qualification Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	7	7	7
2	2	3	3
3	4	5.5	4
4	3	1	1
5	9	8	9
6	6	5.5	6
7	5	4	5
8	1	2	2
9	11	11	11
10	8	9	8
11	10	10	10

TABLE 216 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Qualification Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	9	8	9
2	3	3	3
3	5	9	6
4	2	2	2
5	11	11	11
6	7	7	7
7	4	4	4
8	1	1	1
9	10	10	10
10	6	5	5
11	8	6	8

Transfer - Academic

Qualification Number	Full-time	Part-time	Total Sample
1	6	7	6
2	2	3	2
3	4	6	4
4	1	1	1
5	9	9	9
6	7	5	7
7	5	4	5
8	3	2	3
9	11	11	11
10	8	8	8
11	10	10	10

TABLE 217

Ranking of Desired Qualifications For Faculty Members By Degree Groups

Terminal - Vocational

Qualification Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	9	9	9	9	9
2	4	3	3	3	3
3	8	8	6	6	6
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	11	11	11	11	11
6	6	5	7	7	7
7	7	6	5	4	5
8	1	1	1	1	1
9	10	10	10	10	10
10	3	4	4	5	4
11	5	7	8	8	8

Terminal - Academic

Qualification Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	8	7	9	6	7
2	3	2	3	2	3
3	4.5	4	4	4	4
4	1	1	1	1	1
5	9	10	9	9	9
6	6	5	6	7	6
7	4.5	6	5	5	5
8	2	3	2	3	2
9	11	11	11	11	11
10	7	8	8	8	8
11	10	9	10	10	10

TABLE 217 (continued)

Transfer - Vocational

Qualification Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	9	9	9	8	9
2	4	3	3	3	3
3	6	7	5	5	6
4	2	2	2	2	2
5	10	10	11	11	11
6	5	5.5	7	6	7
7	8	5.5	4	4	4
8	1	1	1	1	1
9	11	11	10	10	10
10	3	4	6	7	5
11	7	8	8	9	8

Transfer - Academic

Qualification Number	Less than Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters and Specialist	Doctorate	Total Sample
1	8	7	6	6	6
2	3	3	2	2	2
3	4	4	4	4	4
4	1	1	1	1	1
5	9	10	9	8	9
6	6	5	7	7	7
7	5	6	5	5	5
8	2	2	3	3	3
9	11	11	11	10	11
10	7	8	8	9	8
11	10	9	10	11	10

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Study of the State University and Community College System of Tennessee, 1972-80. Tennessee Board of Regents, Nashville, ERIC Document ED 116 716, June 17, 1975.

Abel, Emil K. Invisible and Indispensable: Part-Time Teachers in California Community Colleges. Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, California, ERIC Document ED 132 984, 1976.

About the Faculty: A Brief Highlighting Important Literature Since 1971 on Faculty Characteristics, Attitudes, Satisfaction, Preparation, Evaluation, and Collective Bargaining. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 125 702, May, 1976.

Agee, Janice L. "They Didn't Prepare Me For This!" Community and Junior College Journal, 46: 16-18, August, 1975.

Alexander, Carter, and Arvid J. Burke. How to Locate Educational Information and Data. 4th ed. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

Allen, Hollis P. "Training Teachers for the New Curriculum," California Journal of Secondary Education, 16: 164-166, March, 1941.

Alpren, Morton. "A Survey of Courses and Programs for the Preparation of College Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, 13: 273-278, September, 1962.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Personal correspondence between Mary Ann Castillo, Staff Assistant, and the writer. March 2, 1978.

American Association of Junior Colleges. An Introduction to American Junior Colleges. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

American Association of Junior Colleges. Guidelines for Improving Articulation Between Junior and Senior Colleges. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1957.

American Association of Junior Colleges. Preparing Two-Year College Teachers For The 70's. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

American Association of Junior Colleges. To Work In A Junior College. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.

American College Testing Program. The Two-Year College and It's Students: An Emperical Report. American College Testing Program, Inc., Iowa City, Iowa, ERIC Document ED 035 404, 1969.

American Council on Education. Wanted: 30,000 Instructors for Community Colleges. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1949.

Anderson, B. Robert. "Adjunct Faculty Deserve a Better Deal," Change, 7: 8, 64, September, 1975.

Anderson, Duane D. "E.P.D.A. at the University of Iowa," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 19, October, 1972.

Anderson, Duane D. Guidelines for the Preparation of Community/Junior College Teachers. National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, ERIC Document ED 031 205, August, 1968.

Anderson, E. F., and C. E. Thornblod. Report of Selected Data and Characteristics, Illinois Public Junior Colleges, 1968-69. Illinois Report No. 19, Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Junior College Board, 1969.

Archer, Jerome W. Research and Development of English Programs in the Junior College, Proceedings of the Tempe Conference, 1965. Arizona State University, ERIC Document ED 002 976, 1965.

Archer, Jerome W., and Wilfred A. Ferrell. Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College. Bloomington, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Ary, Donald, Lucy C. Jacobs, and Asghar Razavieh. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Astin, Alexander W., and Calvin B. T. Lee. "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers," Educational Record, 47: 361-375, Summer, 1966.

Ayers, Jerry B., and Jack L. Brimm. "Students' Attitudes Toward Education Courses," College Student Journal, 9: 172-178. April-May, 1975.

Bagley, William C. "A Unique Teaching Problem?" Junior College Journal, 8: 448-450, May, 1938.

Bashaw, W. L. "The Effect of Community Junior Colleges on the Proportion of the Population Who Seek Higher Education," Journal of Educational Research, 58: 326-329, March, 1965.

Bates, Kenneth O. "The Potential of Retired Military Personnel as a Source of Junior College Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, 1963.

Beazley, R. "Number and Characteristics of Employees in Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1966," Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education, 1969.

Beckes, Issac K. "The Case for Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 34: 24-28, April, 1964.

Bender, Louis W., and James O. Hammons. "Adjunct Faculty: Forgotten and Neglected," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 20-22, September, 1972.

Berdie, Douglas B., and others. "Improving the Effectiveness of Teaching Assistants--Undergraduates Speak Out," Improving College and University Teaching, 24: 169-171, Summer, 1976.

Best, John W., Research in Education. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Besvinick, S. L., and T. W. Fryer, Jr. "Miami Begins the Diplomate in College Teaching," Junior College Journal, 39: 48-56, February, 1969.

Bhattacharyya, Gouri K. and Richard A. Johnson. Statistical Concepts and Methods. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Birkholz, John R. A Faculty Internship Program for William Rainey Harper College. ERIC Document ED 035 407, August, 1969.

Birkholz, John R. "Teacher Preparation for the Community College," Balance Sheet, 52: 54-55, 69, October, 1970.

Birnbaum, Robert. "Background and Evaluation of Faculty in New York," Junior College Journal, 37: 34-37, November, 1966.

Bishop, Clifford L. "The Purposes of Teacher Internship," Educational Administration and Supervision, 34: 35-43, January, 1948.

Blake, Larry J. "A Catalyst for Staff Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 12-13 October, 1972.

Blake, Wainwright D. "A PLAN for Selecting and Training Junior College Teachers," Nation's Schools, 34: 44, October, 1944.

Blake, Wainwright D. "The Problems and Training of the Junior College Instructor." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Missouri, Columbia, 1943.

Blocker, Clyde E. "Are Our Faculty Competent?" Junior College Journal, 36: 12-17, December 1965-January, 1966.

Blocker, Clyde E. "Comprehensive Community College," NEA Journal, 51: 20-21, September, 1962.

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Bogue, Jesse P., ed. American Junior Colleges. 4th ed. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1956.

Bogue, Jesse P. "The Community College," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 34: 285-295, June, 1948.

Bogue, Jesse P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Borg, Walter R., and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, 1971.

Bornheimer, Deane G., Gerald P. Burns, and Glenn S. Dumke. The Faculty in Higher Education. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1973.

Bossone, Richard M. The Training and Work of California Public Junior College Teachers of English. University of California, Riverside, ERIC Document ED 011 189, 1964.

Bown, Oliver H., and William L. Rutherford. Towards Functional Preservice Teacher Education Centers: Human Interaction Programs. University of Texas at Austin, written for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, ERIC Document ED 133 297, February, 1976.

Boyer, Ernest L. "Neither Transfer Nor Terminal: The Next Step For Two-Year Colleges," Intellect, 101: 110-112, November, 1972.

Bradley, Burke W. "Junior College Provisions for Adult Education." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Missouri, 1942.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Anthropology Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 975, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Art Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 979, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Foreign Language Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 973, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Liberal Arts/Drama Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 976, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Literature Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 978, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Music Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 974, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Philosophy Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 972, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. A Profile of Religious Studies Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 126 977, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. Characteristics of Social Science Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 119 759, February, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. Characteristics of Two-Year College Political Scientists. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 119 760, February, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. Community College Teacher Preparation: Past, Present, Future. Paper presented at the American Association for Higher Education Conference, Chicago, Illinois, March 13, 1973, ERIC Document ED 071 661, March, 1973.

Brawer, Florence B. "Community Colleges: Selecting and Training New Teachers," Change, 5: 56-57, 63, October, 1973.

Brawer, Florence B. Humanities Instructors in Today's Two-Year Colleges. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 138 313, April, 19, 1977.

Brawer, Florence B. Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, ERIC Document ED 026 048, 1968.

Brawer, Florence B. Satisfaction and Humanities Instructors in Two-Year Colleges. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 128 048, October, 1976.

Brawer, Florence B. The Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: The Faculty In Review. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 111 469, 1975.

Brawer, Florence B. Three Colleges: Three Facilities. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 091 034, June, 1974.

Brawer, Florence B. Who Teaches History in the Two-Year College? ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 119 761, February, 1976.

Brazziel, William F., Jr. "Organizing for Full-Time Student Teaching," Journal of Teacher Education, 12: 232-234, June, 1961.

Brick, Michael. Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.

Broudy, Harry S. "The Role of the Foundational Studies in the Preparation of Teachers," in Improving Teacher Education in the United States, ed. Stanley Elam. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1967.

Brown, David G. The Instructor Exchange: Staffing Junior Colleges. Raleigh: North Carolina State University, Center for Research, Development and Training in Occupational Education, 1966.

Brown, David G. The Market Place for College Teachers. Chapel Hills: University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Brown, Donald V. "Post-Secondary Teachers of Technology: A Study of Educational Professional Preparation," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 13: 45-50, Winter, 1976.

Brown, James L. Backgrounds and Characteristics of New Full-Time Community College Faculty Members. ERIC Document ED 112 991, 1974.

Brown, James L. "The Employment of New Full-Time Community College Faculty Members," Clearinghouse, 49: 356-357, April, 1976.

Brown, Ric. The Relationships Between Student Evaluation of Teaching, Student Achievement, and Student Perception of Teacher Effectiveness. California State University, Fresno, ERIC Document ED 133 314, January, 1977.

Brubacker, John S., and Willis Rudy. Higher Education in Transition. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Brunner, Ken A., and Clarence B. Lindquist. "Recent Faculty and Instructional Practices in Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, 30: 327-339, February, 1960.

Buechel, J. F. Marvin. "Desirable Background for Community College Teachers," Junior College Journal, 19: 117-118, November, 1948.

Bushnell, David S. Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Butcher, Stephen. "Who Shall Prepare JUCO (Junior College) Teachers?" The Journal of Business Education, 42: 186-188, February, 1967.

Butt, William G. "Criteria for Staffing the Small College," Community College Review, 3: 50-54, September, 1975.

Buxton, Warren F. "Relationships Between Faculty Preparation and the Courses They Teach in a Selected Community College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972.

Byrd, Richard E. "A Study of the Faculty of the Community Colleges of Tennessee." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Memphis State University, 1969.

Campbell, David N. "School of Education: Friend or Foe?" Educational Leadership, 32: 401-404, March, 1975.

Campbell, William G., and Stephen V. Ballou. Form and Style: Thesis, Reports, Term Papers. 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Carter, Fletcher F. "Selected Aspects of Pre-Service Preparation and Prior Experience of High and Low Merit-Rated Junior College Teachers in Florida." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Florida State University, 1965.

Cartter, Allan M. "A New Look at the Supply of College Teachers," Educational Record, 46: 267-277, Summer, 1965.

Cash, Charles K. "A Comparison of the Educational Preparation of Natural Science Teachers in Selected Community Colleges in Texas with an Optimum Preparation Program as Suggested by the Same Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, East Texas State University, 1973.

Cashin, Harold J., Jr. "Programs for Professional Preparation of Instructors for California Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern Californa, 1968.

Cashin, Harold J., Jr. "Some Attitudes Toward Instructor Preparation," Community and Junior College Journal, 39: 31-34, March, 1969.

Chambers, Thomas A. Academic Instruction at Community Colleges: A Program for Teacher Preparation. Riverside City College, Riverside, California, ERIC Document ED 128 345, 1976.

Chapman, Charles E. "Resharpening the Tools of Instruction," Junior College Journal, 37: 34-37, October, 1966.

Charles, Searle F., and Kenneth H. Summerer. "Building a Junior College Faculty," Junior College Journal, 29: 421-423, March, 1959.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Chickering, Arther W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Christensen, Frank A. "Staff Development: Perceptions of Faculty and Administrators at Selected Community Colleges in Illinois." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Nova University, ERIC Document ED 130 706, 1975.

Christian, Floyd T., and James L. Wattenbarger. "Ten Years--A Plan Evolves in Florida," Junior College Journal, 38: 44-48, September, 1967.

Christopher, Johnny L. "Certain Aspects of the Teacher's Role in Wyoming Junior Colleges with Implications for Program Planning and Improvements." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1966.

Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Clark, Mildred L. "An Exploratory Study of Graduate Assistantships and An Assessment of the Value of These Assistantships for Beginning College Teaching." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Columbia University, 1963.

Cloud, A. J. "Selecting Junior-College Instructors," California Journal of Secondary Education, 22: 280-282, May, 1947.

Cochran, William G. Sampling Techniques. 2d ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Developing Specialists in Learning," Junior College Journal, 37: 21-23, September, 1966.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Community Colleges: Educating Teachers for New Times," Change, 8: 54-55, September, 1976.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Credentials for Junior College Teachers?" Improving College and University Teaching, 17: 97-100, Spring, 1969.

Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Teacher Preparation: Rationale and Practice," Junior College Journal, 37: 21-25, May, 1967.

Cohen, Arthur M. The Humanities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey of the Faculty. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 115 314, 1975.

Cohen, Arthur M. "Toward A Professional Faculty," New Directions For Community Colleges, 1: 101-117, Spring, 1973.

Cohen, Arthur M. Work Satisfaction Among Junior College Faculty Members. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 081 426, November, 1973.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Associates. A Constant Variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer. An Analysis of Humanities Education in Two-Year Colleges: Phase II--The Faculty 1975-1976. Center for the Study of Community Colleges, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 121 358, March, 1976.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer. Focus on Learning--Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College. University of California, Los Angeles, Junior College Leadership Program, ERIC Document ED 019 939, March, 1968.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer. "Focus on Today's Humanities Instructors," Community College Review, 4: 51-57, Spring, 1977.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer. Measuring Faculty Performance. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brawer. "The Humanities Faculty: A Review," New Directions for Community Colleges, 3: 79-94, Winter, 1975.

Cohen, Arthur M., John Lombardi, and Florence B. Brawer. College Responses To Community Demands. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cohen, Arthur M., and others. Developing Specialists in Learning. University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 017 269, 1967.

Cohen, Edward. Faculty for Teaching-Learning: Proposed New Graduate Centers for the Systematic Preparation of Community College Teachers. ERIC Document ED 038 133, February, 1970.

Cohen, Wallace F. "Some Perspectives on Staff Development: Knowing the Student and the College," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 17-18, October, 1972.

Colvert, C. C. "In-Service Training Programs," Junior College Journal, 20: 435-436, April, 1950.

Colvert, C. C. "Professional Development of Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal, 25: 474-478, April, 1955.

Colvert, C. C. "The Ideal Junior College Teacher," Junior College Journal, 22: 502-507, May, 1952.

Colvert, C. C., and M. L. Baker. Salaries of Junior College Teachers and Administrators in the Junior Colleges of the United States for 1954-55. Austin: American Association of Junior Colleges, Research Office, 1954.

Colvert, C. C., and M. L. Litton. Junior College Teachers Salaries. Austin: American Association of Junior Colleges, Research Office, 1953.

Community and Junior College Instruction: Texas, 1975-76. The Fifth Annual Report to the Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators by the Research Committee. Texas Association of Junior College Instructional Administrators, ERIC Document ED 125 696, June 14, 1976.

Conley, William H. "The Junior College Instructor," Junior College Journal, 9: 507-512, May, 1939.

Cooke, Harry L., and Allan S. Hurlburt. "Part-Time Faculty Needs Full-Time Support," Community College Review, 4: 15-18, Summer, 1976.

Cooper, Jack H. "University Field Services Provided to Community Colleges," Community College Review, 3: 50-54, June, 1975.

Cooper, John F. The Morale and Teaching Effectiveness of Junior College Teachers. Arizona Western College, Yuma, AZ, ERIC Document ED 134 266, 1977.

Creager, John O. "The Junior College in American Education," Junior College Journal, 3: 426-434, May, 1933.

Croy, John E. "How Do You Feel About In-Service Programs?" Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 28-29 November, 1973.

Dawson, J. Dudley. A Study to Determine the Feasibility of Establishing a Masters College Program for the Preparation of Community College Teachers. Antioch College, Yellow Springs, OH, ERIC Document ED 060 813, March, 1971.

Dean, David H. "A Comparative Study of Graduates of the Michigan State University College of Education Mott Institute For Community Improvement Level IV Program and the Regular Teacher Preparation Program." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Dennis, Lawrence J. "Theory Versus Practice in Teacher Preparation," Contemporary Education, 47: 88-91, Winter, 1976.

Deyo, Donald E. "Three Cliches," Junior College Journal, 34: 6-7, September, 1963.

Diekhoff, John S. Democracy's College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Dobrovolny, Jerry S. "Preparation of Junior College Teachers of Technical Subjects," Junior College Journal, 35: 9-13, December, 1974.

Dolan, Francis H. "The Preparation of Junior College Teachers," Junior College Journal, 22: 329-336, February, 1952.

Dollahan, June R. "A Study of the Preparation of Teachers of College English in Selected Public Junior and Four-Year Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962.

Donnelly, Charles P. "The Preparation, Functions and Certification of Public Junior College Teachers in Michigan." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1961.

Donovan, Timothy P. "Problems of the Instructor in the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 22: 494-497, May, 1952.

Drake, Sandra L., ed. 1976 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.

Drake, Sandra L., ed. 1978 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.

Drummond, William H. "Does PBTE Mean Reform?" Educational Leadership, 31: 291-293, January, 1974.

Ducanis, Alex J. "Principal or President," Junior College Journal, 32: 183-188, December, 1961.

Dyer, Prudence. "Teacher Internship Programs in NCA Institutions," North Central Association Quarterly, 43: 229-233, Fall, 1968.

Eaton, John M. "A Study of Orientation of New Faculty Members in Michigan Community Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1964.

Ebel, Robert L., ed. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. London: MacMillian, 1969.

Eckert, Ruth E. "A New Design for the Training of College Teachers," Junior College Journal, 18: 25-33 September, 1947.

Eckert, Ruth E., and John E. Stecklein. "Career Motivations and Satisfactions of Junior College Teachers," Junior College Journal, 30: 83-89, October, 1959.

"Education for Government Careers," School and Society, 99: 328-329, October, 1971.

Eells, Walter C. "Abolition of the Early Division: Early History," Junior College Journal, 6: 193-195, January, 1936.

Eells, Walter C. College Teachers and College Teaching. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1962.

Eells, Walter C. "Preparation of Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal, 7: 55-56, November, 1936.

Eells, Walter C. Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

Eells, Walter C. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.

Ehmann, Gerhard E. "Some Criteria for the Training in General Education of the Junior College Level in California." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1951.

Elwood, William F., Jr. The Development of a Curriculum for a Community College Teaching Workshop for Adjunct Faculty. Seminole Community College, Sanford, Florida, ERIC Document ED 129 395, October, 1976.

Engel, Robert E. The Professional Training of Community College Teachers. ERIC Document ED 075 347.

Engelhart, Max D. Methods of Educational Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. "About the Faculty." University of California, Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, May, 1976. (Mimeographed.)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. "Community College Teacher Preparation." A brief prepared for Glassboro State College, Glassboro, New Jersey: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, December, 1976. (Mimeographed.)

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. "Part-Time Instructors in the Community College." University of California, Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1977. (Mimeographed.)

Erickson, Glenn R., and Daniel S. Sheenhan. An Evaluation of a Teaching Improvement Process for University Faculty. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 19-23, 1976. ERIC Document ED 131 111, 1976.

Establishing Junior Colleges. Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 014 283, January, 1964.

Eurich, Alvin C. "Staffing Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, 33: 8-12 March, 1963.

Evans, Arthur H. "Faculty Agreement with the Community College Philosophy as Related to Previous Education and Experience in the Junior College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkley, 1970.

Ewing, William F. "The Present Status of California Public Junior Colleges," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 1: 47-50, October, 1925.

"Facts About Missouri's Public Junior Colleges," School and Community, 53: 22-27 April, 1967.

Falk, Charles F. A Study of the In-Service Education and Supervision Needs of Community College Business Instructors in the State of Illinois. Northern Illinois University, ERIC Document ED 130-710, April 10, 1975.

Fantini, Marion D., and Gerald Weinstein. The Disadvantaged: Challenge To Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Farris, Theodore N. "The Academic Marketplace Revisited: A Study of Faculty Mobility in Publicly Supported Two-Year Colleges in the Greater New York Metropolitan Region." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 1968.

Fellows, David B. "An Evaluation Plan for Part-Time Faculty in Community/Junior Colleges," Unpublished EdD dissertation, Nova University, 1975.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Fields, Ralph R., and Arthur H. Pike. "Community College Problems," Teachers College Record, 51: 528-536, May, 1950.

Fitzgerald, James S., Jr. "Faculty Views of the California Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern California, 1964.

Fleming, James R. "The Pre-Service Preparation of Junior College Vocal Music Teachers." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1971.

Fordyce, Joseph W. "A Significant Role in Teacher Education," Junior College Journal, 36: 13-17, April, 1966.

Frankel, Joanne. Junior College Faculty Job Satisfaction. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 081 425, October, 1973.

Fretwell, E. K., Jr. "Issues Facing Community Colleges Today," Todays Education, 57: 46-48, October, 1968.

Fretwell, E. K., Jr. "New York: The Next Five Years," Junior College Journal, 33: 22-25, March, 1963.

Fricke, Leslie R. "A Study of the Perceptions of Three Groups Regarding the Preparation of Community College Psychology Teachers in Florida and Texas." Unpublished EdD dissertation, East Texas State University, 1974.

Gaddy, Dale. "Faculty Recruitment," Junior College Research Review, 4: 1-3, September, 1969.

Garrison, Lloyd A. "Preparation of Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal, 12: 135-141, November, 1941.

Garrison, Lloyd A. "Preparation of Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal, 12: 204-209, December, 1941.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty--Issues and Problems, A Preliminary National Appraisal. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 012 177, 1967.

Garrison, Roger H. Professional Teacher or Dedicated Amateur?" School and Society, 93: 390-392, October 30, 1965.

Garrison, Roger H. "Teaching as Counseling," Junior College Journal, 34: 12-15, October, 1963.

Garrison, Roger H. Teaching in a Junior College. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Garrison, Roger H. "The Teacher in the Two-Year College," Improving College and University Teaching, 8: 138-140, Autumn, 1960.

Garrison, Roger H. "The Teacher's Professional Situation," Junior College Journal, 37: 15-18, March, 1967.

Gernhart, Jack C., Jaqueline F. Gernhart, and Evangeline A. Barry, eds. 1974 Community and Junior College Directory. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

Gilbert, Arthur N. "Teacher Preparation: An Intern Program for College Teachers," School and Society, 95: 417-420, November 11, 1967.

Gilbert, Marion L. A Study of Community College Teacher-Training Programs in Selected Universities. Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, ERIC Document ED 104 491, 1971.

Giles, Louise. "Planning Community College Resource Centers," American Libraries, 2: 51-54, January, 1971.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., ed. American Junior Colleges. 7th ed. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1966.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "A Meeting of Unusual Importance: The Forty-Third Annual Convention," Junior College Journal, 33: 4-5, February 1963.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Concerns and Cautions for Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 38: 18-21, March, 1968.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Faculty Development Project," Junior College Journal, 38: 7, April, 1968.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Preparation of Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal, 35: 3-4, September, 1964.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Preparation of Junior College Teachers," Educational Record, 48: 147-152, Spring, 1967.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Preservice Training of Instructors," Junior College Journal, 39: 7-9, May, 1969.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. This is the Community College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Golemon, R. B. Deans of Instruction and Faculty Development in Four Small Rural Junior Colleges in Texas. ERIC Document ED 133 037, 1976.

Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Good, Wallace E., Carl Heinrich, and Dwight Wicher. Faculty Profile: Kansas Community Junior Colleges. Kansas State Teachers College, ERIC Document ED 023 392, 1968.

Goodrich, Andrew L. "The Now Faculty and the New Student," Junior College Journal, 41: 26-29, May, 1971.

Gordon, Drusilla D. G. "The Influence of Early Teaching Experience on the Attitudes of Junior College Students Toward Teaching as a Career." Unpublished EdD dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1974.

Gordon, Shirley B., and Raymond P. Whitefield. "A Formula for Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal, 37: 26-28, May, 1967.

Gordon, Ted. "Realistic Training for Junior College Service," California Journal of Secondary Education, 24: 480-482, December, 1949.

Gray, Charles E. A Case Study: New Doctor of Arts Program, Illinois State University. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 133 261, November, 1976.

Gray, William S., ed. The Preparation and In-Service Training of College Teachers. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Green, Charles B. "The Problems of the Beginning Junior College Instructor." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1961.

Greenshields, Myrel J., Frank B. Linsay, and William H. Crawford. "Junior College Teachers as Guidance Workers," Junior College Journal, 29: 366-373, March, 1959.

Grymes, Robert J., Jr. A Survey and Analysis of Part-Time Instructors at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College. J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, VA, ERIC Document ED 125 687, May, 1976.

Guichard, Gus, and others. Part-Time Employment. California Community Colleges, Sacramento, ERIC Document ED 111 464, April, 1975.

Gunderson, Orley D. "A Factor Analysis of Professional Education Competencies of Community College Instructors of Trade and Industrial Educators." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Oregon State University, 1971.

Hager, Don J. "Images of Junior College Education," Junior College Journal, 32: 305-313, February, 1962.

Haggerty, M.E. "Faculty Qualifications for Junior Colleges," The North Central Association Quarterly, 3: 305-309, December, 1928.

Hale, Guy J. "Selected Background Factors of Technical Mathematics Teachers in Public Junior and Community Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.

Hamlin, Norman E. "Preferences of Junior College Administrators Toward High School Teaching Experience," Junior College Journal, 21: 236-239, December, 1950.

Hammons, James O., and Sharon Jaggard. "An Assessment of Staff Development Needs," Community and Junior College Journal, 47: 20-21, November, 1976.

Hammons, James O., and Terry H. S. Wallace. An Assessment of Community College Staff Development Needs in the Northeastern United States. Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Center for the Study of Higher Education, ERIC Document ED 128 058, May, 1976.

Handleman, Chester. "Opinions of Selected Faculty Members on Curriculum and Instruction at Five South Florida Community Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Nova University, ERIC Document ED 112 956, 1975.

Hanzeli, Victor E. "Internship for Teaching Assistants," Improving College and University Teaching, 16: 110-112, Spring, 1968.

Harrell, Robert A. "An Analysis of Instructional Costs in a Comprehensive Community College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Arizona State University, 1971.

Harsha, Wayne. "Preparation of Teachers for the Two-Year College," College Student Journal, 12: 180-187, Summer, 1978.

Harsha, R. Wayne, and Patty Boyle. "A Comparative Study of the Financial Situation of Six Montana Colleges/Universities." Paper presented to Governance and Finance in Higher Education class at Montana State University, Spring, 1977.

Havighurst, R. J. American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1960.

Hawk, Ray. "A Profile of Junior College Presidents," Junior College Journal, 30: 340-346, February, 1960.

Hawkins, T. G. "The Junior College Teacher--Some Unique Characteristics," Junior College Journal, 25: 298-302, January, 1955.

Henderson, Leon N. "Acceptance of Community College Concept," Junior College Journal, 25: 471-473, April, 1955.

Henderson, Leon N. "An Internship in Junior College Teaching," Junior College Journal, 27: 388-395, March, 1957.

Henry, Marvin A. "The Intern Idea in Teacher Preparation," Contemporary Education, 40: 33-38, October, 1968.

Herge, Henry C. The College Teacher. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

Higgins, Sadie G., and Alice J. Thurston. "Challenges in Student Personnel Work," Junior College Journal, 34: 24-28, November, 1963.

Hill, Malcolm D. "The Relationship Between Socialization Experience, Reference Group Identity and Attitudes of Community College Faculty." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1975.

Hills, E. C. "Relation of the Junior College to the Upper Division of the University," California Quarterly of Secondary Education, 2: 102, January, 1927.

Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. New York: Harper, 1958.

Hisert, Gerald H. "Preparation of New York State Community College Teachers as Perceived by Administrators and Faculty Members." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Florida State University, 1972.

Hollis, Ernest V. "Preparation of Teachers for Terminal Curricula," Junior College Journal, 11: 555-557, May, 1941.

Houpt, William S. "Supply, Demand, and Qualification Factors Related to Teaching Personnel for California's Colleges and Universities," Journal of Educational Research, 51: 373-377, January, 1958.

Houpt, William S. "Supply, Demand, and Qualification Factors Related to Teaching Personnel for California's Colleges and Universities." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern California, 1958.

Howe, Richard, D. "Selected Teacher Preparation Programs," Junior College Research Review, 2: 1-3, May, 1968.

Huff, Roland, James Kinneavy, and Charles R. Kline, Jr. Training English Teachers for Texas Community Colleges. University of Texas, Austin, ERIC Document ED 092 209, 1974.

Hurlburt, Allan S. "The Preparation and Characteristics of Junior College Teachers," Junior College Research Review, 2: 1-2, February, 1968.

Ingalls, Roscoe. "Problems of Staffing the Community College," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 194: 393-401, April, 1953.

Ivey, Nathan A. "The Part-Time Instructor and Effective Teaching," Junior College Journal, 31: 40-43, September, 1960.

Jantzen, J. Marc, and Ermerson, G. Cobb. "A Teaching Doctorate Degree for Junior College Instructors," Junior College Journal, 29: 213-214, December, 1958.

Jarvie, L. L. "Making Teaching More Effective," The Public Junior College, ed. N. B. Henry, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Jarvis, D. C. "An Instructional Grid," Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 26-27, April, 1974.

Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.

Jensen, Mary E. The Preparation of Faculty for the Implementation of Innovations in Curriculum and Instruction: Guidelines for Orientation and In-Service Education Programs. University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 031 221, March, 1969.

Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. New Directions for Instruction in the Junior College. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, 1965.

Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. The Experimental Junior College. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, 1968.

Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. The Improvement of Junior College Instruction. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, 1970.

Johnson, B. Lamar. General Education in Action. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1952.

Johnson, B. Lamar. Islands of Innovation. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, 1964.

Johnson, B. Lamar, and Fredrick C. Kintzer. "How Internships Work," Junior College Journal, 33: 17-19, May, 1963.

Johnson, Glenn R., and others. Enhancing College Teaching. Texas A&M University, ERIC Document ED 118 044, 1975.

Johnson, Rita B., and Stuart R. Johnson. "A Strategy for Inservice Instructional Development," New Directions for Community Colleges, 19: 83-89, Autumn, 1977.

Johnson, Robert L. "The Doctor of Arts Degree as Academic Preparation for Community Junior College Faculty." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1977.

Joiner, Barbara. Qualifications and Responsibilities for Nursing Laboratory Instructors in Associate of Arts Degree Programs. Johnson County Community College, Overland Park, Kansas, ERIC Document ED 126 963, April, 1976.

Judge, Harry. "How Are We To Get Better Teachers?" Higher Education Review, 8: 3-16, Autumn, 1975.

Justice, Patricia K. A Comprehensive Plan for Institutional Staff Development. Mount Hood Community College, Gresham, Oregon, ERIC Document ED 126 983, June 10, 1976.

Justice, Patricia K. Staff Development in the Community College--The Contributions Which a Speech-Communications Instructor Can Make. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communications Association, San Francisco, ERIC Document ED 130 355, November, 1976.

Kaplan, M. Stephen. The College Teacher Shortage. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

Keehan, Virginia R. "Some Perspectives on Staff Development: Orienting Staff to College Goals," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 16, October, 1972.

Kelley, Win, and Leslie Wilbur. Teaching in the Community-Junior College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Kelly, M. Frances. Professional Development Project for Two-Year College Vocational and Technical Faculty. State University of New York, Buffalo, ERIC Document ED 029 133, 1968.

Kelly, M. Frances, and John Connolly. Orientation for Faculty in Junior Colleges. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 043 323, June, 1970.

Kennedy, Gerald. "Preparation, Orientation, Utilization and Acceptance of Part-Time Instructors," Junior College Journal, 37: 14-15, April, 1967.

Kidd, Rex C. "The Improvement of the Pre-service Education of Undergraduate College Teachers." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Florida, 1952.

Kintzer, Fredrick C. Middleman In Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Kintzer, Fredrick C., Arthur M. Jensen, and John S. Hansen. The Multi-Institutional Junior College District. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Klapper, Paul. "The Professional Preparation of the College Teachers," Journal of General Education, 3: 228-244, July, 1949.

Knoell, Dorothy M., and Leland Medsker. From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1965.

Knoll, Edwin. "The Maturing of the Junior College," NEA Journal, 50: 27-29, February, 1961.

Knudson, Marvin. "The Junior College in the Decade Ahead," Junior College Journal, 30: 307-309, February, 1960.

Koile, Earl A., and Diane W. Tatem. "The Student Oriented Teacher," Junior College Journal, 36: 24-26, February, 1966.

Koos, Leonard V. "Current Conceptions of the Special Purposes of the Junior College," School Review, 29: 520-529, September, 1921.

Koos, Leonard V. "Is the Junior College Secondary or Higher Education," Junior College Journal, 18: 113-114, November, 1947.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Courses in 1920-21. I.," School Review, 29: 586-592, October, 1921.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Courses in 1920-21. II.," School Review, 29: 668-673, November, 1921.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Teachers: Backgrounds of Experience," Junior College Journal, 18: 457-469, April, 1948.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Teachers' Cooperations," Junior College Journal, 19: 399-411, March, 1949.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Teachers: Degrees and Graduate Residence," Junior College Journal, 18: 77-89, October, 1947.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Teachers: Preparation in Education," Junior College Journal, 18: 332-344, February, 1948.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior-College Teachers: Subjects Taught and Specialized Preparation," Junior College Journal, 18: 196-209, December, 1947.

Koos, Leonard V. "Preparation for Community-College Teaching," Journal of Higher Education, 21: 309-317, June, 1950.

Koos, Leonard V. "Programs of Junior College Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal, 19: 333-346, February, 1949.

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College. 2 vols. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1924.

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College Movement. New York: Ginn, 1925.

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College Movement. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970.

Koren, Charles. "A Program for the Preparation of Teachers of Mathematics in Community Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

Kossack, Sharon, and Nancy Smith. "College Teachers of Preservice Education: Practice What You Preach!" Kappa Delta Pi Record, 12: 101-102, April, 1976.

Kovack, Robert V. "A Study of Michigan Community College Administrator's Attitudes Regarding the Desired Formal Qualifications of Community College Faculty Members." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

Kovack, Robert V. "Which Degrees for Faculty?" Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 30-31, November, 1973.

Kovak, Charles R. "The Perceptions of Selected Community College Staff Towards In-Service Staff Development Programs in Illinois Community Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1974.

Kraft, Charles H. and Constance Van Eeden. A Nonparametric Introduction to Statistics. New York: Macmillian Co., 1968.

Kuhlman, John M. "The Dilemma of the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 37: 68-70, March, 1967.

Kuhns, Eileen P. "Part-Time Faculty," Junior College Journal, 33: 8-12, January, 1963.

Kumpf, Patrick C. "An Analysis of the Needs of Community College Teacher Preparation." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1974.

Kurth, Edwin L., and Eric R. Mills. Analysis of Degree of Faculty Satisfaction in Florida Community Junior Colleges. Washington, DC: United States Office of Education, 1968.

Laffin, Charles W., Jr. "Preparation of Mathematics Teachers for Public Two-Year Colleges in New York State: A Study of Selected Factors in the Educational Programs of Public Two-Year Colleges in New York State that Relate to the Pre-Service Preparation of Mathematics Teachers for These Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, New York University, 1959.

Langsdorf, Williams B. "The Preparation of the Academic Teacher--Problems of Depth and Breadth." Junior College Journal, 29: 24-28, September, 1958.

Larson, Carol A. "California Plans to Simplify Certification Structure," Journal of Teacher Education, 8: 420-421, December, 1957.

Larson, Gary. "Profiling New Faculty in California," Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 12-13, November, 1973.

Leet, Frank. "A Study of the Preparation of Missouri Junior College Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1968.

Levy, Leonard. "The Preparation of Community College Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, 1957.

Levy, Leonard. "The Significance of Similarities and Differences Between Community College Teaching Groups," Junior College Journal, 28: 444-451, April, 1958.

Lewis, Nan C. M. "Comparison and Analysis of Opinions of Junior College Business Department Chairmen and Teacher Education Specialists Regarding Junior College Secretarial Administration Teacher Preparation." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Houston, 1973.

Lewis, Phillip V. "Conflicting Viewpoints on Selected Issues in Business Teacher Education, 1960-1969." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Houston, 1970.

Lichty, E. A. "Development of a Broad Comprehensive Curriculum," Junior College Journal, 25: 468-470, April, 1955.

Ligon, Delma L. "A Study of the Pre-Service Preparation for Instructors in Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1950.

Lindahl, Donald G. "Commonalities in the Professional Education Competencies of Selected Community College Vocational Instructors." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Oregon State University, 1971.

Lipp, Louie, Jr. "The Community College: Good Source of Employee Training," Harvard Business Review, 52: 12-14, July-August, 1974.

Lipscomb, William P., Jr. "An Analysis of Faculty Attitudes in Relation to the Stated Role of Mississippi Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1965.

Litton, Maurice L. "A Study of Selected Aspects of the Pre-Service Preparation of Two Groups of Junior College Teachers." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1953.

Litton, Maurice L., and James T. Rogers. "Retired Military Personnel: A Source of Additional Instructors," Junior College Journal, 35: 17-18, May, 1965.

Lombardi, John. Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 115 316, December, 1975.

Loomis, William G. "A Study of the Formal Preparation of Academic Teachers in Community Colleges With Proposals for Oregon." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Oregon State University, 1964.

Losak, John G., and Rubye Beal. "Survey of Psychology in the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 40: 62-72, March, 1970.

Louk, Earnest L. "An Analysis of the Opinions of Instructors and Supervisory Personnel Regarding Certain Instructional Problems in Community Colleges in the State of Washington." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Washington State University, 1966.

Lynes, Russell. "The Teacher is an Iceberg," Junior College Journal, 36: 8-12, April, 1966.

Magnagna, Richard. "The Community College: Source of Liberally Educated Citizenry," The Journal of General Education, 25: 199-207, October, 1973.

Maloney, Clark M. Attitudes of Missouri Public Junior College Faculty Toward the Objectives of the Comprehensive Junior College. ERIC Document ED 031 247, 1969.

Marston, Fredrick J. "Problems of Articulation Between the Junior College and the University." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Missouri, 1942.

Martorana, S. V., and others, eds. Graduate Education and Community Colleges: Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development. National Board on Graduate Education, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 111 479, August, 1975.

Mattila, Austin J. "Teacher Load in California Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Stanford University, 1958.

Maul, Ray C. "Can We Get Enough Good Teachers?" Junior College Journal, 34: 3-7, December, 1963.

Maul, Ray C. "The Biggest Problem: Finding Good Teachers," Junior College Journal, 36: 5-8, December, 1965.

McCall, Harlan R. "Problems of New Faculty Members in North Central Association Colleges and Universities of Less Than 3,000 Enrollment." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1961.

McCarbery, Richard J. "The Relationship of Selected Factors to Ratings of Community College Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.

McClendon, LeRoy. "A Study of the Pre-Service Preparation for Instructors in Terminal Courses in Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1949.

McClure, M. L., and others. A New Program for the Preparation of Junior College Faculty. Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, OK, ERIC Document ED 061 183, 1970.

McCuen, John T. "An Intern Reacts," Junior College Journal, 35: 25-26, April, 1965.

McCutcheon, Roger P. "The Master's Degree and the Teacher Requirements." School and Society, 74: 177-181, September 22, 1951.

McDonald, Ralph W., ed. Current Trends in Higher Education, 1949. Official Group Reports of the Fourth Annual Conference on Higher Education. Washington, DC: National Education Association of the United States, 1949.

McDowell, F. M. The Junior College. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1919.

McGrath, Earl J. "Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 22: 305-306, February, 1952.

McInnis, Noel F. "Students Are A Lot Like People," Junior College Journal, 38: 40-44, March, 1968.

Mead, J. F. "The Effective Junior College Instructor," Junior College Journal, 11: 245-249, January, 1941.

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Medsker, Leland L. "The Two-Year College," Teachers College Record, 63: 40-52, October, 1961.

Medsker, Leland L., and Dale Tillery. Breaking the Access Barriers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Melvin, Keith L. "Instructional Practices Used in Selected Public Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, 27: 402-405, March, 1957.

Melvin, Keith L. "Instructional Practices Used in Selected Public Junior Colleges," Unpublished EdD dissertation, The University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1957.

Menefee, Selden. "Two-Year College: In Step With Today," American Education, 9: 22-26, December, 1973.

Merson, Thomas B. "Certification Standards for Junior College Teachers in California." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkley, 1953.

Merson, Thomas B. "The Preparation and Selection of Instructors for Community Colleges," California Journal of Secondary Education, 31: 496-501, December, 1956.

Miller, J. C. "Improving Instruction to the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 2: 205-208, January, 1932.

Mills, Richard O. "An Assessment of Selected Community College Teacher Preparation Programs as Perceived by Program Directors and the Deans of Instruction of the Community or Junior Colleges They Serve." Unpublished EdD dissertation, East Texas State University, 1973.

Moe, Jackie. "A Staff Development Model for Part-Time Instructors," New Directions for Community Colleges, 19: 35-46, Autumn, 1977.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Montgomery, Douglas M. "An Analysis of Faculty Acceptance of and Commitment to the Stated Mission of the Florida Community Junior College." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Florida State University, 1962.

Moodie, Clara L. The Community College "Is" Where the Action is! Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, ERIC Document ED 068 937, 1972.

Moore, Hastings. "Faculty Replenishment," Improving College and University Teaching, 15: 225-228, Autumn, 1967.

Moore, William, Jr. Against The Odds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Morgan, Don A. Perspectives of the Community College Presidency. Junior College Leadership Program, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 038 955, March, 1970.

Morgan, Roy E. "Report of the Committee on Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal, 17: 29-33, September, 1946.

Morrison, James L. "The Relationship of Socialization Experience, Role Orientation, and The Acceptance of the Comprehensive Community College Concept by Junior College Faculty." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The Florida State University, 1969.

Morrison, James L., and Charles P. Friedman. Community College Faculty Attitudes, Socialization Experiences, and Perceived Teaching Effectiveness. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, ERIC Document ED 129 390, 1976.

Morse, H. T. "Improving Instruction in the College Classroom," Junior College Journal, 25: 513-523, May, 1955.

Mushlitz, M. E. "Academic Preparation of Junior-College Personnel," California Journal of Secondary Education, 22: 492-495, December, 1947.

National Education Association. Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1963-64, and 1964-65. Research Report 1965-R4, Higher Education Series, Washington, DC: National Education Association, April, 1965.

National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Guidelines for the Preparation of Community/Junior College Teachers. National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 031 205, August, 1968.

National Science Foundation. Junior College Teachers of Science, Engineering, and Technology, 1967: Experience and Employment. National Science Foundation, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 028 768, October, 1968.

Nelson, Jeffrey B. "Two-Year College Teachers in the Making." American Education, 8: 21-24, March, 1972.

Newburn, H. K. "The Board Meets the President," Junior College Journal, 35: 14-17, November, 1964.

Newport, Donald I., Stephen J. Maier, and Thomas M. Shay. "A Focused Projection of Staffing Needs," Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 16-18, November, 1973.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Handbook on Accreditation. Boulder, CO: North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, September, 1977.

North Central Association of Colleges and Schools: Personal correspondence between Thurston E. Manning, Director of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, and the writer. February 24, 1978.

Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges. Personal correspondence between James F. Bemis, Executive Director, and the writer, March 8, 1978.

Norton, Fay-Tyler M. "Two-Year College Instruction: Opportunities for Psychology," American Psychologist, 27: 445-450, May, 1972.

Novak, Charles R., and Barbara K. Barnes. "Florida and Illinois: Views on Staff Development," New Directions for Community Colleges, 19: 11-18, Autumn, 1977.

Nunis, Doyce B., Jr., and Richard M. Bossone. "The Junior College's Search for an Educational Identity," Junior College Journal, 33: 121-124, November, 1962.

O'Banion, Terry. "Staff Development: Priorities for the Seventies," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 10-11, October, 1972.

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow. Tuscon, AZ: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

O'Banion, Terry. "Teachers for Tomorrow: One Year Later," Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 10-11, November, 1973.

O'Connell, Thomas E. Community Colleges: A President's View. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

Ogilvie, William K., and Max R. Raines, eds. Perspectives on the Community-Junior College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Ohm, Kenneth R. "An Analytical Study of the Preparation of Community College Physics Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1972.

"Open the Doors," Newsweek, 76: 77, July 6, 1970.

Ostlie, Selmer. "The Selection and Retention of Junior College Teachers." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Southern California, 1951.

Park, Young. Junior College Faculty: Their Values and Perceptions. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 050 725, June, 1971.

Park, Young. "Teacher Preparation Programs and the Junior College," Junior College Research Review, 5: 1-3, January, 1971.

Park, Young. The Practitioner Views Institutional Research. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, University of California, 1962.

Parsons, Robert. Statistical Analysis: A Decision-Making Approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Pass, George B. "Implications of the Role of the Junior College Teacher for Programs of Pre-Service and In-Service Education." Unpublished EdD dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1968.

Pearce, Frank C. Basic Education Teachers--Seven Needed Qualities. Modesto Junior College, CA, ERIC Document ED 0190 677, September, 1966.

Pelham, Peter D. "Some Perspectives on Staff Development: Training on a Junior College Campus," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 18, October, 1972.

Peterson, Basil H., and others. Critical Problems and Needs of California Junior Colleges. California Junior College Association, ERIC Document ED 011 449, June, 1965.

Phair, Tom S. A Profile of New Faculty in California Community Colleges. ERIC Document ED 026 059, 1968.

Phair, Tom S. "California Colleges Look at Their New Faculty," Junior College Journal, 39: 48-50, December, 1968/January, 1969.

Phair, Tom S. "Changing Characteristics of Newly Employed Faculty in California Community Colleges as Perceived by Deans of Instruction." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1975.

Phair, Tom S. Full-Time Faculty and Staff Hired by One-Hundred Public California Community Colleges for the Academic Year 1975-1976. California Educational Placement Association, ERIC Document ED 118 182, February 12, 1976.

Phair, Tom S. Staffing Patterns in Public California Community Colleges, a 1976-1977 Overview. California Community and Junior College Association, Sacramento, ERIC Document ED 135 433, February 38, 1977.

Potter, Earl L. "The Relationship of Teacher Preparation and Teaching Experience to Assessment of Teaching Performance of Community-Junior College Faculty." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Memphis State University, 1975.

"Preparation of College Teachers," Liberal Education, 58: 57-60, March, 1972.

Preparing Two-Year College Teachers for the '70's; Report of a Conference. American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, DC: ERIC Document ED 034 516, 1969.

President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. Vol I and Vol III, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947.

Preus, Paul K., and Douglas F. Williams. Statewide Community College Faculty Development: A Personalized Approach. Center for the Study of Higher Education, Auburn University, ERIC Document ED 118 168, November, 1975.

Price, Floyd H., and Tim Havley. An Intern in a Community Junior College Tells It Like It Is. Kansas State University, ERIC Document ED 087 496, 1974.

Priest, Bill J. "On the Threshold of Greatness," Junior College Journal, 37: 6-8, September, 1966.

Priest, Bill J. "The Most Significant Problems of Junior Colleges in the Field of Student Personnel Services," Junior College Journal, 29: 303-306, February, 1959.

Prihoda, John J. "Assessing Selected Outcomes of a Junior College Teacher Preparation Program." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972.

Principe, Joseph F. "The Needed Preparation and Attributes of Science Faculty in a Community College." Unpublished EdD dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo, 1972.

"Problems of Public Junior Colleges: A Symposium," Junior College Journal, 10: 519-533, May, 1940.

Proctor, William M. "The Junior College in California," School Review, 31: 363-375, May, 1923.

Pugh, David B. "Committee on Junior College Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal, 16: 428-429, May, 1946.

Pugh, David B. "Committee on Teacher Preparation," Junior College Journal, 17: 388-391, May, 1947.

Pugh, David B., and Roy E. Morgan. "Faculty Needs and Requirements," Junior College Journal, 13: 427-435, May, 1943.

Pugh, David B., and Roy E. Morgan. "Shortcomings in Preparation of Instructors," Junior College Journal, 14: 405-415, May, 1944.

Punke, Harold H. "Academic Qualifications of Junior College Faculties," Junior College Journal, 23: 366-379, March, 1953.

Pyle, Gordon B. "Strengthening the Junior College Teaching Profession," Junior College Journal, 32: 526-533, May, 1962.

Quanty, Michael. Part-Time Instructor Survey. Johnson County Community College, Overland Park, Kansas, ERIC Document ED 127 000, April, 1976.

Rainey, Bill G. "Analysis of Criticisms of Junior College Teachers by University and Senior College Staffs," Junior College Journal, 30: 208-212, December, 1959.

Rapp, Marvin A. "A Program for Improving Teaching in the Two-Year Institutions of the State University of New York," Junior College Journal, 30: 8-12, September, 1959.

Reade, Harold C. "The Preparation of Mississippi Public Junior College Teachers." Unpublished EdD dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1973.

Reeder, Ward G. A First Course in Education. New York: Macmillian, 1949.

Reese, Jack E. "Structuring the Teaching Internships," Community and Junior College Journal, 42: 27-31, May, 1972.

Reiner, Milton K. "Areas of Concern for Comprehensive Community Colleges," School and Society, 99: 47-49, January, 1971.

Remmers, H. H., and others. "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Review of Educational Research, 22: 238-263, June, 1952.

Reynolds, James W. The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1969.

Reynolds, James W. The Junior College. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1956.

Reynolds, James W. "What is a Community College?" Junior College Journal, 21: 201-202, December, 1950.

Ricciardi, Nicholas, "Vital Junior College Problems in California," Junior College Journal, 1: 24-27, October, 1930.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Needed: New Directions in Administration" Junior College Journal, 40: 16-22, March, 1970.

Riechmann, Sheryl, and Michael A. Malec. "Teacher Development for In-Service Faculty," Teaching Sociology, 3: 289-304, April, 1976.

Rieke, Mary W., and others. "People for the People's College. A Summary." Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Rodecker, Charles M. "Pacemakers: California's Community Colleges," California Journal of Secondary Education, 31: 217-220, April, 1956.

Rogers, James T. "Retired Military Personnel as Junior College Instructors—An Analysis Conducted in Florida Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, The Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1965.

Roland, Leo J. "Professional Preparation of Junior College Administrators," Junior College Journal, 24: 72-80, October, 1953.

Roueche, John E. Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Roueche, John E., and Allan S. Hurlburt. "Research on Junior College Teachers," Junior College Research Review, 2: 1-2, March, 1968.

Rudick, Eleanor F. "Proposals for the Preparation of Teachers of Nursing in the Community Junior College." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Columbia University, 1963.

Rummel, J. Francis. An Introduction to Research Procedures in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Russell, James D. "The Way You Always Wanted to Teach—But Were Afraid To Try," Educational Technology, 15: 9-13, June, 1975.

Russell, William F. "A Privileged People," Teachers College Record, 47: 77-88, November, 1945.

Russo, Salvatore. "Qualifications of the Junior College Faculty," Junior College Journal, 8: 193-194, January, 1938.

Ryals, Kelvin, and Dennis Foster. "Instructor Behavior and the Development of Commitment in the College Student," College Student Journal, 9: 310-314, November-December, 1975.

Rydzik, John D. "The Preparation of Allied Health Teachers for Two-Year Community Colleges as Perceived by Selected Faculty and Administrators." Unpublished EdD dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo, 1972.

Salatino, Anthony. Teaching in the Junior College, A Series of Seminars Co-Sponsored by Brown University and Roger Williams Junior College. Brown University and Roger Williams Junior College, ERIC Document ED 013 100, 1967.

Samlin, John R. "In-Service Education in American Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Illinois State University, 1967.

Sarko, Laura. "The Problem of Teaching in Community Colleges," Journal of Higher Education, 35: 384-386, October, 1964.

Seashore, Carl E. The Junior College Movement. New York: Henry Holt, 1940.

Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Professional Staff: Community Colleges, Fall 1975. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, ERIC Document ED 116 729, December, 1975.

Selected Characteristics of Full-Time Professional Staff: Community Colleges, Fall 1976. Hawaii University, Honolulu Community College System, ERIC Document ED 133 033, January, 1977.

Sewell, Donald H., and others. Report on a Statewide Survey About Part-Time Faculty in California Community Colleges. California Community and Junior College Association, Sacramento, ERIC Document ED 118 195, January, 1976.

Sexson, John A., and John W. Harbeson. The New American College. New York: Harper and Brother, 1946.

Shaffer, Laurance F. Preparing Doctoral Dissertations in Psychology. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Shugrue, Michael. "Teacher Preparation and the College Department," College English, 30: 476-481, March, 1969.

Siehr, Hugo E. "Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962.

Siehr, Hugo E., and John X. Jamrich, and Karl T. Hereford. Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1963.

Sims, David M., and Glen I. Bounds. "E.P.D.A. at a Community College," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 14-15, October, 1972.

Sinclair, Phillip A. The Other Crisis. Community and Technical College, The University of Toledo, ERIC Document ED 132 955, 1976.

Singer, Derek S. "Do We Need a Community College Institute? Junior College Journal, 39: 36-40, October, 1968.

Smith, Harlie L. "Better Education of College Teachers—The Junior College," North Central Association Quarterly, 23: 391-396, April, 1949.

Smith, Perle E. "A Study of Certain Characteristics of 'Good' Teachers in a Junior College as Compared With a 'Control' Group." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1955.

Smith, Richard R. "Developmental Needs of Community College Adjunct Faculty," Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2: 31-36, October-December, 1977.

Smith, Sterling L. "An Analysis of Current Training of Teachers in Texas Junior College Allied Health Science Programs and the Development of Guidelines for Their Future Preparation." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, 1973.

Snedecor, George W. and William G. Cochran. Statistical Methods. 6th ed. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1967.

Solomon, Roger B. "Preparing for Teaching in Two-Year Colleges," Improving College and University Teaching, 16: 125-127, Spring, 1968.

Starrak, James A., and Raymon M. Hughes. The Community College in The United States. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1954.

State of Oregon, Department of Education. Personal Correspondence between Robert E. Hamill, Associate Superintendent, Community College Division, and the writer. December 20, 1977.

State of Washington, State Board for Community College Education, Personal Correspondence between E. Frank Price, Associate Director, and the writer. January 4, 1978.

Stetar, Joseph M. "Community Colleges and the Educational Needs of Older Adults," The Journal of Higher Education, 45: 717-721, December, 1974.

Stimmel, David T. Personal interview. San Marcos, Texas, January 24, 1978.

Stinnett, T. M. A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1970.

Stockdale, Dennis L., and Zackary S. Wochok. "College Teacher Preparation: Current Status," Science Education, 57: 353-360, July, 1973.

Stone, Gordon. Personal interview. Belleville, Illinois, February 3, 1978.

Stone, James C. "The Preparation of Academic Instructors for the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 28: 368-371, March, 1958.

Stratton, Alan G. "Needed: The Doctor of Arts in College Teaching," Junior College Journal, 39: 19-23, May, 1969.

Swann, A. Henry. "Qualifications of Mississippi Public High School Teachers of Physics, Chemistry and Physical Science Survey," Science Education, 53: 135-136, March, 1969.

Sylves, David. A Survey of Educational Needs of College Faculty in Selected Two-Year Colleges in New York State. State University of New York, Buffalo College, Buffalo, Educational Research and Development Complex, ERIC Document ED 100 463, 1974.

Tapley, Earl M. "Preparation for Teaching General Education Courses in Junior Colleges," School Review, 64: 191-196, April, 1956.

Tapley, Earl M. "Preparation for Teaching General Education Courses in Junior Colleges," Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1956.

Tead, Ordway. "The Role of General Education in the Junior College," Junior College Journal, 17: 267-277, March, 1947.

The Montana University System. Personal correspondence between William J. Lannan, Community College Coordinator, and the writer. January 16, 1978.

Thornton, James W., Jr. "Improving Junior College Instruction," Junior College Journal, 29: 363-365, March, 1959.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Traxler, Arthur E. "Establishing a Functional Guidance Program in a Junior College," Junior College Journal, 22: 309-320, February, 1952.

Trabue, Marion R. "What Traits Should Junior College Teachers Possess," Junior College Journal, 21: 140-142, November, 1950.

Trent, J. W., and others. The Study of Junior Colleges Roles and Realities of Community Colleges: An Analysis of Literature. University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Document ED 077 507, 1972.

Tuckman, Bruce W. Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.

Turner, Edward T. "Sending the College Professor Back to High School," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, 47: 38, May, 1976.

Tyler, Henry T. "Full Partners in California's Higher Education," Junior College Journal, 35: 4-7, March, 1965.

Tyler, Ralph W. "The Teaching Obligation," Junior College Journal, 30: 525-533, May, 1960.

Unruh, Adolph. "The Special Training Needed for Teachers in Junior Colleges," Education, 71: 139-143, November, 1950.

Utah System of Higher Education. Personal correspondence between Leon R. McCarrey, Deputy Commissioner and Director of Academic Affairs and Planning, and the writer. February 9, 1978.

Vaccaro, Louis C., Jr. "A Survey and Evaluation of the Practices Used by Michigan Colleges in the Recruitment and Selection of Faculty." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.

Vairo, Philip D. "Faculty Quality: A Challenge to the Community College," Journal of Higher Education, 36: 217-220, April, 1965.

Van Dyne, Larry A. "Big Effort Urged to Train Staff for Nation's Community Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education, 7: 1, 4, October 16, 1972.

Wahlquist, John T. "The Status of the Junior College Instructor," Junior College Journal, 1: 125-134, December, 1930.

Walker, Noojin. "Academic Preparation for the Junior College Science Teacher," Journal of Teacher Education, 20: 70-73, Spring, 1969.

Ward, Gordon A. "An Analysis of Public Community College Teachers Preparation Needs with Program Identification." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1969.

Ward, John G. Faculty Development at Oregon Institute of Technology. Oregon Institute of Technology, Klamath Falls, Oregon, ERIC Document ED 130 699, 1976.

Wattenbarger, James L. "Guidelines for Securing and Organizing Staff for a New Junior College." Conference on Establishing Junior Colleges, University of California, Los Angeles, 1963. (Mimeographed.)

Wattenbarger, James L., and Robert S. Carpenter. "Faculty Development: Let Teachers Take the Initiative," Community College Review, 3: 25-30, June, 1975.

Webb, Henry B. "Requirements of Teachers and Teaching: A Cultural Dilemma," Junior College Journal, 27: 315-322, February, 1957.

Weingarten, Samuel, and Fredrick P. Kroeger. English in the Two-Year College. Bloomington, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

Wetzler, Wilson F. "A Breakthrough for Faculty and Program Development" Junior College Journal, 40: 13-15, June/July, 1970.

White, Dorothy T.. "Educational Preparation of Teachers of Nursing for the Community College." Unpublished EdD dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

William Rainey Harper College. Faculty Development Program 1976/77. William Rainey Harper College, Palatine, Illinois, ERIC Document ED 129 391, 1976.

William Rainey Harper College. Faculty Orientation. Palatine, Illinois: William Rainey Harper College, 1967.

Williams, Cratis. A Master's Degree Program for Junior College Teachers. ERIC Document ED 015 759, December, 1966.

Wilson, Richard E. "Staff Development: An Urgent Priority," Community and Junior College Journal, 43: 68-69, June/July, 1973.

Wilson, Robert H. "Junior College Student Teachers," Junior College Journal, 32: 142-146, November, 1961.

Wood, Mary J. Profile of the Woman Journalism Teacher in the Two-Year College. Jefferson Community College, Louisville, Kentucky, ERIC Document ED 129 346, August, 1975.

Wood, William R. "Professional Personnel for Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 20: 513-522, May, 1950.

Wortham, Mary. "The Case for a Doctor of Arts Degree: A View From Junior College Faculty," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 53: 372-377, Winter, 1967.

Worthen, Richard J., and Michael F. Shugrue. The Focus Report of the National Study of English in the Junior College. Bloomington, Illinois: Educational Resources Information Center, 1969.

Yarrington, Roger. "Facing the Critical Issues," Community and Junior College Journal, 44: 8-9 November, 1973.

Yarrington, Roger, ed. Junior Colleges: 50 States/50 Years. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Zook, George F. "The Junior Colleges," School Review, 30: 574-583, October, 1922.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
3 1762 10010781 0

[redacted]
D378
H252
cop.2

Harsha, R. W.
The professional preparation of community college faculty in the Northwest

DATE	ISSUED TO
MAY 10 [illegible]	[illegible] Franks 1025 Burg. 586-7390

[redacted]
D378
H252
cop 2