

D378
B6955
1977

A STUDY OF CURRICULAR NEEDS OF FACULTY IN SELECTED
ALABAMA COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGES FOR POSSIBLE
CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

by

CLAYTON HAROLD BOYER, JR.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Program of
Supervision and Curriculum Development
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To acknowledge all who have been helpful in the activities which have culminated in this dissertation would be impossible. However, there are several who must be acknowledged for the enormous role they have had at some point in the process. As best as possible they will be acknowledged chronologically.

- Clayton and Audrey Boyer, the parents, who first assumed the role of teacher

- Nora V. Smith, the aunt, who encouraged the initial entrance into higher education

- Norman and Helen Crawford, the parents of my wife, who have lent constant encouragement

- Dr. Edgar B. Morgan, friend and physician, who simply said, "Do it."

- The staff and members of First Christian Church who willingly accepted and encouraged my enrollment in classes while serving as their pastor

- Harold Dowler, Rowena Johnson, other staff persons and the congregation of University Christian Church who stood by me in the "ninth month" urging me to finish the task

- Sharon Boyer, my sister, who served as messenger, postal clerk and resident assistant

- Dr. Anne Toppins and Dr. Natalie Barraga who served as consultants for the investigative process and chaplains to the investigator

- Dr. Sam Leles who chaired and guided the dissertation process

- Dr. David Masoner, Dr. Charles Estes, Dr. Yewell Thompson and Dr. Harry Barker who served willingly and helpfully as the committee

Finally, the greatest debt is owed to my wife, Sally, and our children, Beth and Hal, for they constantly did everything in their power to see this investigator through to the finish. Their support was the greatest because they lived with the process from beginning to end, never doubting the goal was within reach. They agonized through the various phases and they celebrated the completion of each phase.

To all, named and unnamed, I say thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Rationale of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	8
Importance of the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
What Research Has Been Done?	10
The Purposes and Functions of Community- Junior Colleges	15
The Kind of Teacher Needed	20
The Kind of Preparation	22
Summary	24
III. METHODOLOGY	27
The Questionnaire	27
The Organization of the Questionnaire	28
The Sample	30
Procedure	32
Analyses of Data	34
Summary	38
IV. RESULTS OF ANALYSES	40
Faculty Profile	40
Curriculum Development Needs	45
Summary	53

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
Summary	56
Conclusions	58
Recommendations	50
APPENDICES	
A. Questionnaire	62
B. Letter to Presidents	63
C. Instructions for Critical Incident Analyses of Faculty Responses	64
BIBLIOGRAPHY	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Background of Community-Junior College Instructors	6
2. Degrees Held by Community-Junior College Faculty	12
3. Course Request Frequencies	14
4. Distribution of Schools by Location, Enrollment and Environment	31
5. Questionnaire Response Rate	35
6. Distribution of Degrees	42
7. Interest in Continuing Education	42
8. Preference for Round Trip Distances	43
9. Preferred Time for Class Meetings	44
10. Faculty Recommendation of Internships	45
11. Ranking of Specific Program Needs	48
12. Responses to Item Six -- Need for Specific Programs	49
13. Ranking of " <u>Personal</u> Development" Needs	50
14. Responses to Item Eight -- Personal Development Needs	51
15. Agreement in Assigning Categories	55

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Rationale of the Study

If the community-junior college is to grow in quality as it has in quantity; if the needs of minority groups are to be met; if the under-educated are to have a second chance; if the needs of business, industry, and government are to be provided for; if communities are to be given opportunities for renewal and rehabilitation; if all citizens are to be given opportunities to explore, extend and experience their hopes and dreams--then it is imperative that immediate and considerable attention be given to the educational needs of those who staff "Democracy's college." (National Advisory Council, 1972, pp. 15-16)

In 1850 a concept was introduced which evolved into public community-junior colleges. This concept was introduced by leaders such as Henry A. Tappan of the University of Michigan and William Watts Folwell of the University of Minnesota. These leaders argued that the first two years of college were more properly met by secondary education. The public community-junior college came into being when William Rainey Harper divided "the first and last two years of the new University of Chicago into the 'Academic College' and 'University College' in 1892." In 1896 these names were changed to 'junior college' and 'senior college'" (Thornton, 1972, p. 47).

The evolution of the community-junior college occurred in four stages. During the first stage, from 1850 to 1920, community-junior colleges became separate institutions which offered the first two years of baccalaureate curriculum. The second stage, from 1920 to 1945, witnessed the inclusion of terminal and semi-professional education in the curricula at community-junior colleges. The third stage, from 1945 to 1965, resulted from an emphasis on educational services to adults. (Thornton, 1972, p. 46). It was at this point in history that community was added to the term junior college. The fourth stage evolution began in 1965.

The fourth stage, evident in the rapidly increasing numbers of community-junior colleges, was a natural extension of the concept introduced in 1850. That original concept included a commitment to "popularizing higher education" which sought to provide opportunity for additional education to persons who were not previously involved in higher education. "Popularizing higher education," also identified as "Democratization of higher education" (Thornton, 1972, p. 32), culminated in the "open-door" of the mid-1960's. The "open-door admissions" policy granted students admission to programs of study without concern for restrictive entrance requirements.

Community-junior colleges have increased in the number of institutions and size of enrollments. Nationally there were no public community-junior colleges in 1900. The National Advisory Council on Education Professions reported that "in 1970 approximately 2,500,000 students attended 1,091 community-junior colleges. This was four times the number of colleges in 1910" (1972, p. 1).

Another comparison of community-junior college growth nationally was made for the period between 1965 and 1975. Since 1965 community-junior college enrollment increased about 600 per cent. The number of community-junior colleges increased about 260 per cent. The number of students in 1965 was 551,260 and the number of schools was 390 (Gleazer, 1971, p. 3). There were 3,921,542 students and 1,014 schools in 1975 (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1976, p. 2).

A similar comparison of growth trends can be made in Alabama. In 1965 the public system of community-junior and technical schools took the form we know today. Enrollment for that year was 5,532 students in ten schools (Pass, 1968, p. 1), and enrollment in 1975 was 60,528 students and the number of post-secondary schools increased to 35 (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1976, p. 95). This represented an increase in enrollment of 994 per cent and a 250 per cent increase in the number of schools in the system.

The growth of public community-junior colleges was also indicated by increased funding. Funding in Alabama for ten public community-junior colleges, excluding technical schools was \$1,083,084.00 in 1965 (State Board, 1965, p. 193). By 1974 the number of public community-junior colleges increased to nineteen and the funding to \$42,115,225.00 (State Board, 1975, p. 320). This represented an increase in funding of almost 4,000 per cent in nine years.

Many issues and problems emerged as a result of rapid increases in the number of schools, student enrollments, and funding. A study by Garrison (1917) indicated that the most fundamental issues were the "three cardinal ones affecting teaching: the need for more teachers, their adequate preparation, and improvement of the climate for junior college careers" (p.v.). The National Advisory Council (1972), James Thornton (1972), Marjorie Fallows (1975), and Arthur Cohen (1967) concurred in this observation.

The first teaching issue, the need for more teachers, was directly related to the enrollment of increased numbers of students at growing numbers of community-junior colleges. This need was met by hiring persons prepared and experienced in secondary education. Several studies conducted to determine the sources from which teachers for

community-junior colleges were drawn have substantiated this fact. Results of these surveys were summarized in Table 1. (See Table 1, p. 6)

The second teaching issue identified was the need for adequate preparation of faculty. Rapid growth of community-junior colleges created a need for great numbers of faculty. A majority of those hired were persons with master's degrees in a subject field, e.g., mathematics or history. Consequently, faculty persons hired had no benefit of a program which specifically prepared them to teach in community-junior college.

As the crisis of simply filling faculty positions passed, concern then focused on adequate preparation of faculty for teaching in community-junior college. That concern was summarized by Arthur Cohen (1967).

Source, preparation, and quality of faculty must be a prime concern to people interested in furthering the movement, for the junior college has accepted instruction as its mission. . . . The junior college above all, is a teaching institution. (p. 21)

The response to the need for adequate preparation resulted in a growing number of programs. By 1970 about 200 colleges and universities were interested in establishing such programs for community-junior college faculty (Cohen, Brawer, and Lombardi, 1971, p. 50).

Table 1
Background of Community-Junior College Instructors
(Percentages of Instructors Surveyed)

Source of Teaching Experience	Anderson and Spencer	NEA	Florida	Clark
High School	40	30	27	67
Senior College	16	17	14	15
Junior College	11	--	--	3
New Graduates	10	24	36	13
Industry and Business	13	11	10	--
Other Sources	10	18	13	2

The information from the Anderson and Spencer, NEA, and Florida studies were found in Monroe (1972, p. 250) and the remaining data were in Clark (1960, p. 116).

In Alabama, however, no program specifically designed to prepare community-junior college faculty existed at the time of this study. One program which provided some training, was a modified Master of Arts in Teaching. The degree was primarily concerned with subject

area concentration requiring forty quarter hours in major and minor fields of study. The program was modified for persons seeking to teach in community-junior college by the addition of the following required courses: IED 665 -- The Community College, GS 600 -- Inter-departmental Seminar, and one quarter of supervised internship in the community-junior college (Auburn University, 1976, p. 119).

This offering did not make invalid for Alabama the observation of Singer (1968) that among the top leaders in two-year colleges there was widespread uneasiness over the insufficient, inappropriate attention given teaching skills and the orientation to subject matter by "many colleges and universities where students are now preparing to teach in our two-year colleges" (p. 36). The National Advisory Council (1972), Garrison (1967), and Thornton (1972) shared the observation made by Singer.

The third concern was creation of a better climate toward community-junior college teaching careers. The development of appropriate programs of study for persons interested in teaching in community-junior colleges should result in better instructors. This, in turn, should contribute to creating a better climate for community-junior college careers.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to gather information related to curricular needs of faculty in selected Alabama Community-Junior Colleges for possible continuing education program development. Two categories of information were gathered. The first category, general in nature, indicated background information about faculty, e.g. degree held and interest in continuing education. The second category gathered information related to selected areas for curriculum development and courses desired for personal development of faculty surveyed.

The Importance of This Study

For the public community-junior colleges in Alabama to be most effective, faculty members need to be adequately prepared. Information was needed for decisions related to provision of graduate programs of study useful to community-junior college faculty in Alabama. This study gathered that information.

Limitations of the Study

This study had certain intentional limits. It was intended to provide data for use in possible development of graduate programs designed to assist faculty of public community-junior colleges in Alabama. This study was not

intended to recommend a formal program of study for
community-junior college faculty.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A great deal has been written about community-junior colleges. Much of the material was exhortative in nature, calling for improvement of community-junior colleges through faculty development.

This review was organized in terms of four questions. The first question sought information regarding results of objective research dealing with community-junior college faculty characteristics and curriculum needs. The second question determined the purposes and functions of community-junior colleges. The third was directed to securing information describing the type of teacher needed in community-junior colleges. The fourth question dealt with the type of programs of study which would be useful to community-junior college faculty.

What Research Has Been Done?

A major study at the national level was Roger Garrison's Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems (1967). His purpose was to "identify some of the current issues and problems affecting the junior college faculty member as he plays his key role in the explosively

expanding two-year colleges throughout the country" (p. 5). To accomplish his purpose he interviewed faculty in representative colleges to determine "significant common denominators of response; to make assessment of the meaning of these responses; and to make recommendations" (p. 6).

Garrison used eighteen key questions for his interviews, although not all questions were necessarily used with each person interviewed. The questions dealt with three areas of information: (1) status of a career in junior college teaching; (2) professional problems, needs, and preparation; and (3) relationship with administration and policy-making (p. 10-11). The largest group of questions dealt with professional problems, needs, and preparation.

Garrison formulated several recommendations from the information gathered in relation to the key questions. The recommendation related to this study suggested the establishment of a National Committee for Junior College Faculty to address itself "to the problems of the preparation and professional refreshment of two-year college teachers" (p. 82).

The data from other studies described two characteristics of community-junior college faculty. The first characteristic indicated that most persons came to

community-junior college positions from secondary education. (See Chapter I, Table 1, p. 6). The second characteristic indicated that most community-junior college faculty hold master's degrees. The data were reported by Cohen (1973, p. 103); Brawer (1973, p. 57); Thornton (1972, p. 134); Cohen, Brawer, and Lombardi (1971, p. 33) and Roaden (1970, p. 5-6). The results of these studies are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Degrees Held by Community-Junior College Faculty
(Percentages of Persons Surveyed)

Degree Held	Cohen 1973	Brawer 1973	Thornton 1972	Cohen, Brawer, and Lombardi 1971	Roaden 1970
Doctorate	7	5.5	9	7	6
Master's	70	75.0	75	69	73
Other	13	9.5	16	14	21

A study of Alabama community-junior college faculty characteristics was done by Paul Preus (1971). This study indicated that 4 per cent of faculty surveyed had doctorates and 77 per cent had master's degrees (1971, p. 5).

The faculty surveyed indicated "strong interest in graduate courses designed especially for instructors teaching in junior colleges" (Preus, 1971, p. 5). He determined that 82 per cent of the faculty surveyed wanted classes offered within one hour's drive of local community-junior colleges (1971, p. 6).

Preus' study also sought to determine faculty interest in courses offered by Auburn University. The data gathered showed a strong interest in courses related to developmental needs of community-junior college students and courses providing an overview of community-junior colleges. The frequency of faculty course requests from Preus' study are reported in Table 3. (See Table 3, p. 14)

Table 3
Course Request Frequencies

Course Number	Course Title	Request Frequency
IED 645	Teaching the Marginally Prepared College Student	339
IED 665	The Community College	268
IED 666	Improving Undergraduate Education	241
IED 663	The American College and University	183
AED 618	Organization and Administration of Higher Education	161
AED 697	Student Personnel Work in Higher Education	112
VED 608	Administration of Vocational Education	83
<u>All Counselor Education Courses</u>		<u>65</u>

Data in the above table were in a study by Preus (1971, p. 6).

The Purposes and Functions of Community-Junior Colleges

The literature dealing with preparation of faculty repeatedly discussed purposes and functions of community-junior colleges when reporting the need for faculty development. This seemed to suggest that an understanding of these purposes and functions was essential to development of faculty. Consequently, the following was included in this review of literature.

"The public community college was born in the image of the public school and thus has its roots in the public school system" (Monroe, 1972, p. 1). Three guiding purposes drawn from public schools were (1) equal opportunities for education, (2) local support and control, and (3) a relevant curriculum which met the needs of the community.

Thornton (1972) saw the general purposes for community-junior college in these terms:

1. a democratic society cannot exist wholesomely without a well-educated citizenry
2. every effort must be expended to help each person make the most of his abilities
3. the community-junior college must be much more than the lower half of a college or university
4. it intends to serve the whole population; students of technical subjects are no more entitled to the exclusive attention of the junior college than are the college transfer or the pre-professional groups.
5. the community college must recognize the individuality of every student. Instructors, planners and legislators must stop thinking of groups or categories and focus on persons who need education. (pp. 33-35)

The Chronicle of Higher Education (1973) contained a report to the 1973 assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges entitled "Educational Opportunities for All: New Staff for New Students." The report stated:

The development of this staff reflects the central commitments of our colleges:

1. That we affirm equal education opportunity for all who come to us
2. That a 'people's college' demonstrate its commitment to growth in competence and personal satisfaction for its students
3. That what we affirm as democratic values -- respect for person and his needs; equal treatment for those from diverse backgrounds and cultural expectations; sensitive responses to communities which support us in the expectation that we will truly serve -- are at the heart of our recommendations for the preparation and continuing renewal of those who are responsible for our students' growth. (1973, p. 11)

In keeping with his commitment "to give substance to the ideal of equal opportunity for appropriate education for all citizens" (p. 35), Thornton considers open admissions as a primary function of community-junior college. Open admission or, as it is sometimes called, open-door admission is extremely simple. "Any high school graduate, or any person over 18 years of age who seems capable of profiting by the instruction offered, is eligible for admission" (p. 35). Every student is to be granted opportunity to succeed or fail on . . .

their own efforts. Inherent in this function is the idea that students with ability but lacking specific preparation for success should find educational options which permit them to succeed. Thus, "so-called remedial courses are an integral consequence of the open-admission policy" (p. 36).

The open-door admission policy increasingly has been accepted as useful in providing the educational needs of Blacks and Hispanic-Americans. "In the academic world, it is as if they were visitors from a foreign nation. They need assurance that they are welcome, that success is worthwhile, and that they are accepted as persons of value in their own right" (p. 36).

In addition to the special needs of students listed above, an open admission policy "embraces several categories of adult students" (p. 36). Included in this group are part-time special students seeking cultural rather than vocational goals. Also included are those seeking to learn new occupational skills or to update old occupational skills. Finally, there are retired citizens "freed of the pressures of vocationalism, immediacy, and practicality, who are truly ready for liberal education" (p. 37).

In view of student differences, Thornton sees as a second function a wide diversification of curriculum. If "appropriate education should be made available" for all who seek out education in community-junior college, it follows that a wide variety of "post-high-school education" should be offered to meet needs and interests of different students.

The third function, guidance, results from the widely diverse student body and curriculum. Diversified curriculum creates for students some difficulty in choosing "courses appropriate for their abilities and opportunities." Guidance is necessary to provide the student information "about the nature and purpose of the several available curriculums, about his own personal and educational qualities, and about employment opportunities for those who complete the various courses" (p. 40).

Providing "excellent teaching" is a fourth function of community-junior colleges. Students are capable of admirable success with good instruction, but pedestrian teaching is most likely to discourage and defeat them. Consequently, "careful preparation and selection of teachers" and constant encouragement for improvement of teaching skills are essential to effective community-junior colleges. Thornton's final statement about his community-junior college function was

"Either it teaches excellently, or it fails completely" (p. 42).

Monroe (1972) listed these functions for community-junior colleges:

1. transfer curricula
2. citizenship and general education
3. occupational training
4. general studies
5. adult and continuing education
6. remedial programs -- reading, writing, and language
7. counseling and guidance
8. salvage
9. screening
10. goal-finding or cooling-out
11. custodial
12. co-curricular or student activity (pp. 26-45).

Dolan (1952, p. 329) and Brunner (1970, p. 32) quoted a common source which delineated four functions. The functions were categorized popularizing, preparatory, terminal, and guidance.

The first function, popularizing, would make available to secondary school graduates the advantages of college education. This education was to be made available for those who could not otherwise "secure it for geographical or economic reasons." Similar benefits were to be made available to "mature residents of the community."

Second, the preparatory function was described as two years work "equivalent to that given in the freshman and sophomore years of standard universities." These two years were to be available locally. The work

was to prepare students for "upper division specialization at the university."

The third function was terminal. This function was to be provided "by means of vocational courses." The aim was to provide training for occupations at the semi-professional level that enabled students to obtain employment upon completion of training.

The guidance function was to assist the student in making adjustments to the higher education setting. It was to be accomplished by "training the student to think" and "to organize his studies effectively." This function would assist students to determine their goals beyond the community-junior college setting, "whether in a higher educational institution or in a life occupation."

The Kind of Teacher Needed

Of community-junior college faculty Gleazer (1973) said,

My general impression of faculty members is that they are sincere, dedicated people. Most are uncomplaining about the task shaping up for them, but they are concerned that their skills do not match this changing most complex educational assignment. (p. 65).

But what are the skills needed to meet this complex, changing educational assignment? The skills needed by faculty members were generally listed in the literature as competency, student-centeredness, and effective communication.

When speaking of competency or teaching ability, Gordon (1967) directed attention to "a range of instructional techniques and familiarity with various media" (p. 28). The American Association of Junior Colleges called for teaching competency to include the need for faculty to keep current in their subject field (p. 68-69).

The second skill, student-centeredness, called for faculty to be aware of and sensitive to individual student needs. Gordon saw this awareness as the need for faculty to understand students' "educational capacities and interests" (1967, p. 28). This meant understanding the students' experiences and roles (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969, p. 12). For Gleazer (1973), the roles and experiences of students included an understanding of the sub-cultures from which students came.

The teaching was not to be subject-centered. Instead, Hurlburt (1968) wanted instructors who had (1) a capacity to explain and put across the point, (2) a willingness to work with all kinds and levels of student questions, and who (3) gave the impression that they were eager to talk about it (p. 1).

Included with competency and student-centeredness was effective communication by faculty with students

and colleagues (Gordon, 1967, p. 28). The very nature of community-junior colleges lends itself to the breakdown of communication. The multiple programs, the diversity of students and faculty, and the variety of schedules were not conducive to easy communication.

In addition to the above skills, the National Advisory Council on Education Profession suggested that faculty needed a commitment to the purposes and objectives of the community-junior college (1972, p. 6). This commitment was also mentioned by Gleazer (1973, p. 67) and Gilbert (1971, p. 20).

The Kind of Preparation

As recently as the 1960's three patterns of two-year college teacher preparation were common: (1) a college degree and experience in secondary schools; (2) a master's degree in traditional academic programs; and (3) for vocational-technical programs, experience in a specific occupation with a little training in class instruction (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1973, pp. 1-2). Of these programs the master's degree program remains the most popular (Brawer, 1973, p. 57).

Without regard for the degree granted, consideration centered on when the development program should be offered. The two options were pre-service and in-service. Pre-service was for those who sought programs

prior to employment in community-junior colleges. In-service referred to programs of study for those who were teaching in the community-junior colleges. The in-service program allowed continuation of employment as an instructor, while the faculty member was engaged in a program of study.

The literature indicated that few strong pre-service programs existed. Those which existed provided "a small fraction of qualified personnel needed" (National Advisory Council, 1972, p. 8). Cohen (1973) argued that the inadequacy of pre-service programs of study were a result of inflexibility of university disciplines and the unsureness of the colleges of education about the special needs of community-junior college faculty. The results were instructors who were either "narrow, subject-matter specialists or secondary-school-oriented . . . neither type is prepared to teach community college students" (p. 10). Garrison determined that the training needed was a broad, solid, general set of courses, "full of the kind of material that we [the teachers] are going to have to teach" (p. 39).

The writers of People for People's College expressed the feeling that "while the need for pre-service programs is important, programs for the 70's should

focus on in-service education" (National Advisory Council, 1972, p. 8). In-service programs had value over pre-service programs in that instructors were involved in the teaching setting. Persons, in this kind of setting, were highly motivated by the search for solutions to problems found in classrooms (Gleazer, 1973, p. 69). In addition, Brawer (1973) felt the in-service program would assist both the older instructor as well as the new instructor (p. 56). One further consideration was that few community-junior college instructors had pre-service study "to help them understand the distinctive opportunities and requirements of teaching in this kind of college" (Thornton, 1972, pp. 125-126). Finally, Chronister stated that:

the need for in-service professional development programs for community college faculty and staff is documented and a very real issue facing contemporary higher education. If the needs . . . are to be met effectively and efficiently, it will be a cooperative and combined effort on the parts of community college and graduate institutions. (Chronister, 1970, pp. 7-8)

Summary

The research and literature showed that community-junior college faculty came primarily from secondary school settings. The majority of the faculty held master's degrees.

The findings for Alabama indicated interest in courses associated with developmental needs of the

students. Those faculty surveyed also indicated a strong interest in graduate courses offered within one hour's drive of local community-junior colleges.

The functions of community-junior colleges reflected the purposes which guided the development of these colleges. The purposes included a desire for equal education opportunities for all citizens, a commitment to developing competence and personal satisfaction for students, and respect for individual students.

The literature argued that three skills were important to accomplishment of the purposes of community-junior colleges. The faculty member needed to be competent, student-centered, and able to communicate effectively.

The kind of preparation reported to have top priority, by the literature, was in-service programs. The in-service programs allowed the faculty member to continue to teach while engaged in a program of study. Also, the person teaching was likely to bring problems and questions raised by actual classroom situations to a formal program of study.

All of the literature examined indicated a need for development of graduate study for persons interested in teaching in community-junior colleges. The limited number of studies conducted in Alabama indicated a need for

gathering data about faculty in Alabama to assist in development of programs for community-junior college faculty.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

In Chapter III the general methodology of this study was presented. The presentation included statements regarding development of questionnaire used, selection of sample surveyed, and analyses techniques applied to data gathered.

The Questionnaire

The instrument used to collect community-junior college faculty data was developed in the fall of 1975. Four graduate students, including the present investigator, enrolled in a seminar Problems of Supervision and Curriculum Improvement at the University of Alabama, College of Education, designed the questionnaire. The first questionnaire developed was unsatisfactory; it was not as specific or as concise as desired. A second questionnaire was developed and was field tested in a graduate class studying the Junior College, at the University of Alabama. After some additional modifications were made, the instrument was determined ready for use. (See questionnaire -- Appendix A, page 65.)

The questionnaire gathered information regarding teaching faculty in Alabama. Information sought was divided into two categories. The first category of information, general in nature, indicated some background data regarding faculty surveyed. The second category sought information about selected areas of curriculum development and courses desired for personal development of faculty surveyed.

The Organization of the Questionnaire

The background data was gathered through use of items one through five. Item one sought information indicating the highest degree held by responding teaching faculty. Data related to interest in continuing personal education was collected by items two through four. Item two asked if the respondent was interested in continuing his or her education. Item three sought to determine round trip distances respondents would be willing to travel to meet classes. Responses were limited to five options (25, 50, 100, 150, or 200 miles). Item four was designed to secure responses as to time of day faculty would like for courses to be offered. The options listed were evening (3-5 p.m.), night (6-9 p.m.), weekend and other.

Curriculum developed for the future might involve persons who were preparing to teach in community-

junior colleges. Item five sought an indication of the value teaching faculty assigned to internship (practice teaching).

Items six through eight sought data related to need of faculty for general program areas. Items six and eight listed program areas with forced choice responses (no need -- some need -- great need). Six specific program areas were listed under item six. They were (1) instructional methods; (2) subject matter, cognate areas, teaching field; (3) research skills; (4) curriculum change, innovation, development; (5) interpersonal skills (understanding junior college clientele); and (6) remedial techniques (communication skills, math). Five areas for "personal development" were listed under item eight. The areas were: (1) showing strong interest in the student; (2) content, being knowledgeable in broad areas; (3) use of effective interpersonal skills; (4) being flexible in evaluating ideas and adjusting; and (5) using experiential or alternate modes of learning.

Item seven gathered information through use of an open-ended statement, "The problem(s) I encounter most often with students is (are)." From these faculty perceptions of student problems, it was hoped that courses to assist faculty in responding to these problems would be indicated.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate school and position (administrator or faculty) held. This was done simply to determine which of these had responded.

The Sample

Selection of the sample was determined in two steps. First, the participating community-junior colleges were chosen as a random sample using Pi as a random table. Second, an accidental sample was constituted of those who responded from each school. No controls were exercised by the investigative group in selection of respondents.

Schools selected for this study were fairly well distributed by location, environment, and enrollment. Table 4 shows this distribution. (See Table 4, p. 31) All schools selected for inclusion in the sample had several areas of commonality. They were all part of Alabama's state-supported system of community-junior colleges. Most were established by state action. It should be noted that Northwest was originally established by action of local residents. All had Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation. All offered an Associate degree for "two year principally bachelor's creditable" studies. Six of eight schools offered a Certificate of Completion for "terminal

TABLE 4
 DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY LOCATION, ENROLLMENT AND ENVIRONMENT

<u>School</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Environment</u>	<u>Population</u>
Jefferson State	Birmingham	6,918	Cosmopolitan		300,910
Calhoun State	Decatur	5,452	Urban	Industrial Center	38,044
Lurleen B. Wallace	Andalusia	919	Small town	with Industry	12,500
Northeast	Rainsville	1,755	Rural Community		1,500
Northwest	Phil Campbell	1,160	Rural Community		1,000
Patrick Henry	Monroeville	709	Rural		3,632
Snead	Boaz	1,776	Small Town	Agri-culture and Industry	4,654
Lawson State	Birmingham	2,579	Cosmopolitan	Industrial Center	300,910

(Burgess, 1975, pp. 2-10)

occupational" studies (Podolsky and Smith, 1976, pp. 2-5). Northeast State Junior College and Northwest State Junior College offered associate degrees only. All were co-educational.

Most of the schools admitted high school graduates, non-high school graduates with high school equivalency certificates, or non-high school graduates who had completed 16 units. Exceptions to this general rule were John C. Calhoun, Northwest, Snead, and Lurleen B. Wallace. Calhoun would accept only high school graduates or those with equivalency certificates. Northwest and Lurleen B. Wallace had open door enrollment programs. Snead accepted high school graduates but considered non-high school graduates.

Procedure

Gathering data from the selected schools was accomplished in two steps. First, the respective presidents were contacted by telephone to solicit their support and assistance in distribution of questionnaires. Second, packets were sent to presidents of the respective schools. The packets contained a cover letter of instruction for distribution (see Appendix B), questionnaires for distribution and a self-addressed envelope to be used to return completed questionnaires.

Directions asked that questionnaires be distributed to full-time faculty. No instructions were given as to who should distribute questionnaires. In most cases a person was assigned by the respective presidents to distribute, collect and return the questionnaires.

Each questionnaire had an envelope attached should individual respondents wish to return their questionnaire anonymously to person assigned to collect the questionnaires at the respective institutions. Some individual respondents determined to use envelopes provided with individual questionnaires to mail their response directly to the investigator. In some cases, the decision to mail questionnaires directly resulted in unusable data.

Five hundred and thirty-two questionnaires were distributed. Three hundred and eleven were returned representing a response of 58 per cent. A comparison of questionnaires distributed and returned was conducted. This comparison revealed two factors which seemed to effect the response rate.

The first factor centered on the response rate of Northeast State Junior College. None of the 25 questionnaires distributed to faculty and administrators of this school were usable. It was determined to delete this school from the sample.

The second factor involved responses from administrators. Originally, questionnaires were included for

both administrators and teaching faculty. The number of questionnaires provided to participating community-junior colleges for both administrators and teaching faculty was determined by data provided in Directory of Community and Junior Colleges (1973). The response by administrators was limited. Of 92 questionnaires sent, 16 (17.4 per cent) were returned by administrators. As a result of this very limited response, the decision was made to remove questionnaires provided for administrators from the sample.

The result of both actions, removal of Northeast State Junior College and administrator questionnaires, was a reduction in the number of questionnaires from 532 to 415. The responses (288) received compared with the revised number (415) distributed resulted in a response rate of 69.4 per cent. (See Table 5, p. 35.)

It should be noted that 27 faculty respondents are reported for Lurleen B. Wallace State Junior College resulting in a 122.7 per cent return for teaching faculty. This resulted from six teaching faculty using forms sent for use by administrators of that school.

Analyses of Data

Data gathered by all questionnaire items, except item seven, were subjected to analyses by selected

TABLE 5

Questionnaire Response Rate

COLLEGE	ADMINISTRATION		FACULTY	
	SENT	RETURNED PER CENT	SENT	RETURNED PER CENT
Jefferson	30	7 23	169	128 75
Calhoun	18	4 22	94	55 58.5
Lurleen B.				
Wallace	7	0 0	21	27 122.7
Northwest	4	0 0	30	25 83.3
Patrick Henry	4	4 100	19	14 73.7
Snead	12	1 8.3	33	25 75.8
Lawson	17	0 0	59	14 23.8
Totals	92	16 17.4	415	288 69.4

programs included in Behavioral Sciences Statistics Program Library (Barker, 1973) available at the University of Alabama. Data for items one through five were subjected to analyses by computer program spec07 (Barker, 1973, p. 90). Spec07 was an item analysis treatment reporting responses in terms of per cent of whole sample selecting each available choice option.

Consideration was given to felt need for specific programs in selected general areas (item six) and personal development needs (item eight). Data collected by items six and eight were subjected to three analyses. Item six and eight combined were subjected to treatment by corr20 (Barker, 1973, p. 64), a discriminate analysis program. Items six and eight were then subjected separately to corr20. These treatments were conducted to determine similarity of response by schools which participated in this study. The last analysis of this data was a spec07 item analysis. This was conducted to determine, by percentages, interest expressed for selected needs listed on questionnaires under items six and eight.

Item seven was analyzed through use of critical incident analysis. The open-ended statement resulted in 462 responses from faculty members. In some cases faculty members responded with more than one student problem. All responses were recorded on cards, one

response per card. The cards were given identification numbers.

The investigator categorized the cards, allowing one week before reviewing and finalizing the categories. This process resulted in the emergence of 19 categories. They were:

1. The need for improved basic communication (reading and writing) and science (math and other science) skills
2. Responsibility and self-discipline as seen in study habits
3. Lack of background preparation and need for remedial work (general statements)
4. Motivation (interest and initiative)
5. Apathy (laziness)
6. Student personnel problems -- working
7. Student personnel problems -- personal problems
8. Student personnel problems -- goal setting and course planning
9. Student problems -- absenteeism
10. Student problems -- critical thinking ability
11. Student problems -- library skills
12. Student problems -- closed mindedness
13. Student problems -- grade consciousness
14. Student problems -- inability to receive and follow instructions
15. Student problems -- related to veterans

16. Student -- miscellaneous
17. Faculty concern -- class size, individual learning levels and facilities
18. Faculty concern -- course development difficulties
19. Miscellaneous

The cards were reassembled in the numerical order using the identification number. The deck of cards, a sheet of instructions (see Appendix C) and category label cards were given to two other persons to categorize. After Dr. Anne Toppins and Dr. Natalie Barraga each categorized the cards independently, responses were recorded. A comparison of agreement in categorization of responses was conducted. Agreement in categorization was reported in percentages.

Summary

The questionnaire used for this study was developed by four graduate students in the fall term of 1975 at the University of Alabama. Data collected in response to questionnaire was drawn from a sample constituted of teaching faculty from seven community-juniór colleges in Alabama.

Data for all questionnaire items, except item seven, were analyzed using programs available through the Behavioral Sciences Statistic Program Library

(Barker). The two programs used were item analysis (spec07) and discriminate analysis (corr20). Items one through five made use of spec07, while items six and eight used corr20 as well. Item seven was subjected to a critical incident analysis.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF ANALYSES

Results of analyses of data gathered by survey questionnaire were reported in this chapter. A discussion of each item was included. Items one through five were subjected to analysis using spec07 (Barker, 1973, p. 90) to determine background information about faculty. Items six and eight were analyzed by corr20 (Barker, 1973, p. 64) to determine similarity of responses from selected community junior colleges. Data for items six and eight were then subjected to analysis by spec07 (Barker) to determine curriculum development needs of faculty surveyed.

Item seven represented data indicating student problems as perceived by faculty respondents. Responses to this open-ended statement were treated as critical incidents and used to establish categories. Inferences were drawn regarding curriculum to be developed to assist faculty meet student problems.

Faculty Profile

The initial category of information in the problem statement gathered data related to background of faculty. This information identified (1) degrees held,

(2) interests in continuing education, (3) distance respondents were willing to travel to attend classes, and (4) preferred time for classes to be offered. An additional question was posed to determine if these faculty members would recommend an internship (practice teaching) for those persons interested in teaching in community-junior colleges. The distribution of these responses was analyzed by use of spec07.

Distribution of degrees held by faculty was the first analysis. Data in Table 6 indicated that faculty surveyed in the fall of 1975 approximated the distribution of degrees reported in national studies prior to 1975. (See Table 6, p.42) The range of degrees held by community-junior college faculty in those studies were: master's -- 69 per cent to 75 per cent and doctorate -- 5.5 per cent to 9 per cent. Paul Preus (1971) reported that in Alabama 77 per cent of faculty had master's and 4 per cent had doctorates.

Interest in continuing one's formal education was indicated by 87 per cent of respondents. The remaining respondents were either not interested (10 per cent), undecided (1 per cent), or simply chose not to respond (1 per cent). Results of this item were summarized in Table 7. (See Table 7, p. 42)

Table 6
Distribution of Degrees

Degree	Number	Per Cent
Bachelor	18	6
Master's	219	76
Ed. S.	15	5
Doctorate	24	8
Other	6	2
No Response	5	1

Table 7
Interest In Continuing Education

Response	Number	Per Cent
Yes	250	87
No	30	10
Undecided	5	1
No Response	2	1

When asked to indicate round trip distances that faculty respondents might be willing to travel in order to attend a continuing education experience, the most frequent response was 50 miles (29 per cent). Other

responses indicated that 16 per cent were not interested in any of the round trip choices made available. The majority were willing to travel less than one hundred miles round trip. Paul Preus determined in 1971 that most faculty responding to his study were willing to travel one hour for classes offered. He did not report if this was the total round trip time or one way time. Regardless, it indicated that his subjects limited the distance they were willing to travel to less than 100 miles. The travel preferences for the present study were summarized in Table 8.

Table 8
Preference for Round Trip Distances

	Miles					
	0	25	50	100	150	200
Number	48	56	84	63	22	14
Per Cent	17	19	29	22	8	5

The time option most preferred by respondents for class meetings was 3 to 5 p.m. The option of 6 to 9 p.m. was fairly close to 3 to 5 p.m. option. Of those responding, 47 per cent chose 3 to 5 p.m.; 37 per cent chose 6 to 9 p.m.; and 19 per cent chose weekends.

There was more than 100 per cent response to the options available. This may have been due to respondents choosing more than one option. This may have affected the results which indicated closeness of preferences for options one and two. The response data was reported in Table 9.

Table 9
Preferred Time for Class Meetings

	3 to 5 p.m.	6 to 9 p.m.	Weekends
Number	135	107	55
Per Cent	47	37	19

Item five sought to determine value assigned by respondents to internships (practice teaching) for new faculty. A majority (53 per cent) were in favor of internships. This did not seem as definitive as responses to other items. Further study may be needed in this area. Table 10 indicates the breakdown of responses.

Table 10
Faculty Recommendation of Internships

	Yes	No	Undecided	No Response
Number	152	65	61	9
Per Cent	53	23	21	3

Curriculum Development Needs

The second category of information gathered data related to curriculum development need. Faculty perceptions of specific program needs were identified through items six, seven and eight. In items six and eight, respondents were limited in responses to selected curriculum development needs. Response to item seven was open-ended, and permitted inferences about needs as related to faculty perceived student problems.

Analysis of items six and eight was accomplished in three steps. Steps one and two involved use of corr20 (Barker) to determine if being a member of one of the seven college faculty groupings had affected individual responses made to items six and eight. The third step used spec07 (Barker) to determine interest expressed by individual respondents for selected needs listed under items six and eight.

The first step was a discriminate analysis of the combined eleven variables in items six and eight, to determine whether or not group responses were significantly different. The use of corr20 (Barker) resulted in an F-ratio of 1.186, with 66 and 1456 degrees of freedom ($p=.15$). The results were not statistically significant. These findings indicated that responses secured from faculty members of the seven community-junior colleges were not significantly different when the seven groups were compared with each other. It seemed that group membership had not affected individual faculty responses.

Although responses by groups were not found significantly different as combined, there was a possibility that item six and item eight analyzed individually would produce significant difference among groups. Consequently, item six and item eight were analyzed separately by corr20 (Barker). Again results obtained were not statistically significant. Analysis of item six indicated an F-ratio of 1.367 with 36 and 1215 degrees of freedom ($p = 0.074$). Item eight results indicated an F-ratio of 0.845 with 30 and 1110 degrees of freedom ($p = 0.7068$).

Since results did not indicate that group membership had affected individual faculty responses on either item six or item eight, it was determined to use individual

responses of faculty surveyed to indicate their felt needs for specific developmental programs. This determination was made by use of spec07 (Barker).

Analysis of item six sought to determine felt need of respondents for specific program areas listed. These program areas were (1) instructional methods; (2) subject matter, cognate areas, teaching fields; (3) research skills; (4) curriculum change, innovation, development; (5) interpersonal skills (understanding junior college clientele); and (6) remedial techniques (communication skills, math). Interest was elicited by response to three forced choice options (no need, some need, great need) for each of the six selected program areas.

Of the six specific program needs listed, need two (subject matter, cognate areas, teaching field need), accrued the largest percentage (50 per cent) of respondents indicating great need. Ninety per cent of faculty responding to this specific program need indicated either some need or great need. Research skills seemed to be viewed as least important. Priority of specific program needs was determined by combining the percentage of respondents indicating great need with the percentage of respondents indicating some need for each of the six selected program areas of item six. This ranking was reported in Table 11.

Table 11
 Ranking of Specific Program Needs
 (Reported in Percentages)

Specific Program	Rank	Some Need	Great Need	Combined Need
Subject Matter	1	40	50	90
Instructional Methods	2	49	35	84
Curriculum Change	3	54	29	83
Remedial Techniques	4	44	36	80
Interpersonal Skills	5	53	26	79
Research Skills	6	55	17	72

A summary of all response options for each of the program areas is contained in Table 12. (See Table 12, p. 51) It should be noted that, with the exception of the second program need (subject matter), the majority of the responses are to be found under the "some need" choice option. This may have been because not enough choice options were made available to respondents.

Table 12
 Responses to Item Six -- Need for Specific Programs
 (Reported in Percentages)

Program	No Need	Some Need	Great Need	No Response
Instructional Method	11	49	35	4
Subject Matter, cognate areas, teaching field	6	40	50	4
Research Skills	22	55	17	6
Curriculum change, innovation, development	10	54	29	7
Interpersonal skills (Understanding junior college clientele)	15	53	26	6
Remedial Techniques (communication skills, math)	13	44	36	7

Item eight sought to determine what development-
 al program areas were most needed for respondents'
 "personal developments". The priority for "personal
 development" needs was determined by combining the

percentages of respondents indicating great need and some need for each of the five suggested "personal development" areas. The ranking of "personal development" needs was reported in Table 13.

Table 13
Ranking of "Personal Development" Needs
(Reported in Percentages)

Personal Development Need	Rank	Some Need	Great Need	Combined Need
Content	1	57	30	87
Experiential or Alternate Modes of Learning	2	50	33	88
Interpersonal Skills	3	61	16	77
Being Flexible in Evaluating Ideas	4	60	17	77
Showing Strong Interest in Students	5	43	14	57

Responses to each of the five personal development needs were summarized in Table 14. As in item six the responses to item eight "personal development" needs loaded on the "some need" forced choice option.

Table 14
 Responses to Item Eight --
Personal Development Needs
 (Reported in Percentages)

Needs	No Need	Some Need	Great Need	No Response
Interest in Student	33	43	14	10
Content	6	57	30	7
Interpersonal Skills	14	61	16	10
Being Flexible	15	60	17	9
Experiential or Alternate Modes of Learning	12	50	33	6

Responses for items six and eight indicated three curricular needs of faculty surveyed. First, faculty wished to improve the content of their teaching. Second, they were seeking assistance with instructional methods. Third, they indicated a need for personal development in use of experiential or alternate modes of learning.

The open-ended statement "The problem(s) I encounter most often with students is (are)" of item seven resulted in 462 responses which were classified into nineteen categories through use of critical incident

analysis. This analysis revealed a 79 per cent level agreement in categorization among the investigator, Dr. Anne Toppins and Dr. Natalie Barraga. These three persons did not agree on categorization of 21 per cent of responses. Of 462 responses, 109 were in category one. There was complete agreement in categorization between the three individuals of 104 responses and disagreement in 5 responses. To determine percentage of agreement and disagreement in category one the total responses (462) was divided into the number of agreed upon responses (104) showing a 22 per cent agreement in that category. Percentage of agreement and disagreement for all categories was determined in this manner. Results of critical incident analysis categorization were reported in Table 15. (See Table 15, p. 55)

Most responses (273) were assigned to five categories representing 59 per cent of all responses. When only responses which were assigned to categories acceptable to all three categorizers were considered, these 273 responses represented 74.6 per cent of all responses. Faculty perceptions of student problems with the greatest frequency were:

1. The need for improved basic communication (reading and writing) and science (math and other science) skills -- category one

2. Lack of background preparation and need for remedial work (general statements) -- category three
3. Responsibility and self-discipline as seen in study habits -- category two
4. Motivation (interest and initiative) -- category four
5. Student personnel problems (goal setting and course planning) -- category eight.

Three of the five students' major problems, determined by critical incident analysis, were related to functions attributed to community-junior colleges in the literature. Problems one and two fall within Thornton's first function. Problem five could be included in Thornton's third function and in the fourth function reported by Dolan and Brunner. The remaining two problems are not clearly indicated in any of the listings of functions stated earlier in this study, but were viewed by this investigator as best administered to by adequately prepared faculty. This was function four as understood by Thornton.

Summary

Faculty included in this study sample were described in the following terms. They held master's degrees. They were interested in continuing their formal education, but preferred that such classes be offered between 3 to 5 p.m. on weekdays. They were willing to attend classes if they did not have to drive a distance greater than 100

miles round trip. Internship for prospective community-junior college faculty was not viewed as a great need by these respondents.

When development of curricula to assist Alabama community-junior college faculty improve their teaching is undertaken, these findings would be useful. First, faculty were interested in improving the content (subject matter) of their teaching. Second, they indicated a need for help with instructional methods, including experiential or alternate modes of learning. The third finding was related to a need for assistance with remedial techniques and interpersonal relationship skills. The fourth finding indicated faculty were not interested in developing research skills or an ability to show strong interests in students.

Inferred from faculty perceptions of student problems were needs which would be considered in developing courses to assist faculty. These needs were (1) remedial and developmental assistance for students, and (2) guidance in setting goals and course planning. Also important were courses designed to help faculty understand student problems of motivation and self-discipline.

Table 15
Agreement in Assigning Categories

Category	Number of Responses		Percentage of Agreement
	Agreed	Disagreed	
The need for basic communication and science skills	104	5	22.5
Responsibility and self-discipline in study habits	47	10	10
Lack of background preparation and need for remedial work	55	16	11.9
Motivation	46	10	9.9
Apathy	16	10	3.5
Student personnel problems -- working	11		2
Student personnel problems -- personal	9	6	1.9
Student personnel problems -- goal setting and course planning	21	4	4.5
Student problems -- absenteeism	6	3	1
Student problems -- critical thinking ability	5	3	1
Student problems -- library skills	3		1
Student problems -- closed mindedness	4	4	1
Student problems -- grade consciousness	3		1
Student problems -- inability to receive and follow instructions	10		2
Student problems -- related to veterans	3	2	1
Student -- miscellaneous	4	8	1
Faculty concern -- class size, individual learning levels and facilities	11	8	2
Faculty concern -- course development difficulties	3		1
Miscellaneous	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	366	96	79.2

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to gather information related to curricular needs of faculty in selected Alabama Community-Junior Colleges for possible continuing education program development. Two categories of information were gathered. The first, general in nature, indicated background information about faculty, e.g. degree held and interest in continuing education. The second category gathered information related to selected areas for curriculum development and courses desired for personal development of faculty surveyed.

This study had certain intentional limits. It was intended to provide data for use in possible development of continuing education programs designed to assist faculty of public community-junior colleges in Alabama. This study was not intended to recommend a formal program of study for community-junior college faculty.

Data were collected by use of an eight item questionnaire. The eight items were divided to obtain two categories of information. Data, for the first category

of information, were gathered by items one through five. These five items gathered information from faculty regarding (1) degree held, (2) interest in continuing education, (3) distance faculty were willing to travel to attend classes, (4) preferred time for class meetings, and (5) the need for internships for prospective community-junior college faculty.

The second category of information was gathered using questionnaire item six through eight. Response to item six indicated need felt by faculty responding for selected courses. Inference from responses to the open-ended statement of item seven indicated courses needed by faculty to assist them in dealing with student problems. Data gathered in response to item eight indicated courses needed by faculty for personal development.

The sample for this study was established in two steps. Seven community-junior colleges were selected randomly, using Pi as the random table. The faculty from these schools constituted the sample of those persons willing to respond to the questionnaire. The sample was constituted of 288 faculty respondents.

Data for all questionnaire items, except item seven, were analyzed using programs included in the

Behavioral Sciences Statistics Program Library available at the University of Alabama. Items one through six and item eight were subjected to an item analysis program (spec07). Items six and eight were, also, subjected to a discriminate analysis program (corr20). Data for item seven were subjected to critical incident analysis.

Conclusions

The first category of information indicated the following background data regarding faculty responding to this study. The majority of the faculty (77 per cent) held master's degrees. They (87 per cent) were interested in continuing their education. They (47 per cent) preferred that continuing education classes be offered between 3 to 5 p.m. on weekdays. The faculty (87 per cent) responding were willing to drive less than 100 miles round trip to attend class. The faculty (47 per cent) did not view the internship for prospective community-junior college faculty as a great need.

The second category of information indicated faculty need for development of certain curricula to improve their teaching. First, faculty were interested in improving the content (subject matter) of their teaching. Second, they indicated a need for help with

instructional methods, including experiential or alternate modes of learning. Third, they were interested in learning more about remedial techniques and inter-personal skills.

The second category of information, also, revealed faculty needs for assistance in dealing with student problems. There were four needs for faculty development inferred from faculty perceptions of student problems. The four needs were: (1) giving remedial and developmental assistance to students, (2) giving students guidance in setting goals and course planning, (3) understanding the student problems of motivation, and (4) self-discipline.

Recommendations

This study has resulted in two types of recommendations. First, there are practical recommendations suggesting actions which could be taken in response to the findings of this study. Second, there are recommendations for further study which were beyond the perimeters of this study.

Practical Recommendations

The first recommendation suggests the establishment of continuing education opportunity for faculty of community-junior colleges in Alabama. This recommendation was based on the high percentage (87 per cent) of faculty

respondents who indicated an interest in such an opportunity.

A second recommendation suggests that a network of continuing education centers be established. Faculty were interested in traveling a short distance (less than 100 miles round trip) and in attending classes from 3 to 5 p.m. The community-junior colleges are distributed in such a way that there is not one location which would meet these limits. The solution then would be several strategic locations. To establish this network in the most efficient manner calls for some cooperative planning by the University of Alabama and Auburn University.

The fourth recommendation is that curriculum areas determined as needed by this study be considered in design and development of possible programs of study. The areas indicated by the faculty respondents were:

1. improving content (subject matter)
2. instructional methods
3. experiential or alternate modes of learning
4. remedial techniques
5. interpersonal skills
6. giving guidance to students in setting goals and course planning
7. understanding student problems of motivation and self-discipline.

Recommendations for Further Study

The development of opportunities for community-junior college faculty will involve both community-junior colleges and state universities. The role each of these institutions have in development of continuing education at the graduate level merits study. These institutions become involved through the faculty members interested in continuing their education. The expectations of community-junior colleges for faculty with improved teaching skills should be juxtapositioned with limitations placed by university requirements, e.g. residence requirements, on persons seeking to enroll in programs of study.

The conflict between the Alabama Education Association and the Alabama State Department of Education and its effect on continuing education opportunities for community-junior college faculty merits study. The Alabama Education Association represents faculty members and their interests. The State Department of Education ultimately decides what is required for employment of faculty by community-junior colleges.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

We would like your opinion about the needs of persons associated with junior and community colleges. Please answer the following questions:

1. What is your highest earned degree? BA ___ MA ___ EdS ___ Doc ___ Other (please specify) ___ Number of graduate hours beyond last degree ___
2. Would you be interested in continuing your education? Yes ___ No ___
3. Round-trip distance you are willing to travel to do so? (Please circle)
25 miles 50 miles 100 miles 150 miles 200 miles
4. When would you prefer courses to be offered? evening (3-5 p.m.) ___ night (6-9 p.m.) ___ weekend ___ other _____
5. Would you recommend an internship (or practice teaching) for persons planning to teach or administer in junior and community colleges?
Yes ___ No ___ Undecided ___
6. How much need do you feel for specific programs in the following areas: (please answer by circling the number which best reflects your feelings.)

	NO NEED	SOME NEED	GREAT NEED
Instructional methods	1	2	3
Subject matter, cognate areas, teaching field	1	2	3
Research skills	1	2	3
Curriculum change, innovation, development	1	2	3
Interpersonal skills (understanding junior college clientele)	1	2	3
Remedial techniques (communication skills, math)	1	2	3
7. (Please finish the following sentence.) The problem(s) I encounter most often with students is (are)
 - A. _____
 - _____
 - _____
 - B. _____
 - _____
 - _____
8. I feel the most need for personal development in: (Please answer by circling the number which best reflects your feelings.)

	NO NEED	SOME NEED	GREAT NEED
Showing strong interest in the student	1	2	3
Content, being knowledgeable in broad areas	1	2	3
Use of effective interpersonal skills	1	2	3
Being flexible in evaluating ideas and adjusting	1	2	3
Using experiential or alternate modes of learning	1	2	3
Other (please be specific) _____	1	2	3

My present position is: (Please check appropriate space.) Administrator ___ Faculty ___

NAME _____ (optional) _____ COLLEGE, EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION OR AGENCY _____

Thank you for helping us in this study.

Curriculum Graduate Seminar
College of Education
University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa

APPENDIX BLETTER TO PRESIDENTS

Dear

We are presently making a study of junior and community colleges to determine needs for further professional growth as felt by faculty members. To do this we have selected several of our state's junior and community colleges in hopes that their full-time faculty will share their insights by responding to the questionnaire enclosed.

We are asking you to:

1. Distribute the questionnaire to your full-time faculty.
(They may return the individual questionnaire in a sealed envelope to you.)
2. After collecting all the questionnaires you can mail them back in the large enclosed stamped and self-addressed envelope by Tuesday, November 18.
3. Please complete one of the questionnaires yourself.

I sincerely appreciate your efforts in this venture which we believe will be mutually advantageous.

Sincerely,

Sam Leles, Professor of Curriculum
College of Education

APPENDIX CINSTRUCTIONS FOR CRITICAL INCIDENT ANALYSES
OF FACULTY RESPONSES

The following are the categories for faculty responses (N= 462) to the open ended question, "The problem(s) I encounter most often with students is (are) . . .?"

The responses have been gathered in the following categories. Please try to place all responses in one of the following categories.

1. The need for improved basic communication (reading and writing) and science (math and other science) skills
2. Responsibility and self-discipline as seen in study habits
3. Lack of background preparation and need for remedial work (general statements)
4. Motivation (interest and initiative)
5. Apathy (laziness)
6. Student personnel problems -- working
7. Student personnel problems -- personal problems
8. Student personnel problems -- goal setting and course planning
9. Student problems -- absenteeism
10. Student problems -- critical thinking ability

11. Student problems -- library skills
12. Student problems -- closed mindedness
13. Student problems -- grade consciousness
14. Student problems -- inability to receive and follow instructions
15. Student problems -- related to veterans
16. Student -- miscellaneous
17. Faculty concern -- class size, individual learning levels and facilities
18. Faculty concern -- course development difficulties
19. Miscellaneous

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
1973 Community and Junior College Directory. Wash-
ington, D. C.: American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges, 1973.
- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
1976 Community, Junior and Technical College
Directory. Washington, D. C.: American Associa-
tion of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.
- American Association of Junior Colleges. Preparing Two-
Year College Teachers for the 1970's: Report of a
Conference. Washington, D. C.: 1969. (ERIC
Document Reproduction Service No. ED 034 516)
- American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
Community College Faculty Development. Washing-
ton, D. C.: 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction
Service No. ED 081 411)
- Auburn University. The Graduate School Bulletin: 1976
- 1977. Auburn, Alabama: Auburn University, 1976.
- Barker, Jr., Harry R. Behavioral Sciences Statistics
Program Library. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: The Univer-
sity of Alabama, 1973.

- Brawer, Florence B. Community colleges: selecting and training new teachers. Change, October 1973, 5 (8), 56-57, 63.
- Brunner, Ken August. Historical development of the junior college philosophy. Junior College Journal, April 1970, 40 (7), 30-34).
- Burgess, William E. (ed. dir.) The College Blue Book -- U. S. Colleges: Narrative Descriptions (15th ed.) New York: MacMillan, 1975.
- Chronister, Jay L. In-Service Training for Two-Year College Faculty and Staff: The Role of Graduate Institutions. Charlottesville, Virginia: Virginia University, School of Education, August 1970.
- Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Cohen, Arthur M., Brawer, Florence B. & Lombardi, John. A Constant Variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.
- Cohen, Arthur. Teacher preparation: rationale and practice. Junior College Journal, May 1967, 37, 21-25.
- Cohen, Arthur M. Toward a Professional Faculty. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1973.
- Dolan, F. H. The preparation of junior college teachers. Junior College Journal, February 1952, 22, 329-336.

- Fallows, Marjorie R. Goodbye, Pygmalion. Change,
March 1975, 7 (2), 52-53.
- Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and
Problems. Washington, D. C.: American Association
of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Gilbert, Marion L. A Study of Community College
Teacher-Training Programs in Selected Universities,
Washington, D. C.: 1971. (ERIC Document Repro-
duction Service No. ED 104 491)
- Gleazer, Edmund, Jr. (ed.) American Junior Colleges
(8th ed.) Washington, D. C.: American Council
on Education, 1971.
- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. Project Focus: A Forecast
Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-
Hill, 1973.
- Gordon, Shirley B. & Whitefield, Raymond P. A Formula
for Teacher Preparation. Washington, D. C.: 1968.
(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 016
488)
- Hurlburt, Allen S. The Preparation and Characteristics
of Junior College Teachers. Washington, D. C.:
1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED
018 179)
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College.
San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

- National Advisory Council On Education Professions Development. People for the People's College: Community-Junior College Staff Development. Priorities for the 70's. Washington, D. C.: 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 061 942)
- Pass, George B. Implications of the role of the junior college teacher for programs of pre-service and in-service education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968.
- Podolsky, Arthur & Smith, Carolyn R. Education Directory -- Colleges and Universities 1975-76, Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1976.
- Preus, Paul K. An Analysis of Educational Status, Needs, and Aspirations of Personnel in Alabama Junior Colleges. Auburn: 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 050 727)