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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Justification of Study

The community college is the fastest growing educational institution in the United States today. It is part of "a $10-billion-a-year national industry," for two-year colleges now have an annual enrollment of approximately 11.5 million students, full-time and part-time, in credit and non-credit courses.¹ Of the more than 1200 two-year institutions in 1981, over 900 were public community/junior colleges.² That same year these institutions enrolled more than 50 percent of all first- and second-year college students.³ By fall of 1983, that figure had increased to 60 percent.⁴

In spite of the community college's size and importance in higher education, its advocates have been perturbed for many years by what they perceive to be a major institutional problem: an unclear or weak identity with the general public, with those in higher education, and with

¹ "Notes on...Community Colleges," CHE, September 8, 1982, p. 3.
its own faculty members.\textsuperscript{5} The general public is confused about the nature of the community college and its role in higher education. Almost half the adults surveyed in a 1981 Gallup poll thought the "primary function" of the community college was to provide academic (transfer) education.\textsuperscript{6} Their perception was in sharp contrast to the "primary


function" indicated by enrollment patterns: in 1981 almost two-thirds of community college students were enrolled in occupational-technical programs, not academic (transfer) ones. Like the general public, those within higher education often know little about the community college and sometimes care even less, regarding it as "not a . . . 'real' college" or as an "overblown high school and trade school." Perhaps most disturbing of all, even some community college faculty and staff are unaware of or are uncommitted to the articulated goals of the institution. Indeed, as these goals have proliferated to the point where

7 Parnell, Some Tough Questions, p. 18.


they now encompass almost every kind of program and type of student, some community college faculty have reacted "first with dismay, then with apathy or even antagonism."

Lack of a clearcut institutional identity probably worked to the advantage of the community college during the 1950s and 1960s when this institution was beginning its rise to prominence on the education horizon. Described in 1947 by the President's Commission on Higher Education as an institution whose "purpose" was to provide "educational service to the entire community," the community college was able to use this rubric as a rationale for offering any course or program desired by the community in which it was located. In these efforts the community college was aided by its position as a new educational institution unhampered by long-held public conceptions of its appropriate purposes and activities. Another aid was a period of national economic prosperity during which abundant funding was available for the community college to offer almost anything to anybody. During this time the community college found itself being all things to all people as it offered diverse kinds of educational services to the public.

Today's economic conditions, however, no longer are so conducive to such programmatic growth and development. Taxpayers are reluctant

12 Cohen and Brawer, The American Community College, p. 68.

to pay for duplication of educational services, and legislators support state financing formulas which simply do not permit the kind and level of program expansion desired by some leaders of the community college.14

During the present economic period, the lack of a strong institutional identity may hamper the community college financially. If the general public does not understand the institution's missions and goals, it may be less willing to support the community college through taxes and private contributions. If prospective students do not perceive the distinctive strengths of the community college, they may be reluctant to attend it. If other educators do not comprehend the role of the community college in higher education, they may not encourage public support of or student attendance at the institution. Finally and most important, if legislators do not understand what the community college is and how it differs from other colleges, they may not provide the funding necessary for the institution to maintain its distinctive role in public education.15

The community college is not the only educational institution whose


financial future may be affected by its lack of a strong identity. Thelin argues that "private colleges . . . may face attrition if they do not succeed in transmitting a special identity to students and prospective applicants." In particular, "the invisible colleges," small (less than a thousand students), private institutions having "moderately selective or unselective admissions policies," face severe financial difficulties because of their unclear image with prospective students. Public land-grant universities are also searching for their special identity in today's society and seeking ways to strengthen their funding base through stronger external relations. However, of all the public educational institutions, the community college may be the most likely to suffer from the fiscal conservatism of today's taxpayers and legislators since this institution is the newest and least well-known by the general public and the "decision makers."

This fiscal conservatism may well be the force which brings about a stronger identity for the community college. In deference to reluctant


taxpayers and the "restrictive financing" imposed by most state funding policies, the community college will have to choose certain missions over others. In so doing, it will be clarifying its institutional identity as it declares which missions it will undertake and which ones it will not.

In choosing certain missions over others, the community college may move in several possible institutional directions, including the following:

1. Comprehensive Community College - The institution may continue in its present course as a comprehensive institution, giving equal emphasis to academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service program.

2. Academically Oriented Two-Year College - The institution may become a more academically oriented two-year college, committing most of its resources to its degree-granting programs in both academic (transfer) and occupational-technical education while minimizing community service activities. In addition, it would have a general education core curriculum required of all students.

3. Community-Based Learning Center - The institution may evolve into a community-based learning center, which emphasizes lifelong learning and the part-time, adult learner, deemphasizes the formal structure of credit hours and courses, and serves as a "nexus" or center of a community learning network where the student is linked up with someone or

---

someplace that can teach him what he wants to know.  

This last direction is the one advocated by Edmund Gleazer, president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) for twenty-three years and acknowledged as "the leading spokesman of the community college movement." Gleazer has delineated this vision of the community college in numerous articles and books, but especially in his most recent book, *The Community College: Values, Vision, and Vitality*. Many community college presidents also support this vision and consequently want "public support . . . for virtually any educational activity."

A fourth direction has also been projected for the community college: *Postsecondary Occupational Training Center*. Such an institution would concentrate upon occupational training, often in cooperation with industrial establishments, and have very limited offerings in the humanities and social and natural sciences.

In one sense, the community college has been moving in this direction since the last decade. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, the majority of community college students enrolled in academic (transfer) programs.

---


For example, in 1965, 87 percent of the students were enrolled in the liberal arts. During this period the community college, although offering a comprehensive program of academic, occupational-technical, and community service activities and/or courses, was in many ways like a junior college, an institution whose primary academic purpose is to prepare students for four-year or senior institutions. However, during the 1970s curricular enrollment patterns began to shift as students began to question the value of liberal arts education and as the job market began to tighten except for people trained in the new technologies.\textsuperscript{26} Enrollment in occupational-technical programs increased dramatically so that in the fall of 1981, 63 percent of the students enrolled for credit in community colleges were enrolled in occupational-technical programs.\textsuperscript{27} To many administrators and faculty, this enrollment trend is of great concern. They fear continued growth in occupational-technical programs will cause the community college to become a technical institute or postsecondary occupational training center rather than what it presently is in most states: a comprehensive, educational institution which offers a balanced curriculum with programs in academic (transfer) education, occupational-technical education, and community service.\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{27} Parnell, \textit{Some Tough Questions}, p. 18

\textsuperscript{28} John J. Connolly, "Community Colleges in the 1980s," \textit{Educational}
The specific institutional direction chosen by the nation's community colleges will be determined by a number of factors, with economic considerations predominating. Another significant factor will be the role a particular state wants its community colleges to play in the state's overall system of higher education. For example, in Virginia a system of community colleges was established by the state in 1966 to extend educational opportunities for postsecondary education. Financed almost entirely by the state, the twenty-three community colleges known as the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) offer programs in three major areas: academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service. Although the colleges are comprehensive in their program offerings, their "principal emphasis . . . is occupational-technical education." Presently in Virginia there seems to be increasing pressure to further emphasize the occupational-technical program component, possibly at the expense of the academic (transfer) program. The November 23, 1982, issue of the Times-Herald reported that a proposal has been made to change the tuition structure at the state's community colleges. Virginia residents attending a community college pay tuition

(continuation)

Record (Fall 1981), p. 39.


equivalent to 20 percent of the cost of their college instruction. The plan being proposed by the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia, the coordinating body for all public higher education in Virginia, would change this rate so that students in the academic (transfer) programs would pay 25 percent while students in occupational-technical programs would still pay only 20 percent. Adoption of this plan by Virginia's General Assembly might seem to indicate that the state government wants Virginia's community colleges to move in the institutional direction of Postsecondary Occupational Training Centers.

Another indication that the state wants Virginia's community colleges to increase their emphasis on the occupational-technical program component may be the appointment of the System's latest chancellor, Dr. Johnas Hockaday. Appointed in July 1983, Hockaday is a strong advocate of "high technology education and retraining for the unemployed." However, he also believes that "community colleges should stay comprehensive in their nature. We can do other things while retraining."  

As part of a state system, Virginia's community colleges must follow the direction pointed out to them by the state. However, those deciding the direction would do well to consider a number of factors before making this decision. One such factor is faculty preferences for present and proposed institutional directions.

32 "More High-Tech Training Predicted," The Daily Press Virginia
Purpose

The present study was designed to determine VCCS faculty preferences for the four possible institutional directions outlined in this chapter and to explore possible relationships between specific faculty characteristics and faculty preferences for these institutional directions. Also investigated were VCCS faculty's perceptions of institutional and System-wide commitment of resources to program areas and perceptions of their own influence in determining institutional and System directions. The results of this study will be used to clarify whether or not community college faculty support the broad institutional directions envisioned by community college leaders in their efforts to instill a strong identity for this institution.

Statement of Problem

(1) What are the preferences of VCCS faculty for the institutional directions of Academically Oriented Two-Year College, Community-Based Learning Center, Comprehensive Community College, and Postsecondary Occupational Training Center? and (2) What faculty characteristics affect faculty preferences for each of the institutional directions?

Theoretical Rationale

The importance of faculty support for an institution's basic mission or choice of direction is made clear in Burton Clark's work on institutional...
or "organizational saga."

Developing his concept of organizational saga from his research on the histories of three private colleges (Reed, Antioch, and Swarthmore), Clark determined that over the years an institution develops a saga, "a unified set of publically expressed beliefs about the formal group that (a) is rooted in history, (b) claims unique accomplishment, and (c) is held with sentiment by the group." In other words, a formal group or organization develops a sort of "embellished" history which becomes the group's "definition" of the institution, "a definition full of pride and identity" for the institution's members.

A saga is developed in two stages: initiation and fulfillment. The initiation stage requires a leader with "a strong purpose" who can inspire others with his vision of the future. This leader must then find an appropriate setting for the implementation of his vision. "A setting that is open, or can be opened, to a special effort" is best. Such a setting is typically found in an "autonomous new organization," one "in a crisis or decay," or a stable one simply ready for change.

Not only does the leader need an appropriate setting, he also needs the support of key elements in the organization if the saga is to attain

---


34 Clark, p. 100.

35 Clark, p. 99.

36 Clark, pp. 102-3.
fulfillment and endure. In an educational organization, these key elements are the following:

1. the personnel or senior faculty
2. the program or any highly distinctive or unique practices of the college, such as a special grading system
3. the social base or those people outside of the institution who are "devoted" to it, people such as the alumni
4. the student subculture or student body
5. the imagery of the saga or "ways of sharing memory and symbolizing the institution" such as through special ceremonies or traditions.37

Of these five elements, three are "groups of believers" -- the senior faculty, the alumni, and the students. According to Clark, the senior faculty or personnel are the most important element, for these people are the ones who must "become committed" to the vision of their educational leader if it is to endure. Just how important their support is becomes clear when Clark asserts: "When they are hostile to a new idea, its attenuation is likely; when they are passive, its success is weak; and when they are devoted to it, a saga is probable."38 Without true faculty support a new direction for an institution would have little chance of success, while an existing direction might flounder because faculty are not genuinely committed to it.

37 Clark, pp. 104-7.
Although Clark's concept of institutional saga derived from his study of individual, private educational institutions, it may provide a conceptual lens through which to view a specific type of educational institution, such as the community college. Certainly leaders within the community college have acknowledged the importance of at least one factor in Clark's theory of institutional saga: faculty commitment to the goals of their institution. In the 1960s Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson stated, "Community colleges must have a faculty of well-qualified teachers who understand the place and functions of community colleges and who are dedicated to this type of education." Commenting in the early 1970s about an unpublished study which indicated a lack of support by community college personnel for "many of the less traditional functions of the comprehensive community college," Medsker said:

It may be, of course, that a study of attitudes in any type of educational institution would reveal no greater degree of harmony than was indicated by the study of community colleges. But since the functions, programs, and services of the community college are so diverse, it is particularly essential that those who work in it accept the goals which society in general sees for the institution . . . . In fact, one finds it difficult to believe that the community college can realize its potential unless there is a

---

38 Clark, pp. 104-106.
39 Leslie, p. 50.
40 Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, p. 141.
41 Medsker, p. 139.
complete commitment on the part of the staff
to a new and different type of institution...\textsuperscript{42}

Gleazer expressed a similar viewpoint when he said:

Ultimately the goals of the institution are
translated in the classrooms, and shops, and
laboratories... The faculty of the community
college in the future, by their very perceptions
of what the college should do and be, will have
a great deal to do with what that college
becomes. Statements of purpose by the board
and proclamations -- no matter how inspirational
-- by the president about the work of the college
will be of little effect unless shared by the people
who participate most intimately in the learning
situation.\textsuperscript{43}

Although ignoring the effect that other groups such as students and alumni
can have upon the future of an educational institution, Gleazer's words
are typical of those within the community college who state that faculty
commitment to their institution's stated purposes is vital if the institution
is to achieve these purposes.

In their study of the two-year college instructor, Cohen and Brawer
not only acknowledge the centrality of faculty to an educational
institution\textsuperscript{44} but also link faculty awareness of and commitment to
institutional goals with image -- both self and collective. Because the
community college "has shifted roles repeatedly during and markedly

\textsuperscript{42} Medsker, p. 141.

\textsuperscript{43} Edmund J. Gleazer, "To Deliver on the Promise - The Central
Issue," \textit{A Day at Santa Fe} (Gainesville: Santa Fe Junior College, 1971),
p. 4.

\textsuperscript{44} Cohen and Brawer, \textit{The Two-Year College Instructor Today}, p. x.
during the tenure of many currently practicing instructors," faculty are no longer sure of their institution's purposes nor of their own roles in the institution. "Consequently the group as a whole maintains an indistinct self-image and projects an unclear collective picture to outsiders."^45

Nunis and Rossone also link faculty support of institutional purposes to the image or identity of the community college. Questioning whether faculty of academic (transfer) subjects and faculty of occupational-technical subjects could share the same perspective about "the multiple purposes" of the community/junior college, they concluded that faculty members' conflicting viewpoints about purposes could only "contribute to the institution's confused state of identity."^46

Thus the issues of institutional identity and faculty support of institutional missions and directions become intertwined. If those within the institution, especially those defined as being "at the core"^47 of it, are unclear about their role within the institution as well as their institution's role in higher education, how then can the institution itself project a clear image or identity to "outsiders" -- the general public, prospective students and the state leaders who determine a public institution's financing?

^45 Cohen and Brawer, The Two-Year College Instructor Today, p. 40.


^47 Cohen and Brawer, The Two-Year College Instructor Today, p. x.
Therefore, those who are concerned about the lack of a strong identity for the community college should concern themselves with faculty attitudes toward proposed directions for the community college, since faculty support for a given direction seems vital for a strong institutional identity. For example, although many community college leaders support Gleazer's vision of the community college as a community-based learning center emphasizing lifelong learning and community services, at least one study shows faculty support for certain aspects of this vision is less than enthusiastic. Thus, efforts by national community college leaders to move the community college in this direction may well be doomed to failure if community college faculty do not support such a move.

In examining faculty attitudes towards institutional missions, present and proposed, of the community college, one finds that certain faculty characteristics seem to affect faculty support for these missions. For example, Leslie studied the acceptance of the community college philosophy among faculty members of two-year institutions and found that faculty without the PhD were more accepting of community service goals and the community college philosophy than were faculty with the PhD. He also found that younger faculty and vocational-technical faculty were more likely to support the community college philosophy than were older faculty and faculty in the academic (transfer) programs. Other


49 Leslie, p. 61.
studies have indicated that faculty in academic (transfer) programs can be less understanding about the background of community college students or hostile toward vocational-technical education or fearful that the community college is becoming a technical school or simply desirous of a more academic orientation in the institution. Furthermore, some of the faculty who have been teaching in the community college since the 1950s or early 1960s when it was primarily enrolling transfer-level students have trouble accepting the enrollment shifts to occupational-technical programs. Thus the variables of age, highest academic degree held, primary program area in which teaching, and length of time teaching in the community college seem to be related to certain faculty attitudes toward institutional directions. It is possible that other faculty characteristics such as previous teaching experience in different kinds of educational institutions may also have a bearing upon faculty preferences for certain institutional directions.

---


52 Connolly, p. 39.


54 Cohen and Brawer, The Two-Year College Instructor Today, p. 103; Connolly, p. 39.
In examining the relationship of faculty characteristics to preferences for certain institutional directions for the community college, one must be aware of the great demographic diversity of community college faculty. For example, they are far more apt to vary among themselves in academic backgrounds and professional experiences than are faculty in a four-year college or university. While almost all faculty at a four-year institution have advanced study beyond the master's degree and many possess the doctorate, the academic background of community college faculty is far more varied. While most of the faculty possess a master's degree, some faculty in the occupational-technical programs may possess only an associate or a bachelor's degree. Doctoral degrees are the exception rather than the rule. The professional experiences of community college faculty prior to their teaching at the community college also vary widely. Community college faculty may have had previous teaching experience in secondary schools, in vocational-technical or proprietary schools, or in senior institutions. Community college faculty in some of the occupational-technical programs may have had work experience in their teaching field. For example, an instructor of air conditioning repair may have worked as an air conditioning repair man awhile before joining the community college as a faculty member.

Such a diverse group of faculty may well hold diverse opinions about the future of the educational institution in which they teach. As decision

55 Cohen and Brawer, The American Community College, p. 66.
makers at either the state or local level determine the future institutional
direction for community colleges within their domain, it is important for
them to be aware of faculty opinions about proposed directions. For
example, in Virginia the General Assembly should become cognizant of
the degree to which VCCS faculty support the Assembly's apparent efforts
to identify Virginia's community colleges primarily with occupational-
technical education. Faculty who desire another identity for the VCCS
will not be supportive of the Assembly's efforts nor of the possible effect
of these efforts -- the turning of the Virginia's comprehensive community
colleges into institutions which are primarily postsecondary occupational
training centers. A lack of unified faculty commitment to the intended
or actual direction of the VCCS may adversely affect the identity of
the community college in Virginia: it may appear to outsiders (the
general public, prospective students, and state decision makers, including
the legislature) as an institution fuzzy in focus and/or torn by internal
dissension.

In addition, those who determine the institutional direction of
Virginia's community colleges may find it useful to learn of possible
relationships between some specific faculty characteristics and faculty
members' preferences for institutional directions for the VCCS.
Information about such relationships may be useful in future hiring
decisions.56 For example, if the VCCS wishes to move in the direction

56 Eaton, p. 21
of postsecondary occupational training center, it may find it advisable to hire faculty with the characteristics related to support of this direction.

Definition of Terms

In this study the terms below shall be defined as follows:

Institutional Direction: The intended goal toward which the VCCS (representing the institution of the community college in Virginia) is moving. For example, if one says that the VCCS is moving in the institutional direction of postsecondary occupational training center, then one is saying the VCCS's intended institutional goal is for Virginia's community colleges to become primarily postsecondary occupational training centers.

Comprehensive Community College, Academically Oriented Two-Year College, Community-Based Learning Center, and Post-secondary Occupational Training Center are defined as stated on pages fourteen and fifteen.

Institutional Identity: The dominant image/impression/understanding held about an institution by its members and the general public.

General Hypothesis

The heterogeneity of VCCS faculty negatively affects their unanimity for any one institutional direction desired by national and state community college leaders.

Sample and Data Gathering Procedures

The population for this study was all full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS. For the 1982-83 academic year, the number was 1913. To
ensure a representative sample size at the .05 percent confidence level. 57 Of these faculty were systematically selected for the study after first being stratified along the variable of institutional size. Those selected for the sample received a survey questionnaire, primarily asking them to rank order their preferences for the four institutional directions discussed in this chapter and requesting information about specified faculty characteristics.

Organization of Study

In this chapter a general introduction to the identity problem of the community college and to the relationship of faculty to this problem has been presented. The purpose of the study, statement of the problem, general hypothesis, definitions of terms, and sample and data gathering procedures have also been included. In Chapter 2 the relevant literature is reviewed. Procedures used to gather the data are described in Chapter 3. Data analysis is provided in Chapter 4. Finally, in Chapter 5 a summary of the study, conclusions, and implications for future research are provided.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Summary of Rationale

Burton Clark's work on organizational saga indicates the importance of faculty support for an institution's goals. Such support is vital, not only for its positive effect upon institutional morale, but also for its effect upon institutional identity. Faculty support of goals set by the institution's leader(s) is essential to the development of a strong organizational saga, which then becomes a "definition" of the institution, and "a definition full of pride and identity"\(^1\) for the institution's members. The creation of an organizational saga helps define or clarify not only the "institutional self-image" but also the "public image," both of which help comprise an institution's identity.\(^2\)

Relationship to Problem

A strong institutional identity often aids an institution in its fund raising, both with the public and with legislators. Hence, leaders within the community college have long been concerned about their institution's lack of identity. Ironically, the community college may finally achieve in the 1980s what it has so long desired -- a clearer institutional identity


\(^2\) Clark, p. 107.
-- as financial concerns force individual colleges and state systems to clarify institutional identity by choosing certain missions over others. For example, if a community college chooses to emphasize its academic (transfer) mission over its occupational-technical, the institution will move in the direction of becoming an academically oriented two-year college. As the community college moves in this direction, it may also reduce or even eliminate its community service mission. In so doing, the institution will be clarifying its identity: it will no longer appear as an institution which does anything and everything but will become an institution which primarily prepares students to transfer to senior academic institutions.

Actually, it is unlikely that the community college will move in this specific institutional direction. Nationally the community college seems to be moving in the direction of the postsecondary occupational training center as enrollment in its occupational-technical programs continues to mount. Whereas in the 1950s and 1960s, the community college primarily offered academic (transfer) programs and prepared students to transfer to four-year colleges and universities, in the 1980s the community college offers more occupational-technical programs than academic and prepares the majority of its students for jobs in occupational-technical fields. In so doing, it is in danger of losing its comprehensive nature and becoming simply a postsecondary occupational training center.

Some states seem more inclined to move their community colleges in this direction than do others. In Virginia the state's coordinating body for all of Virginia's public higher education, the State Council of Higher
Education in Virginia (SCHEV), has developed at the urging of the General Assembly a tuition plan which encourages the VCCS to increase enrollment in its occupational-technical programs. According to the proposed plan, the state will cover a greater share of the cost of instruction in occupational-technical programs than in academic programs. Request of such a plan by the General Assembly would seem to indicate a desire on its part that Virginia's system of community colleges become primarily postsecondary occupational training centers.

Before members of the General Assembly vote upon this plan, they would do well to consider first whether or not the faculty in Virginia's community colleges support such a move. Both Clark's work on organizational saga and the opinions of prominent leaders of the community college movement make clear the importance of faculty commitment to the goals of the community college. Such commitment is important not only for faculty morale but also for the students themselves. If a large portion of the faculty is unsympathetic to occupational-technical education yet finds itself primarily teaching students enrolled in these courses, the faculty may fail to understand these students' educational needs or may treat these students with indifference or even contempt.\(^3\) In addition lack of faculty commitment

may be a significant factor in the long standing problem of the community college — its lack of identity as an educational institution. Its blurred identity may be a significant factor contributing to possible funding problems for the community college as economic conditions in the 1980s continue to spell cutbacks and belt tightening for all institutions of higher education.

**Summary of Relevant Literature**

*Identity or image of the community college.* Although the "identity problem" of the community college has been widely discussed in writings about the community college, comments on this topic seem based more on casual observation and "gut-level feelings" than on empirical research. What little research that has been conducted tends to concern itself primarily with the various images specific groups have of the community college.

The majority of research has concentrated upon the image(s) of one specific community college, but occasionally a research study has treated the issue of community college image on a broader scale. Salisbury studied both professional and popular American periodicals for the years 1937 to 1967 to trace the development of the community junior college's image in the United States during this time span. He found that the image of the community college began to shift from that of an institution with "an historically conventional college preparatory role" to one with "more comprehensive, diffuse, and multiple roles in the field of
Eventually its "projected gross image . . . was that of the citadel of democratic education."  

Salisbury was not the only writer to examine the media in his study of community college images. Canavit studied news articles in both local and state papers to analyze the "image projection and community perceptions" of one community college. However, the majority of research on this topic has relied upon the survey to elicit the image perceptions of the following groups: the general public, potential students, enrolled students, administration, or faculty. The

---


5 Salisbury, p. 78.


11 Roger Hardy Averette, "The Image of Cape Fear Technical Institute as Perceived by Selected Formal Leaders and Clientele," DAI,
perceptions surveyed always concerned a particular community college or possibly a state system of community colleges rather than perceptions about the community college as an institution.

Nagel also used the survey to solicit nationally opinions of community junior college presidents about their local institutional image. Responses indicated the important role faculty are believed to play in the public perception of the community college, for the presidents ranked faculty relationships with students as the second most important fact in the development of a local institutional image (student performance being the most important). However, since the response rate for the survey was less than fifty percent, the results of this study are questionable.¹²

Newfeldt used a different approach than the survey to focus upon the image of the community college. Drawing upon histories but also upon other reference works, he attempted to "describe and analyze conflicting images of the community junior college movement where possible."¹³ He concluded that both "practitioners and critics have projected" certain images, but "none are based solely on historical evidence. As such, they have functioned as much as normative and

(cont.)


attitudinal as they have as factual and descriptive statements of the institution's history.\textsuperscript{14}

Instead of focusing upon various image of the community college, Young selected to study a possible explanation for what he termed the institution's "identity crisis."\textsuperscript{15} First he surveyed directors of community college education in 108 senior institutions to discover "the ten leaders who . . . had had the greatest impact on the formulation and development of the community college identity since 1963.\textsuperscript{16} He then analyzed the writings of these ten leaders to determine "their concerns about the basic values of the community college.\textsuperscript{17} In their writings Young found "an egalitarian ideal" of the community college identity which often conflicted with the 'elitist' model . . . implicit in their descriptions of many attitudes and practices in the community college.\textsuperscript{18} Young's study led him to conclude: "The real community college is located somewhere between the two models . . . \textsuperscript{19}

Not all who write about the community college's images or its identity problem do so from a research perspective. Many write from

\textsuperscript{14} Newfeldt, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{16} Young, p. 334.
\textsuperscript{17} Young, p. 334.
\textsuperscript{18} Young, p. 335.
\textsuperscript{19} Young, p. 339.
the vantage point of casual observation and usually concentrate upon one of three aspects of the community college's lack of identity. They either concern themselves with (1) the general public's and/or legislators' lack of understanding of this institution, (2) the institution's unclear identity within the educational system, or (3) the lack of faculty understanding and/or acceptance of certain community college goals. Almost uniformly these writers assume that lack of a clearcut identity is damaging to the community college.

Lack of public understanding has long been a concern of the community college. Edmund Gleazer, a prolific writer and major spokesman for the community college during the 1960s and 1970s, expressed his concern about this topic in an inspirational address to the 1957 convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges (which later became the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges). He urged the two-year schools to work together to achieve "public understanding and acceptance" of the two-year college since "many people know nothing, or next to nothing, or the wrong thing about the two-year college." Later that same year Gleazer again addressed the same issue, writing that "public acceptance of the community college


has been a major problem.\textsuperscript{22} He stressed the necessity for the general public to reach "a clearer understanding of the unique functions of this type of college."\textsuperscript{23} At the same time that Gleazer urged the necessity of greater public understanding of the community college, he was also aware that this understanding could not really be achieved until the community college clarified its own identity by defining its objectives:

We have felt keenly the need for wider public understanding and for growing support of a moral and financial nature. There is no finer way to promote understanding and consequent support than through a study of objectives which involves the constituencies of a college — teachers, administrators, students, board members, alumni, and citizens.\textsuperscript{24}

Another president of the AAJC was also concerned about the "public misunderstanding about the full scope and functions of the junior and community colleges."\textsuperscript{25} Basing his opinion on his observations and experience while president of the AAJC, Henry Littlefield attributed this problem to two "weaknesses:" a failure to tell the "story" of the community college "in the right way, at the right time, and to the right people" and "an overemphasis on the local characteristics of individual

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Edmund J. Gleazer, "It's Time to Ask Some Questions," JJCJ (November 1957), p. 124.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Gleazer, "It's Time," p. 124.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Edmund J. Gleazer, "The Junior College - Bigger! Better?", JJCJ (May 1958), p. 485.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Henry W. Littlefield, "On Increasing Understanding of Junior Colleges," JJCJ (December 1960), p. 181.
\end{itemize}
institutions." Later Littlefield specified what he judged to be the critical issues facing America's junior colleges. His major concern was that "a better image of these institutions may evolve. Anything that will contribute to increased public understanding of the true picture of the two-year institution is commendable." A junior college student, Carlos Moore, also expressed his concern about this institution's lack of a "favorable image in the minds of the public." He offered several suggestions for improving the image but felt that the student body was "the most important factor." People who have no other contact with the junior college than through a certain student will form their image by the accomplishment of that student. Moore concluded: "Ultimately, one of the best ways to advertise the junior college to the public and to establish a respectable image is to present the true facts because they alone portray the true image of the junior college."

Almost twenty years later writers about the community college were still concerned about the lack of public understanding but were also

26 Littlefield, p. 181.


29 Moore, p. 197.

30 Moore, p. 197.
troubled by the lack of understanding of legislators and others in the position to make decisions affecting the future of the community college. Yarrington, vice president of the AACJC in 1980, noted Gleazer's concern, expressed in his book *Values, Vision, and Vitality*, that state legislators do not understand "the kind of institutions community colleges need to become to serve individuals and communities well in the 1980s."\(^{31}\)

Yarrington stressed the seriousness of this problem: "It is in the states that the policy framework and the financial formulas are created . . ."If . . . state legislators and state officials do not understand what the institution should be doing for citizens and communities in the 1980s, we have a major problem."\(^{32}\) Parnell, the present president of the AACJC, also recognizes the need to "bring about better understanding particularly among the decision makers, if . . . (community colleges) expect to gain the kind of support that will allow . . . them to realize their full potential to contribute to the development of individuals and to the solution of our socioeconomic problems."\(^{33}\) Parnell is so convinced of the need for greater understanding of the community college that he has stated: "the most compelling force in my life is to try to clarify the image of the


\(^{32}\) Yarrington, p. 8.

American community college -- who we are, what we're up to, who we're serving."\textsuperscript{34}

Cosand has reiterated Parnell's concern about the public's lack of understanding of the community college:

It continues to be a fact that this distinctly American institution is not understood or properly respected nationally, and in far too many states and local communities. Such lack of understanding creates damaging and simplistic solutions to community college problems by external forces.\textsuperscript{35}

Although the leaders of the community college seem united in their perception that lack of understanding by the public and by "decision makers" is a major problem for the community college, the problem seemingly has not hurt the growth of the community college, at least until this decade. As Gleazer noted: "It is remarkable that an institution perceived by many to lack something in public understanding continues to represent the growth sector in American public education."\textsuperscript{36} However, as noted earlier, the economic conditions of the 1980s seem to promise restrictions ahead for the community college, including forced choice of programmatic missions.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} "New Priorities for Community Colleges," AAHE Bulletin (February 1982), p. 11.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Joseph Cosand, "Who Will Make the Decisions?", Community College Review, 10 No. 4 (Spring 1982), p. 27
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Edmund J. Gleazer, "So Far, So Good," CJCJ (May 1981), p. 13.
\end{itemize}
Lack of a clear identity within the educational system has also been a recurring concern of writers about the community college. During the late 1950s and early 1960s when the community college was just beginning its meteoric growth pattern, some spokesmen argued that the community college was indeed a distinct educational institution, "not just the penthouse for the high school nor the first two years of the senior institution," but "an identifiable educational experience with distinct qualities and characteristics." Medsker also saw the institution "as a new kind of college, integrated into the pattern of higher education, and offering board programs, valuable in themselves." Not everyone envisioned the institution in these terms. A common image of the community college during these years was that of "'glorified high school.'" Opposed to this image, Hagen, a faculty member at a four-year institution, argued for "the image of the junior college as a 'natural bridge between high school and university,'" contending the junior college should be "a full-fledged partner in the pursuit of higher learning." Basing his comments upon acquaintance with some junior college faculty and upon his own observations, Hagen was convinced that

---

40 Hagen, p. 307.
junior college faculty would experience "discontent and demoralization" if any other image prevailed.

At least two other professors at senior institutions also concerned themselves during this time with the community or junior college's educational identity. Nunis and Bossone traced the history of the junior college's search for an educational identity, attributing its identity problem to its early days when the junior college was "largely an educational institution dominated by the secondary schools and the secondary outlook" and controlled by local school boards. Not only would its lack of a "true educational identity" make the junior college unable "to fulfill all of its purposes with excellence," the lack might also affect the institution's staff which may not be "in agreement with the multiple purposes" of the institution.

Palinchak also attributed much of the community college's identity problem to its link with the secondary school. He also noted that because in some states the junior or community college is organized as a branch campus run by a four-year college or university, the junior

41 Hagen, p. 309.
43 Nunis and Bossone, p. 123.
44 Nunis and Bossone, p. 124.
college "is forced to prove itself to its senior partners without duplicating or becoming a four-year institution."\textsuperscript{46}

Writing from a vantage point of almost ten years later, Eaton, a community college president, stated the present "identity crisis"\textsuperscript{47} of the community college may stem partly from some recent data such as California's 1980 report on community college students and Breneman and Nelson's report on community college financing. Both of these paint a negative picture of the skills level of many community college students and document a low success rate for its graduates when they transfer to senior institutions. Drawing upon secondary sources and her own experience within community colleges, Eaton offered several suggestions for improvement of the community college, including a vision of the institution as one whose "unique and central function is instruction for effective and meaningful survival."\textsuperscript{48} Believing that an institution's faculty and staff are key ingredients in its success, she suggested hiring only "persons of quality and commitment" who would then receive in-service training to understand "the goals and present planning" as well as the "present institutional intent and direction"\textsuperscript{49} of their individual community college.

\textsuperscript{46} Palinchak, pp. 93-4.

\textsuperscript{47} Judith S. Eaton, "Judging Community Colleges: Look at Student Success," \textit{CJCJ} (September 1982), p. 16.

\textsuperscript{48} Eaton, p. 21.
A community college faculty member, Majors, used his experience as a history professor plus some limited research to present his perspective on the community college's lack of identity within the educational system. Less concerned with the reasons and more with the effects of this lack of identity, Majors claimed that community college faculty may well be "uninvited stepchildren" rather than "accepted members of the academic family."\(^{50}\) He asserted there is a "wide gulf of hostility"\(^ {51}\) between community colleges and senior institutions and a "lack of professional and intellectual commerce"\(^ {52}\) between faculty of these institutions. Such a lack is manifested in the activities of professional educational societies. For example, a check by Majors revealed that several major historical societies have no junior or community college people "in position of responsibility"\(^ {53}\) nor do the professional journals of these societies usually publish pieces by junior or community college faculty. During 1970-1975 less than one percent of the contents of three leading history journals was written by two-year faculty.\(^ {54}\) Although Majors drew all of his

\(^{49}\) Eaton, p. 21.

\(^{50}\) William R. Majors, "Community College Faculty: Unwanted Stepchildren or Accepted Members of the Academic Family?", \textit{The History Teacher} (August 1974), p. 575.

\(^{51}\) Majors, p. 578.

\(^{52}\) Majors, p. 579.

\(^{53}\) Majors, p. 579.

\(^{54}\) Majors, p. 579.
examples from the field of history, his criticism of senior faculty's attitude toward two-year college faculty, not only as manifested in professional relations but also in graduate programs which prepare two-year faculty and in articulation between institutions about courses and curricula, is applicable for faculty in all liberal arts fields.

Faculty understanding and acceptance of community college goals. Majors' complaints about senior faculty's failure to accept community college faculty on an equal basis is but one of the concerns of community college faculty. Other authors have also questioned the extent to which community college faculty understand, let alone accept and endorse, all the goals of their institution.

Under the auspices of the American Association of Junior Colleges (now the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges), Garrison visited twenty campuses and conducted hundreds of interviews over a ten-year period "to identify some of the current issues and problems affecting the junior college faculty member."55 One of Garrison's findings was that "many faculty members are unsure even of the aims and purposes of their own individual college."56 Although Garrison's study is dated, similar conclusions have been reached by others writing at a later date.57

56 Garrison, p. 77.
Even when faculty know what the goals of their institution are, they may not always support these goals. For example, while advocates of the community college have always claimed its basic purpose is to extend educational opportunity to everyone, not all faculty are enthusiastic about this goal.

One such faculty opinion was verbalized by Slutsky who forthrightly expressed the concern of many community college faculty about the "low academic achievement" of community college students. Making it clear that she spoke from the perspective of a liberal arts faculty member who wants the community college to be truly an institution of higher learning, Slutsky asserted: "Faculty members are demoralized: they expected some students of college-level ability, but they find that most able students no longer attend the image-poor college." To Slutsky, the community college needs to reevaluate its missions since "no doubt all these missions need doing, but one institution cannot do it all." To Slutsky, the community college needs to reevaluate its missions since "no doubt all these missions need doing, but one institution cannot do it all."

Slutsky's words may well express the attitude of many community college faculty who were teaching in the institution before the trend in the 1970s toward total open admission engulfed the community college

(cont.)
"Now to Achieve the Goals," JCJ (May 1972), p. 22.


59 Slutsky, p. 9.

60 Slutsky, p. 13.
with a massive wave of underprepared students. According to Cohen and Brawer in their definitive study of the community, "faculty members already there had their own priorities, based on their expectations when they entered the college and their subsequent experience within it."61 Consequently these faculty "reacted first with dismay, then with apathy or antagonism to the new missions articulated by college spokes persons."62 Other leaders of the community college are also aware that not all faculty support the articulated goals of the community college. Basing his opinion on personal observation as well as the results of empirical data, Medsker asserted: "Research on the attitudes of staff indicate that there is not a high degree of congruence between purposes and commitment in many institutions."63 To Medsker, this lack of congruence was a matter of grave concern since he found it
difficult to believe that the community college can realize its potential unless there is a complete commitment on the part of the staff to a new and different type of institution, unhampered by a hierarchical notion about institutions and their pecking order.64

Gleazer also voiced his concern about the faculty's "differences of opinion with respect to the mission of the community college." Such differences

---

62 Cohen and Brawer, p. 68.
64 Medsker, p. 142.
were causing "a high degree of frustration among community college faculty."\textsuperscript{65}

Several of the national studies conducted on community college faculty also indicate lack of faculty commitment to institutional goals. Under the sponsorship of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Bushnell conducted a national study of the community college in which the Educational Testing Service's Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was administered to over 12,000 members (faculty, students, and presidents) of 92 public and private two-year colleges. Analysis of faculty responses to the IGI suggested a lessening commitment by the faculty to the community college's basic mission of extending educational opportunity. For example, faculty preferred that the goal of working with students of any ability level be ranked as lower in importance than it was then ranked. At the time the study was conducted, faculty felt that goal was ranked second in importance at their institution; the faculty preferred, however, that it be ranked seventh out of twelve institutional goals.\textsuperscript{66}

It has also been shown that some faculty are not inclined to rank highly the goals of community service and lifelong learning, goals central to Gleazer's vision of the community college as a community-based learning center. Cross reported on a 1979 field test of the Community College Goals Inventory which was administered to almost 1500 members

\textsuperscript{65} Gleazer, "Now to Achieve the Goals," p. 22.

(faculty, administrators, and trustees) in eighteen community colleges across the nation. Out of twenty institutional goals, faculty preferred that community service be ranked eighteenth and lifelong learning be ranked tenth. This "lack of enthusiasm" for these goals was not shared, however, for the goal of vocational education, which was given a preferred ranking of fourth by the faculty.68

Cohen and Brawer also found a similar degree of commitment to vocational or occupational-technical education in their study of the two-year college instructor. As part of a study conducted by the Center for the Study of Community Colleges and sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, a survey questionnaire was administered to over 2,000 humanities instructors (full- and part-time) and department and division chairmen outside the humanities in 156 colleges selected by stratified random sampling. Thirty-eight percent of the humanities instructors who responded (overall response rate of eighty-four percent) agreed with the statement: "Career education and occupation training should be the major emphasis in today's community college."69

Faculty understanding and acceptance of community college goals have also been studied on a state as well as a national level. Hutchinson's report on a 1961-62 study utilizing a survey questionnaire sent to over __________

68 Cross, pp. 113-23.
69 Cohen and Brawer, The Two-Year College Instructor, p. 20.
1,000 junior college faculty members in Florida indicated a desire for the institution to be comprehensive in nature. Faculty believed "the emphasis in the junior college should be about equal on transfer courses, terminal courses, and on community services."\(^70\)

Not all faculty want the community college to be comprehensive in its programs. Friedman's study of faculty in five two-year colleges in Missouri indicated that faculty teaching academic (transfer) courses were unenthusiastic or even opposed to comprehensiveness. These faculty "feared that terminal occupational programs . . . would cause their junior college eventually to, as some put it, 'degenerate into a trade school.'"\(^71\) Friedman pointed out that much of their concern stemmed from a desire for the prestige generated from teaching in an academically oriented institution, prestige which they feared would disappear as their institutions achieved comprehensiveness.\(^72\)

Leslie's study of the acceptance of the community college philosophy among faculty of two-year institutions in Pennsylvania also found a lack of enthusiasm for the comprehensive curricula of the community college. Using a survey administered to a stratified random sample of 160 faculty from the three kinds of two-year colleges in Pennsylvania (community

\(^70\) Nan S. Hutchinson, "Three Images," *JCJ* (September 1963), p. 140.


\(^72\) Friedman, pp. 417-23.
colleges, private junior colleges, and commonwealth campuses), Leslie asked faculty to respond to twenty-five items concerning community college philosophy, including its commitment to comprehensive program offerings. The resulting data, based on an eighty-six percent rate, was then analyzed using one-way analysis of variance of four independent variables (type of institution, age, highest degree held, and reference group) and three factors (institutional standards of quality, institutional goals, and faculty role). From his analysis of the data, Leslie concluded that "faculty support for the community college philosophy is mild indeed and that a wholehearted commitment on the part of faculty to this form of higher education is lacking." However, "community college faculty were somewhat more positive as to the community college philosophy" than were faculty from the other two types of two-year colleges. Also, "all other factors being equal, . . . young faculty, vocational technical faculty and faculty not holding the PhD are somewhat more likely to support the community college philosophy than are those who are older, in the liberal arts and holders of the PhD." 

Other studies have also indicated the support and acceptance of vocational technical faculty for the community college philosophy. A


74 Leslie, p. 54.

75 Leslie, p. 61.
1974 report on a survey study conducted with 240 Minnesota two-year faculty members concluded: "Most likely, the ideals and educational philosophy of vocational technical faculty members are more aligned to the objectives of the community college."\(^{76}\) London's ethnographic study of the culture of one community college in Massachusetts also indicated that vocational technical faculty were more comfortable with their teaching role and with the students themselves than were faculty teaching liberal arts and human services, who were often "unfamiliar with the social class milieu, educational levels, and sensibilities of their students."\(^{77}\)

**Summary of Research and Relationship to Problem**

**Summary of Research.** Many people have stated their opinions about the identity problem of the community college, but few have conducted empirical research on this topic. With few exceptions the research that has been conducted has been done primarily at the dissertation level and has used the survey questionnaire to focus upon a single institution's image rather than upon national images of the community college. However, empirical studies concerning the attitudes of community college faculty have been frequent and occasionally sponsored by national organizations. This research, like that on community college image or identity, also relies heavily upon the survey questionnaire.

---

\(^{76}\) "Which Faculty Members are Satisfied?" *CJCJ* (March 1974), p. 56.

to probe its sample population, which is sometimes drawn nationally and sometimes statewide. The results of these studies vary sometimes on one or two points (e.g. the degree to which faculty teaching academic subjects accept occupational-technical education), but they do seem to concur on the following:

1. Many community college faculty do not support some of the basic goals espoused in the literature of the community college movement (e.g. extension of educational opportunity through open admissions).

2. Faculty are often unenthusiastic about the specific goal of community service, which forms the basis for much of Gleazer's vision of the community college of the future. Vocational or occupational-technical instructors are more supportive of this goal than are instructors of academic courses.

3. Faculty who have been teaching in the community college since the 1950s or early 1960s prefer that it be an academically oriented two-year college.

4. Greater commitment to a comprehensive program is likely to be found among faculty who teach occupational-technical subjects than among faculty who teach academic courses, presumably because a comprehensive program encompasses occupational-technical education, which is sometimes scorned by faculty teaching in academic (transfer) programs.

These research findings indicate a lack of faculty agreement about both the general and programmatic goals of the community college. The findings also suggest a relationship between certain faculty characteristics (e.g. teaching field, number of years of experience teaching in the
community college) and a faculty member's preference for certain institutional directions or goals.

Relationship to program. It seems likely that economic conditions in the 1980s will force community colleges to make certain choices affecting their programmatic missions. Some missions may have to be modified or even deleted. Those with the authority to make these decisions would do well to remember the importance of faculty support for whatever programmatic mission(s) the institution chooses to emphasize.

Specifically in Virginia the legislators and other decision makers who determine the programmatic emphasis and consequent institutional direction of Virginia's community colleges should become aware of how much faculty support there is (or is not) for various institutional directions for Virginia's community colleges. For example, if the decision is made to have Virginia's community colleges become primarily postsecondary occupational training centers and a large portion of the present VCCS full-time faculty do not concur with this decision, this portion may react "first with dismay, then with apathy or antagonism." Such reactions would likely have an adverse effect upon faculty morale and might negatively affect faculty treatment of students. Faculty who hope to teach future graduates of senior institutions but instead find themselves teaching future air conditioning repairmen are likely to be unsympathetic

---

78 Cohen and Brawer, *The American Community College*, p. 68.
toward these students. Thus, general agreement between decision makers and faculty about present and future directions for the VCCS should positively affect faculty morale and faculty treatment of students. In addition, such agreement might also lead to a stronger institutional identity for Virginia's community colleges as their faculty, the key personnel in an educational institution, support in spirit as well as words the goals set for the institution by its leaders.

---

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Population and Selection of Sample

The population for this study was all full-time teaching faculty in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). Part-time faculty were excluded because they are a fluid group; both their number and membership vary from academic quarter to quarter and from year to year within each community college. Non-teaching faculty (i.e. counselors and librarians) were also excluded for two reasons: (1) It is the teaching faculty who are the most directly involved in carrying out the programmatic missions of a college. (2) Hypotheses generated for this study were based on previous research which was conducted primarily on teaching faculty.

Since Virginia's twenty-three community colleges vary in enrollment size from those which have a full-time enrollment (FTE) of under 1,000 students to those which have an FTE of over 5,000 students, it is possible that the size of an institution (as determined by FTE) might affect a VCCS faculty members responses to some of the questions on the survey.¹ For example, the nine Virginia community colleges which enroll 1,000

¹ When the VCCS Office of Planning and Evaluation evaluated this research proposal to determine whether or not to authorize the research, Ed Morse, a staff member, suggested that the sample be stratified along the characteristic of institutional size, as determined by FTE. The final approval for the research was given on the assumption that this suggestion (and others) would be incorporated if feasible.
students or less generally are located in service areas or districts which have no other postsecondary educational facilities in them. Faculty at one of these community colleges might be more apt to rank first the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College because these faculty may believe the people within their service area should have the opportunity to pursue either an academic course of study or an occupational one. Faculty at some of the larger Virginia community colleges, which generally are located in areas having several postsecondary educational institutions within them, may be less influenced by this concern as they indicate their preferences for institutional direction for the VCCS. Since institutional size (as determined by FTE) might affect faculty responses on the questionnaire, it was decided to employ a systematic sampling stratified along the characteristic of institutional size as determined by FTE.

To stratify the sample, several steps were taken. The first step was to use VCCS enrollment figures for the 1982-83 academic year\(^2\) to classify Virginia's twenty-three community colleges into one of the following four size categories which are the ones used by the VCCS for budget purposes:\(^3\)

\(^2\) VCCS Planning and Evaluation Office, *Student Enrollment Booklet*, Fall Quarter 1982, Table 3T.

\(^3\) Statement by Dr. Stuart Bounds, Dean of Financial and Administrative Services at Thomas Nelson Community College, personal conversation, Hampton, Virginia, October 28, 1983.
A. 1,000 students or less
B. 1,001 - 2,000 students
C. 2,001 - 5,000 students
D. 5,001 students or more

Nine community colleges were in Group A, eight in Group B, three in Group C, and three in Group D. Next, the percentage of 1982 - 83 VCCS full-time teaching faculty within each group was determined. 14 percent (273 faculty) were in the institutions in Group A, 23 percent (455 faculty) in those in Group B, 16 percent (307 faculty) in those in Group C, and 47 percent (910 faculty) in those in Group D. The final step was to use these same percentages in stratifying the sample. Thus 14 percent of the sample (25 faculty) was selected from the institutions in Group A, 23 percent (74 faculty) from those in Group B, 16 percent (52 faculty) from those in Group C, and 47 percent (151 faculty) from those in Group D.

To select the faculty within each group, the following steps were taken. First, a list of all full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS for the academic year 1982 - 83 was obtained from the Personnel Office of the VCCS. The list contained faculty grouped according to institution: all faculty at a particular community college were listed together in alphabetical order. All the lists of faculty at the institutions within Group A were placed together in random order as were the lists of faculty within Groups B, C, and D. When the faculty were then divided or grouped by size of institution, they were still listed by their institution
so that a systematic sampling could be made to ensure that at least one faculty member from each institution, no matter how small, was in the study. To select the systematic sample, first a random start to choose the first case in each institution was made. Then every sixth faculty member from this start was selected until the specified number of faculty members for that particular size grouping was reached. If one of the names selected for the sample was that of a person who had participated in the pre-test of the instrument, then this name was eliminated and the name of the next person on the list was selected instead.

Procedures

**Data gathering.** The survey instrument used in this study was mailed to the college address of each of the faculty in the sample. To ensure high response rate, the following steps were taken:

1. Use of a signed cover letter which briefly explained the importance and purpose of the research and offered to share its results.
2. Use of a short questionnaire containing mostly close-ended questions.
3. Enclosure of a preaddressed, postage-paid return envelope.
4. Inclusion of an individual identification number on each survey to facilitate follow-up of nonrespondents.

---

5. A postcard reminder sent to everyone one week after the original mailing of the questionnaire.

6. A letter and replacement questionnaire sent to all nonrespondents three weeks after the original mailing.5

Ethical safeguards and considerations. Permission to conduct the research was elicited from the College of William and Mary Committee for Research on Human Subjects, from the VCCS Director of Planning and Evaluation, and from each president of Virginia's twenty-three community colleges. Participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. Every effort has been made to maintain this confidentiality. In addition closure to this research project is being provided to its participants since all who indicated a desire for the results of the survey will receive them.

Instrumentation

Description. The survey instrument was designed by the investigator as a short questionnaire using both close-and open-ended questions. The survey began with four close-ended questions designed to elicit respondents' perceptions of institutional and System commitment of resources to program areas and perceptions of their own influence in determining institutional and System directions. Another close-ended

question followed, asking the respondents to rank order their preferences for four possible institutional directions for the VCCS. Next, there were eight open-ended questions about the following faculty characteristics: age, program area in which teaching most courses, years of teaching experience in the community college, experience teaching at the secondary level or at a senior institution or at a vocational-technical center or proprietary school, administrative duties, and teaching of continuing education courses. The questionnaire concluded with an open-ended question which gave respondents the opportunity to comment about the present and/or possible future direction(s) for the community college in Virginia.

In order to keep the questionnaire as brief as possible, information about each respondent's sex, academic rank, and highest degree held was obtained either from the VCCS Personnel Office or from the most recent college catalogue of the appropriate institution.

Validity. The content validity of the survey instrument was determined by pre-testing of the instrument. First, colleagues in the higher education program at the College of William and Mary were asked

---

6 Nine open-ended questions were included on the survey questionnaire - the eight listed in this chapter as well as a question asking the field of the respondent's highest earned degree. However, in analyzing the data, it was decided not to use the information gathered from this question. Since over thirty different fields were indicated by the respondents, classifying or categorizing these fields into just a few categories did not seem feasible. Use of the information without categorizing it would have resulted in just a few cases for each field, thus giving too few cases to yield significant results on the variable.
to examine the instrument for clarity and readability and to make suggestions for its improvement. Second, some "potential 'users' of the data"7 -- administrative personnel in the VCCS offices and the institutional research director at one of the Virginia community colleges -- were asked to examine the instrument and suggest ways to improve it. Finally, the instrument was pilot-tested with a potential group from the survey population. The eight students within the higher education program at the College of William and Mary who were also full-time teaching faculty within the VCCS were mailed the survey and asked to complete it and give feedback as to its format, clarity, and appropriateness of questions. Insights gained from each of these three stages of the pre-testing process were used to revise and strengthen the survey questionnaire, both during and after each aspect of the pre-testing.

Design

This was an exploratory descriptive study which used correlation to clarify hypothesized relationships between the independent variables of faculty characteristics and the dependent variable of faculty preferences for institutional directions for the VCCS.

Specific Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses generated for this study were derived from the study's general hypothesis that the heterogeneity of VCCS faculty negatively affects their unanimity for any one institutional direction

7 Dillman, p. 157.
desired by national and state leaders of the community college. In other words, the educational and professional backgrounds and experiences of VCCS faculty are so diverse that their unanimity for any particular institutional direction is highly unlikely. However, it is possible that faculty who share a similar educational background and/or professional experiences may prefer the same institutional direction. Therefore, the following specific directional hypotheses were tested:

\[ H_1 \text{ Of the four institutional directions, that of Comprehensive Community College will be the one most preferred by the majority of VCCS faculty.} \]

The majority of VCCS faculty is most likely to prefer this institutional direction for at least two reasons. First, this direction is the closest of the four to the existing direction of the VCCS. Presently the VCCS is comprehensive in its offerings, for each of the twenty-three member institutions offers academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service programs. However, unlike the Comprehensive Community College defined in this study, the VCCS is not "giving equal emphasis" to all three program areas. Instead, occupational-technical education receives the primary emphasis.\(^8\) Not only are VCCS faculty likely to prefer the direction of Comprehensive Community College because it comes the closest to being the status quo but also because there is evidence to suggest that many community college faculty support

the programmatic diversity of the comprehensive community college. Hutchinson's report of a study of junior college faculty in Florida during the early 1960s indicated their support for comprehensive program offerings.9 Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, in their study of the two-year college, considered that a large segment of two-year college faculty was supportive of the programmatic diversity created by developing occupational-technical program offerings.10 Cohen and Brawer's study of two-year college faculty found that "a surprisingly high number" of humanities faculty supported emphasis on occupational-technical education in community colleges.11 When Leslie studied the acceptance of the community college philosophy among faculty of two-year institutions in Pennsylvania, he found that faculty at community colleges were the most supportive of community college philosophy, including its comprehensive curricula.12 Such studies indicate the likelihood that VCCS faculty will be supportive of the programmatic diversity implicit in the concept of the Comprehensive Community College.


H2  Of the four institutional directions, that of Community-Based Learning Center will be the one least preferred by VCCS faculty.

There is evidence to indicate that community college faculty as a group is not highly supportive of the goals of community services and lifelong learning, two goals integral to Gleazer's vision of the Community-Based Learning Center. As part of a 1979 field test of the Community College Goals Inventory, community college faculty were asked to rank twenty goals for the community college in terms of what are and what should be the goals of the community college. Faculty as a group indicated that the goal of lifelong learning was currently fourth in importance or priority but that it should only be tenth. The goal of community services was rated as fourteenth in present priorities; however, faculty thought it should be rated eighteenth. Lack of faculty support for these two goals would seem to indicate a lack of support for key components of Gleazer's Community-Based Learning Center.

H3  Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Academically Oriented Two-Year College:

---

a. are over forty years of age
b. teach the majority of their courses in academic (transfer) programs
c. have more than fifteen years of experience teaching in the community college
d. have teaching experience at a four-year college or university
e. have a doctorate

The age of a community college faculty member and the consequent number of years he has usually taught at a community college may affect his preferences for institutional direction. Faculty who began teaching in the community college during the late 1950s and early 1960s were teaching in an institution that was then geared primarily to academic (transfer) education. As enrollment in the community college shifted from academic to occupational-technical programs in the 1970s and as community colleges took on the mission of remedial or developmental education, these same faculty found themselves teaching at a very different kind of institution than the one they originally entered. These faculty may well prefer that the community college return to a more academic orientation than it presently seems to have.

Faculty who teach the majority of their courses in academic (transfer) programs may also be likely to prefer the direction of Academically Oriented Two-Year College. An early study by Friedman

---

14 Cohen and Brawer, p. 103.
noted this preference and linked it to a desire for greater status in academe.\textsuperscript{15} Also, at least in the VCCS, faculty who teach in academic (transfer) programs are required to have more academic preparation than many faculty teaching in the occupational-technical programs. As Gleazer noted, those community college faculty, who "have credentials acquired in a university environment . . . geared to a different kind of student" than the community college student may not be too accepting or sympathetic toward some of the community college students.\textsuperscript{16} London also noted the possible discomfort liberal arts and human services faculty may experience with students possessing different educational values.\textsuperscript{17} These faculty may prefer that their institution enroll more academically oriented students with whom the faculty members can be more comfortable.

For much the same reasons, faculty who have taught at a four-year college or university prior to teaching at the community college may desire that the community college be more academically oriented. Cosand questions whether these faculty are "equipped for the community

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} Howard B. London, \textit{The Culture of a Community College} (New York: Praeger Press, 1978), p. 115.
\end{itemize}
college diversity of students, a diversity not found at a more academically oriented institution.

Possession of the doctorate may also be linked to a preference for a more academically oriented institution. Leslie's study of two-year faculty indicated that faculty with the PhD were not as likely to support the community college philosophy as were faculty without the PhD. His findings provide some support for this conjecture.

**H4** Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College:

a. are less than forty-one years of age
b. teach the majority of their courses in occupational-technical programs
c. have less than sixteen years of experience teaching in the community college
d. have teaching experience in the secondary school
e. have some administrative duties
f. have taught a continuing education course at their institution
g. do not have a doctorate

Leslie's study of community college faculty is also useful for providing insight into some of the characteristics of faculty who are likely to prefer the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College.

---

19 Leslie, p. 61.
College. He found that "young faculty, vocational-technical faculty, and faculty not holding the PhD are somewhat more likely to support the community college philosophy including its commitment to comprehensive program offerings than are those who are older, in the liberal arts, and holders of the PhD." A 1974 study of community college faculty in Minnesota also found that vocational-technical faculty held "ideals . . . more aligned to the objectives of the community college."

Less teaching experience in the community college may also contribute to support of the direction of Comprehensive Community College. Faculty who joined the community college in the 1970s or early 1980s were joining an institution that was already comprehensive in its program offerings and whose high enrollment in and consequent emphasis upon occupational-technical education was already an established fact. These newer faculty did not find themselves in the position of many older faculty who joined an institution that was initially a junior college concerned with the first two years of an undergraduate education and evolved into a comprehensive community college, enrolling certain kinds of students in certain programs, both of which caused some older faculty to "react first with dismay, then with apathy or antagonism."

---

20 Leslie, p. 61.
21 "Which Faculty Members Are Satisfied," CJCJ (March 1974), p. 56.
Faculty who have come to the community college from a secondary school teaching experience rather than from a four-year college or university teaching experience may also be comfortable with the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College since it permits a diversity of students. Cosand believes these former high-school teachers are "probably less academic and more student oriented" than faculty who have taught at a senior institution and therefore more accepting of the diversity in students enrolled at a community college.23

Faculty who have some administrative duties and/or have taught a continuing education course at their institution may also be more supportive of the Comprehensive Community College. It is possible that faculty performing administrative tasks may, by so doing, gain insight into the budgetary and other concerns which frequently affect policy decisions at an institution, particularly one within a system of community colleges such as the VCCS. Faculty who understand the reasons for decisions affecting such things as class size and program offerings may be more supportive of the present direction of their institution (that of the Comprehensive Community College) than faculty who are not as knowledgeable and who may tend to blame the comprehensive nature of the community college for decisions they do not support. Similarly, faculty who teach a continuing education course thus attain more

23 Cosand, p. 28.
familiarity with the community service function of the comprehensive community college and may be more supportive of it as a result.

H5 Faculty with the following characteristics are likely to rank first the institutional direction of Postsecondary Occupational Training Center:

a. teach the majority of their courses in occupational-technical programs

b. have teaching experience at a vocational-technical center or at a proprietary school

c. have no academic degree higher than a bachelor's degree

Faculty who prefer the direction of Postsecondary Occupational Training Center are expressing a preference for an institution which primarily offers occupational training and has only very limited offerings in the humanities and social and natural sciences. It seems likely that faculty who would be supportive of this direction would be those who teach the majority of their courses in occupational-technical programs as opposed to academic (transfer) program since many faculty teaching academic (transfer) courses would be out of a job if program offerings in their area were reduced. Also, degree requirements for faculty teaching in occupational-technical programs are usually less stringent than for faculty teaching in academic (transfer) programs. For example, some of the occupational-technical faculty in the VCCS only possess an associate's degree while others have only a bachelor's degree. All faculty teaching in the liberal arts are required to have at least a master's degree. Thus
faculty teaching in occupational-technical programs are more likely than faculty in academic (transfer) programs to possess no academic degree higher than a bachelor's degree. Also, of all the faculty teaching at a community college, it is logical that faculty teaching in occupational-technical programs are the most likely to have had prior experience teaching at a vocational-technical center or proprietary school.

**Statistical Analysis**

Multiple discriminant function analysis was used to determine whether the independent variables of faculty characteristics could differentiate between the four categories or groups of the dependent variable, faculty preferences for institutional directions. On the basis of their top choice for the institutional direction of the VCCS, faculty were placed into one of four groups (one group for each possible institutional direction). After each faculty characteristic or independent variable was assigned a number, the analysis was run to determine the contribution of each variable in discriminating among the four groups. A stepwise procedure was used to select the most discriminating variables and to determine the discriminant functions. The statistics generated for this analysis included: (1) the number of cases (faculty) in each group, (2) means and standard deviations for each group, (3) stepwise statistics using the Wilks' lambda method, (4) standardized and unstandardized discriminant function coefficients, and (5) a classification table. Statistically significant results were determined at the .05 confidence level.
Summary

A sample of 323 faculty members was systematically selected from the entire VCCS full-time teaching faculty population (after the faculty had been stratified along the variable of institutional size) and asked to respond to a survey questionnaire developed by the researcher. Appropriate steps were taken to ensure a high response rate. Information derived from the questionnaire was statistically analyzed using stepwise discriminant analysis to determine discriminant functions and the most discriminating variables between the four faculty groups generated by preferences indicated on the questionnaires. The appropriate steps were taken to receive research permission from the necessary parties, to ensure confidentiality of participants' responses, and to provide closure of the participants by distributing research results if requested.
Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results from the analysis of the data collected through the survey sent to a systematically selected sample of 323 VCCS faculty members.

Although the response rate to the survey questionnaire was quite high, many of the returned surveys could not be used for various reasons. A total of 268 surveys were returned for a response rate of 83 percent. However, of the surveys returned, forty-two of them (13 percent) were not used in the data analysis for the following reason: two of them (1 percent) were returned several weeks after the cutoff date for collection of data. Nine questionnaires (3 percent) were returned unanswered either because the faculty member had resigned from the institution, was on leave, or chose not to answer. On four questionnaires (1 percent) the identification number had been torn off by the respondent, thus making it impossible to use the college catalogs and VCCS Personnel Office listings to obtain information on three of the faculty characteristics or independent variables. Twenty-seven of them (8 percent) were missing data since the respondents had not answered all of the questions about faculty characteristics or did not answer the dependent variable question about preferences for institutional direction.
Thus of the 269 returned questionnaires, 226 (70 percent) contained all the responses necessary for the discriminant function analysis. Instead of using dummy variables for the missing data on the twenty-seven incomplete questionnaires, it was decided to use the natural response rate of 70 percent since it adequately represented the sample population.

Analysis of Data

Discriminant function analysis. The research problem included two questions:

(1) What are the preferences of VCCS faculty for the institutional directions of Academically Oriented Two-Year College, Community-Based Learning Center, Comprehensive Community College, and Postsecondary Occupational Training Center? and (2) What faculty characteristics affect faculty preferences for each of these institutional directions?

Multiple discrimination function analysis was used to determine whether the twelve independent variables of faculty characteristics could differentiate between the four categories or groups on the nominal dependent variable, faculty preferences for institutional directions for the VCCS. A stepwise procedure utilizing Wilks' lambda was used to select the most discriminating independent variables. Although discriminant functions were also determined through the stepwise procedure, the focus of the analysis was upon the discriminating power of the independent variables rather than upon differences among the groups as indicated by the discriminant functions. Statistically significant results were determined at the .05 level of confidence. The computer
The College of William and Mary was used to perform the statistical analysis. The program used was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) with the subprogram DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS.

The stepwise procedure indicated that four variables were statistically significant in discriminating among the groups (Table 1). The most discriminating variables are listed below in the order of their discriminating power:

1. Program area of majority of courses
   Wilks' Lambda: 0.0961877
   Significance: 0.0344

2. Highest degree held
   Wilks' Lambda: 0.926796
   Significance: 0.0097

3. Vocational-technical or proprietary school teaching experience
   Wilks' Lambda: 0.907414
   Significance: 0.0105

4. Sex
   Wilks' Lambda: 0.892371
   Significance: 0.0141

The following variables did not contribute to further discrimination: age; teaching experience at a community college, secondary school, four-year college or university; performance of some administrative tasks; teaching of continuing education courses; academic rank; size of institution.
### TABLE 1. Significant Discriminating Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Action Step Entered</th>
<th>Action Removed</th>
<th>Vars In</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Area of Majority of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.961866</td>
<td>0.0344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.926796</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votec. or Proprietary School Teaching Exp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.907414</td>
<td>0.0105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.892371</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three discriminant functions were derived, but only one of them was statistically significant (See Table 2). With an eigenvalue of 0.04051, Function 1 accounted for over 64 percent of the variance existing in the discriminating variables. Its canonical correlation was 0.2647628, indicating that the variables only explain about 6.7% ($0.26^2$) of the variance. Wilks' lambda was 0.8923709 with a corresponding chi-square of 25.166 with 12 degrees of freedom. The significance level was 0.0141.

An examination of the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients (Table 3) indicates that Variables 2 and 6 contribute the most to Function 1. Variable 2, program area of majority of courses, has a coefficient of .93329, indicating it is the major contributor to this function. Variable 6 (vocational-technical or proprietary school teaching experience), with a coefficient of -0.57998, also contributes a good deal to Function 1.

The pooled within-groups correlations between canonical discriminant functions and discriminating variables (Table 4) indicate much the same picture of Function 1. Variables 2 and 6 have the highest correlation (0.72027 and -0.44004 respectively).

Since only Function 1 is statistically significant yet possesses a very low canonical correlation, it is clear that the discriminant functions derived in this study do not provide a strong measure of discrimination among the four groups of the dependent variable.

Further verification of the weak discriminating power of the functions is seen in the classification results. To check the adequacy of
### TABLE 2. Canonical Discriminant Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Canonical Correlation</th>
<th>After Function</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Chi-Squared</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07538</td>
<td>64.22</td>
<td>64.22</td>
<td>0.2647628</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8923709</td>
<td>25.166</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04051</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>98.73</td>
<td>0.1973036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9596411</td>
<td>9.1043</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00149</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.0385763</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9985119</td>
<td>0.32912</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Function 1</td>
<td>Function 2</td>
<td>Function 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area of Majority of Courses</td>
<td>0.93329</td>
<td>0.10158</td>
<td>0.17494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voctec. or Proprietary School Teaching Exp.</td>
<td>-0.57998</td>
<td>0.22667</td>
<td>-0.08270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-0.29068</td>
<td>0.51025</td>
<td>0.82173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Held</td>
<td>0.31699</td>
<td>0.87483</td>
<td>-0.49863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Function 1</td>
<td>Function 2</td>
<td>Function 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Area of Majority of Courses</td>
<td>0.72027</td>
<td>-0.00830</td>
<td>0.37667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc Ed. or Prop. School Teaching Exp</td>
<td>-0.44004</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
<td>-0.08146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td>-0.13475</td>
<td>-0.08277</td>
<td>-0.04475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.05851</td>
<td>-0.04241</td>
<td>-0.09484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Held</td>
<td>0.10758</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
<td>-0.09484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Coll. or Univ. Teaching Exp</td>
<td>0.04704</td>
<td>0.09840</td>
<td>-0.06851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of Continuing Ed. Course(s)</td>
<td>-0.05955</td>
<td>-0.08234</td>
<td>-0.07343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-0.13235</td>
<td>0.052876</td>
<td>0.08670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td>0.13960</td>
<td>0.027450</td>
<td>0.06803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Teaching Exp</td>
<td>-0.01591</td>
<td>-0.02601</td>
<td>-0.07343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of Administrative Tasks</td>
<td>-0.00670</td>
<td>-0.06710</td>
<td>-0.07343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables are ordered by the function with the largest correlation and the magnitude of that correlation.
the derived discriminant functions, the original set of cases was classified using these functions to see how many of the cases had been correctly classified by the variables being used. The results were as follows (See Table 5): Fewer than half (43.36 percent) of the cases or faculty were correctly classified. Even fewer of the faculty who selected Academically Oriented Two-Year College (Group 1) as their first choice for institutional direction for the VCCS were correctly classified — only 37 percent. Only 38.5 percent of the faculty who selected Community-Based Learning Center (Group 2) as their most preferred institutional direction were correctly classified. The functions were most effective in discriminating faculty who chose Comprehensive Community College as their top choice. 57.4 percent of these cases (Group 3) were correctly classified. The functions were least effective in classifying faculty who selected Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their most preferred institutional direction. A scant 6.5 percent of these faculty were correctly classified.

The classification results also indicate how poorly the discriminant functions differentiate between Group 1, Academically Oriented Two-Year College, and Group 4, Postsecondary Occupational Training Center. The derived discriminant functions predicted that 35.5 percent of the people who actually selected Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their preferred choice for VCCS institutional direction would choose Academically Oriented Two-year College.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Predicted Group Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Academically Oriented</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Two-Year College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3: Learning Center</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4: Community College</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of "grouped" cases correctly classified: 43.36%
Other data analysis. Although the primary purpose of the survey instrument was to elicit data on the independent and dependent variables, the survey also requested responses on two questions designed to ascertain faculty members' knowledge about the percentage of institutional and System resources committed to the three basic program areas of academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service.

A frequency distribution of the responses\(^1\) (See Tables 6 and 7) indicated that most faculty do not believe that either their individual institution or the VCCS does or should commit its resources equally to the three programs areas. According to almost 90 percent of the responses, the program area of community service, defined as non-credit personal interest courses and cultural activities, both does and should receive between 0-25 percent of an individual institution's and the System's resources. Individual institutions are perceived to make a greater commitment of resources to the academic (transfer) program area than the System does. Over 67 percent thought their own institution was committing between 26-50 percent of its resources to this program area, while only 59 percent thought the System was making a similar commitment. Furthermore, faculty think both the System and their own institution should make a greater commitment of resources to this area. Almost 79 percent thought their institution should be committing between

\(^1\) Although 226 questionnaires contained responses usable for the discriminant analysis, only 157 (49 percent of the total sample) contained complete responses on Questions 1 and 2. Thus the figures cited for Questions 1 and 2 are based on a total of 157 responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Areas</th>
<th>Percentage of Resources Committed</th>
<th>IS No.</th>
<th>IS Pct.</th>
<th>SHOULD BE No.</th>
<th>SHOULD BE Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic (Transfer)</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational-Technical</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures cited are based on a total of 215 responses.*
TABLE 7. Responses Concerning the System's Commitment of Resources to the Three Program Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Percentage of Resources Committed</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>SHOULD BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic (Transfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational-Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures cited are based on a total of 215 responses.
26-50 percent of its resources to this area, while 77 percent thought the Systems should make the same commitment.

Perceptions about institutional and system-wide commitment of resources to the occupational-technical program area were strikingly similar. Faculty think both their institutions and the System commit a greater percentage of resources to this area than to the academic (transfer) area. 38 percent think their own institution commits between 51-75 percent of its resources to the occupational-technical area, while only 8 percent think their institution makes a similar commitment to the academic (transfer) area. 39 percent think the System also commits between 51-75 percent of its resources to the occupational-technical program area, while only 11 percent think the System makes a similar commitment to the academic (transfer) area. Faculty also think that both their institutions and the System should decrease their (estimated) commitment to the occupational-technical program area. Only 29 percent think their institution should commit between 51-75 percent of its resources to this area. The majority (66 percent) think the institutional commitment should be between 26-50 percent. Similarly, only 26 percent think the System should commit between 51-75 percent of its resources to the occupational-technical area, while 69 percent think the System's commitment should be between 26-50 percent.

Faculty were also asked to indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 how much influence they thought VCCS faculty both have and should have in
determining the direction of their own institution (Question 3) and of the VCCS (Question 4). The results\(^2\) (See Tables 8 and 9) indicate that faculty want much more influence than they think they have. Also, faculty think they have and should have more influence in determining their own institution's direction than the System's direction. In determining the direction of their own institution, almost 74 percent (159) of the respondents think VCCS faculty have no influence or only a slight influence. Almost 98 percent (210) think faculty should have influence ranging from moderate to the primary influence. Almost 70 percent (152) think faculty should have a major influence or be the primary influence. In the determination of the institutional direction of the VCCS, almost 92 percent (197) of the respondents think faculty has no influence or only a little influence. Approximately 93 percent (201) think faculty should have influence ranging from moderate to the primary influence. Over 51 percent (11) think faculty should have a major influence or be the primary influence.

An open-ended question was used to give survey respondents the opportunity to comment about present and/or future directions for the community college in Virginia. No statistical analysis was attempted on the data generated by this question. All responses to the question are included in Appendix D.

\(^2\) Only 215 (66 percent) of the surveys contained complete answers to Questions 3 and 4. Thus the figures cited for these questions are based on a total of 215 responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HAVE</th>
<th></th>
<th>SHOULD HAVE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No Influence</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A Slight Influence</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A Moderate Influence</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A Major Influence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Primary Influence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>SHOULD HAVE</td>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No Influence</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A Slight Influence</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A Moderate Influence</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A Major Influence</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Major Influence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses

$H_1$ Of the four institutional directions, that of Comprehensive Community College will be the one preferred by the majority of VCCS faculty.

On the basis of their top choice for preferred institutional direction, faculty were placed into one of four groups (one group for each possible institution direction). The results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Direction</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Approximate % of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academically Oriented Two-Year College</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Learning Center</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Community College</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Occupational Training Center</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (51 percent) of faculty surveyed selected the Comprehensive Community College as their preferred choice of institutional direction for the VCCS. Thus the hypothesis was accepted.

$H_2$ Of the four institutional directions, that of Community-Based Learning Center will be the one least preferred by VCCS faculty.

Since the smallest number (26) and percentage (11 percent) of faculty chose this direction as their top choice, this hypothesis was accepted.

$H_3$ Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Academically Oriented Two-Year
College:

a. are over forty years of age

Since the variable of age was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

b. teach the majority of their courses in academic (transfer) programs

Since the discriminant functions were not too useful in indicating how the discriminating variables affected choice of preferred institutional direction, it was decided to examine the frequency distribution of these variable within each group. Subprogram CROSSTABS was used to crosstabulate the four groups by each of the four statistically significant variables.

According to data from the CROSSTABS program, the program area in which faculty teach the majority of their courses (Table 10) does not seem related to the preference for the institutional direction of Academically Oriented Two-Year College. 42.6 percent of the faculty who selected this direction as their choice primarily teach in academic (transfer) programs, while the same percent (42.6) teach primarily in occupational-technical programs. Therefore this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

c. have more than fifteen years of experience teaching in the community college
TABLE 10. Crosstabulations of Variable Program Area of Majority of Courses by Institutional Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Academically Oriented Two-Year College</th>
<th>Community-Based Learning Center</th>
<th>Comprehensive Community College</th>
<th>Postsecondary Occupational Training Center</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Transfer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational-Technical</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the variable of community college teaching was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

d. have teaching experience at a four-year college or university

Since this variable was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

e. have a doctorate

According to data from the CROSSTABS program (Table 11), of the people who have doctorates, the largest number (18) prefers Comprehensive Community College as their top choice for institutional direction. Only 6 people with doctorates selected Academically Oriented Two-Year College. Also, of those who selected Academically Oriented Two-Year College, only 11.1 percent of them had doctorates, the smallest percentage of doctorate holders in any of the four groups. Therefore, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

H4 Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction Comprehensive Community College:

a. are less than forty-one year of age

Since the variable of age was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

b. teach the majority of their courses in occupational-technical programs
TABLE 11. Crosstabulation of Variable Highest Degree, by Institutional Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Tot Pct</th>
<th>Institutional Direction</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AOTYC</td>
<td>CBLC</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>POTC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmasters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to data from the CROSSTABS program (Table 10), almost 60 percent (59.1) of the faculty who selected Comprehensive Community College as their top choice for institutional direction teach the majority of their courses in occupational-technical programs. Also, almost 60 percent (58.6) of the survey respondents who teach primarily in the occupational-technical programs chose Comprehensive Community College as their preferred institutional direction. Therefore, this component of the hypothesis was accepted.

c. have less than sixteen years of experience teaching in the community college.

Since this variable was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

d. have teaching experience in the secondary school.

Since this variable was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

e. have some administrative duties.

Since this variable was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

f. have taught a continuing education course at their institution.

Since this variable was not found to be statistically significant as a discriminating variable, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.
g. do not have a doctorate

According to data from the CROSSTABS program (Table 11), 50 percent of the faculty who have doctorates chose Comprehensive Community College as their preferred institutional direction. Since having a doctorate does not seem to affect negatively a faculty member's preference for this direction, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

H5 Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Postsecondary Occupational Training Center:

a. teach the majority of their courses in the occupational-technical program areas

According to data from the CROSSTABS program (Table 12), more faculty (51.6 percent) who have Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their preferred institutional direction teach the majority of their courses in academic (transfer) rather than in occupational-technical program (45.2 percent). Therefore, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

b. have teaching experience at a vocational-technical center or at a proprietary school

According to the data from the CROSSTABS program (Table 12), of the 33 faculty who have had this teaching experience, only 18.2 percent of them chose Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their preferred institutional direction. 36.4 percent of them preferred
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academically Oriented Two-Year College</td>
<td>Community-Based Learning Center</td>
<td>Comprehensive Community College</td>
<td>Postsecondary Occup. Training Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column | 54    | 26     | 115    | 31    | 226 |
Total   | 23.9  | 11.5   | 50.9   | 13.7  | 100.0 |
Comprehensive Community College and 30.3 percent of them preferred Academically Oriented Two-Year College. Therefore, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

c. have no academic degree higher than a bachelor's degree

According to data from the CROSSTABS program (Table 11), of the 32 faculty who had no academic degree higher than a bachelor's degree, only 5 of them or 15.6 percent selected Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their preferred direction. 13 faculty each (40.6 percent) preferred Academically Oriented Two-Year College and Comprehensive Community College. Therefore, this component of the hypothesis was rejected.

Summary of Data Analysis

The following hypotheses were accepted:

H₁ Of the four institutional directions, that of Comprehensive Community College will be the one preferred by the majority of VCCS faculty.

H₂ Of the four institutional directions, that of Community-Based Learning Center will be the one least preferred by VCCS faculty.

H₄ Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College.

b. teach the majority of their course in the occupational-technical program areas.

The following hypotheses were rejected:
Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Academically Oriented Two-Year College:

a. are over forty years of age  
b. teach the majority of their courses in the academic (transfer) programs  
c. have more than fifteen years of community college teaching experience  
d. have teaching experience at a four-year college or university  
e. have a doctorate

Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College:

a. are less than forty years of age  
c. have less than sixteen years of experience teaching in the community college  
d. have teaching experience in the secondary school  
e. have some administrative experience  
f. have taught continuing education course(s) at their institution  
g. do not have a doctorate

Faculty with the following characteristics are most likely to rank first the institutional direction of Postsecondary Occupational Training Center:

a. are less than forty-one years of age
b. teach the majority of their courses in the occupational-technical program area

c. have teaching experience at a vocational-technical center or at a proprietary school

d. have no academic degree higher than a bachelor's degree

Discussion

What emerges from the data generated by this study is a perspective on what the community college faculty in one state — Virginia — desire the institution in which they teach to be. Most desire either the status quo or the traditional conception of a college, while few desire the radical departures envisioned by community college leaders nationally and statewide.

A majority (51 percent) of the faculty whose responses were analyzed chose Comprehensive Community College — defined as an institution which "includes and emphasizes equally academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service programs" — as their top choice for future institutional direction for the VCCS. Of the four directions or options given on the questionnaire, this one is the closest to being what the community college in Virginia presently is. Perhaps for this reason it was the direction most frequently selected. However, an indication that respondents to the survey do not fully support this concept of the community college is seen in the statistics generated by the questions asking faculty to indicate what percentage of institutional and System resources should be committed to the three program areas. If respondents
believed each of the three program areas should be emphasized equally, assumedly they would believe that resources should be equally divided among the three program areas. However, as stated earlier, most of the respondents do not believe that either their institution or the VCCS should commit its resources equally to these areas. Specifically, the respondents indicated a preference for the Community Service area to receive between 0-25 percent of the resources while the other two areas should receive between 26-50 percent of the resources.

Although the majority of the respondents selected Comprehensive Community College as their top choice for institutional direction for the VCCS, another significant segment (24 percent) chose Academically Oriented Two-Year College, thus indicating a preference that the Virginia community college become a more Academically oriented institution with a general education core curriculum required of all students. Such an institution would provide an education very similar to what most community college faculty probably received in their first two years of undergraduate school. Both preferences -- that for the Comprehensive Community College and that for the academically Oriented Two-Year College -- reflect a desire for what the average faculty member is either presently experiencing (the status quo of the comprehensive community college) or for what he probably experienced when he was in college (a traditional, academically oriented institution).

Some VCCS faculty are more adventurous, however. 14 percent of them desire an institution devoted primarily to occupational training with
limited offerings in humanities and the sciences, an institution very unlike the ones in which these faculty presently teach or were taught. An even smaller percentage (11 percent) desire a radical departure from their present and past collegiate experiences. These faculty want their institution to be a place where the traditional structure of credit hours and courses leading to certification of the student is dispensed with in favor of the establishment of a community learning network (with the institution at the center) whereby would-be learners are linked up with available learning resources.

Whatever it is that makes a faculty member desire a particular direction is still not clear. Previous research indicated that occupational-technical faculty are more supportive of community service than are faculty in academic (transfer) programs. Although the present study did not directly address faculty support of community service programs, the concept of community service seems integral to Gleazer's vision of the community-based learning center. In this study occupational-technical faculty were no more supportive of the Community-Based Learning Center direction than were academic (transfer) faculty. Previous research also indicated that faculty teaching since the late 1950s and early 1960s are more supportive of the academically oriented two-year college than are faculty who began teaching the community college in later years. Although few faculty in the present study have been teaching in the community college for over twenty years, of those who have, there was no trend toward support of the Academically Oriented Two-Year College.
The one way in which the results of this study concurred with previous research was in the finding that faculty teaching primarily in occupational-technical programs are more likely to support the mission of the comprehensive community college than are faculty who teach the majority of their courses in academic (transfer) programs. This correlation between teaching primarily in occupational-technical programs and support of the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College is the only clear correlation to emerge from this study.

Regardless of why a VCCS faculty member prefers a specific direction, it is clear that the faculty member wants to have some influence in determining institutional directions. Usually believing he has little or no influence in determining the direction of his own institution, let alone that of the System in which his institution is a member, the average VCCS faculty member wants the faculty to be a major or even the primary influence in determining institutional directions.

If VCCS faculty did have the influence they desire in determining institutional directions, it is clear that the community college in Virginia would remain as it is -- an institution which offers something for everyone but within the traditional college structure of credit hours, courses, and degrees.
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SUMMARY

Overview

The community college lacks a strong institutional identity among the general public, among those in higher education and among its own faculty. Its lack of a strong identity, although useful during its expansion period in the late 1950s and 1960s, is now potentially a major drawback. As the community college competes with the other institutions of higher education for hard sought private donations, reluctant government funding, and declining numbers of students, its lack of a distinct institutional identity may hinder its efforts to gain financial support and students.

These economic considerations may well force the community college during the next decade to seek actively a strong institutional identity. Possible identities or institutional directions include its continuance as a comprehensive community college or its emergence into an academically oriented two-year college, a community-based learning center, or a postsecondary occupational training center.

In order for any one of these identities to be successful in the sense of becoming widely known and accepted by the general public, by those in higher education, and by those making the funding decisions, it must first be supported by the community college's key personnel -- the faculty. Without strong support by the faculty, a new direction or identity
for the community college has little chance of success, while an existing direction may flounder because faculty are not genuinely committed to it.

Statement of Problem

Since some of the decision makers in Virginia seem to be desirous of identifying the community college in Virginia as primarily a postsecondary occupational training center, these decision makers should be cognizant of the preferences of the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) faculty for this as well as for other possible institutional directions for the System. In addition, these decision makers should know what faculty characteristics, if any, affect faculty preferences for the possible institutional directions. Information about the relationship between certain faculty characteristics and faculty preferences for specific institutional directions may be useful in the future hiring decisions.¹ For example, if the VCCS wishes to move in the direction of postsecondary occupational training center, it may find it advisable to hire faculty with the characteristics related to support of this direction.

The present study was designed to determine VCCS faculty preferences for four possible institutional directions and to explore possible relationships between twelve faculty characteristics and faculty preferences for these institutional directions. Also investigated were VCCS faculty's perceptions of institutional and System-wide commitment

of resources to program areas and perceptions of their own influence in determining institutional and System directions.

Sample and Data Gathering Procedures

From the entire VCCS full-time teaching faculty, which was first stratified along the variable of institutional size, a sample of 323 faculty members was systematically selected to ensure a representative sample size at the .05 percent confidence level.

Each of the 323 faculty members in the sample was mailed a survey questionnaire developed by the researcher. The questionnaire, which consisted of both close- and open-ended questions, primarily asked faculty to rank order their preferences for four institutional directions and requested information about certain faculty characteristics. Information about other desired faculty characteristics was obtained either from the VCCS Personnel Office or from VCCS college catalogs. Appropriate steps were taken to ensure a high response rate.

Data Analysis

Multiple discriminant function analysis was used to determine whether the independent variables of faculty characteristics could differentiate between the four categories or groups of the dependent variable, faculty preferences for institutional directions. First, a stepwise procedure involving Wilks’ lambda was used to select the most discriminating variables. These variables were then used to derive three discriminant functions, which were tested in various ways to determine their significance or discriminating power. Finally, the 226 cases in the
study (70 percent response rate) were classified by means of the three discriminant functions derived from the analysis to check the discriminating power of the functions.

Conclusions

Preferences for institutional direction. The results of the study indicate that most VCCS faculty prefer that the community college in Virginia remain largely as it is -- a comprehensive community college -- or that it become more like the traditional view of a college, an academically oriented albeit two-year institution. Over half of the respondents selected Comprehensive Community College as their most preferred institutional direction, while 24 percent chose Academically Oriented Two-Year College. Few faculty seem to prefer the more radical directions: only 14 percent of the faculty who responded selected Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their top choice, and only 11 percent selected Gleazer's vision of the Community-Based Learning Center.

Relationship of faculty characteristics to preferences. Whatever it is that makes a VCCS faculty member prefer one institutional direction to another has not been clarified by this study. Although four variables or faculty characteristics (program area of majority of courses, highest degree held, vocational-technical or proprietary school teaching experience, and sex) were found to be statistically significant, only one of them, program area of majority of courses, seemed to have a clear correlation with a specific preference: Faculty who taught the majority
of their courses in occupational-technical programs were more likely to rank first the direction of Comprehensive Community College than were faculty teaching primarily in academic (transfer) programs. Other studies of community college faculty have also found that occupational-technical faculty are apt to be very supportive of the comprehensive community college.²

The lack of any clear correlation between most faculty characteristics and preferences for specific institutional directions may be seen as evidence supporting the study's general hypothesis: The heterogeneity of VCCS faculty negatively affects their unanimity for any one institutional direction desired by national and state leaders of the community college. VCCS faculty were hardly unanimous in their support of any one direction. Although the majority (51 percent) of the respondents selected Comprehensive Community College as their most preferred direction, a large portion (49 percent) of the faculty did not select this direction but preferred others.

The widely varying backgrounds of the VCCS faculty may have been a factor in this lack of unanimity. For example, the academic background of the respondents varied widely from those possessing only an associate's degree or less to those holding a doctorate. Specifically, 11 percent had an associate or bachelor's degree, almost 70 percent had a master's

degree, and 16 percent had a doctorate. The professional backgrounds of the faculty also varied widely. 39 percent of the respondents had taught at a secondary school, 48 percent at a four-year college or university, and 15 percent at a vocational-technical or proprietary school, while others had had no prior teaching experience. Although correlations between specific academic backgrounds and/or prior professional experiences were not found in this study, the diversity of academic backgrounds and professional experiences may have been a factor in the failure of any one institutional direction to receive the unanimous or nearly unanimous support of the VCCS faculty.

Perceptions concerning institutional and System commitment of resources to program areas. Although the majority of survey respondents rated the Comprehensive Community College as their most preferred institutional direction, they apparently did not fully support the concept of a comprehensive community college, defined in this study as an institution which emphasizes equally the three program areas of academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service. If equal emphasis is construed to mean equal commitment of resources, many faculty did not believe that their own institution or the System should commit available resources equally to the three program areas. Most respondents (90 percent) thought community service should receive only between 0-25 percent of the resources. Over 75 percent thought academic (transfer) programs should receive between 26-50 percent of the resources,
while over 65 percent thought occupational-technical programs should receive a similar commitment of resources.

Perceptions of faculty influence in determining institutional and System directions. Survey respondents believed VCCS faculty have little influence in determining the direction of their own institution and even less in determining the System's direction. However, respondents believed they should have a significant influence in determining the institutional direction. Almost 70 percent of the respondents believed faculty should have a major influence or be the primary influence in determining the direction of their own institution, while 51 percent thought faculty should have a similar influence in determining the direction of the System.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that the identity problem of the community college will increase if its leaders attempt to move the institution in a direction radically different from the prevailing direction of the comprehensive community college. Faculty seem accepting of this direction perhaps because it allows for both academic and occupational-technical degree granting programs as well as for community service endeavors -- something for everyone.

Some community college faculty are also desirous that their institution become a more academically oriented one. Such a preference may stem from a desire that the institution in which they teach should
match more closely that of their own collegiate experience\textsuperscript{3} or perhaps may derive from a desire for greater professional status.\textsuperscript{4} These faculty may be viewing higher education in terms of an educational pyramid, with "the colleges and universities closest to Europe historically and geographically"\textsuperscript{5} at its apex and with institutions, such as the community college, which deviate widely from the European models, at the base. These faculty may believe they will have greater professional status if their institution moves away from its comprehensive nature to become a more academically oriented two-year college, one that would deemphasize or even do away with diploma and certificate programs in occupational-technical areas and would encourage the growth of more academic (transfer) programs for the two-year degree. To some two-year faculty, "academic transfer education . . . is more commensurate with their conception of what higher education is and does and affords them a more important function and prestigious self-image within that world of higher education."\textsuperscript{6}


\textsuperscript{6} Friedman, p. 421.
Whatever their reasons for preferring the institutional directions of Academically Oriented Two-Year College or Comprehensive Community College, few faculty in this study preferred the directions which were a radical departure from the traditional or conventional. Specifically, only 14 percent of the faculty preferred Postsecondary Occupational Training Center as their top choice for institutional direction. Those who chose this direction were indicating their preference for an institution which primarily offers occupational training, often in cooperation with industrial establishments, and has very limited offerings in the humanities and social and natural sciences. The lack of desire for such an institution may indicate a lack of commitment by faculty members to occupational-technical education, or it may indicate that community college faculty members do not want occupational-technical education to be the primary reason for their institution's existence. Certainly the lack of support for this direction combined with the support for the direction of Academically Oriented Two-Year College, as indicated in this study, would seem to cast doubt upon the view espoused by Gene Bottoms, Executive Director of the American Vocational Association, who has stated the following about community colleges:
These colleges are distinguished by the clarity of their mission to prepare youth and adults for employment. All who work in these institutions know that vocational/technical education is a primary reason for the institution's existence, and that this purpose and reason is backed up by administrative action. The president or chancellor of such an institution sends a variety of signals, continuously, to help the faculty understand this, and the faculty themselves have bought this mission. They are not divided about it.7

Comments by some of the faculty in this study would seem to contradict Bottoms' view that faculty "are not divided" about the place of vocational or occupational-technical education in the community college. Given the opportunity to state anything they wanted to say about the present and/or possible future directions for the community college in Virginia, some faculty in the study responded as follows:

I think the Community College System has taken a dangerous turn toward training technicians, and is turning away from the areas (humanities, arts, languages, history) which give meaning, depth, and a sense of responsibility to life.

... we must resist the pressure to become purely occupational centers, funneling the lower and lower middle classes into boring, low paying, dead end jobs. The academic transfer programs provide the opportunity for people to obtain the broad educational background needed for real success.

I believe it would be extremely shortsighted of the Commonwealth to move farther toward emphasizing occupational training which necessarily implies deemphasizing education in

the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Hopefully the Commonwealth will realize that the educational system needs to produce citizens with all that implies and not just productive automations for the industrial process. It will require all our intelligence and ability to survive humanely in the decades ahead, and that certainly means more than just earning a living!

Such comments seem to indicate a limited acceptance of the occupational-technical programs and certainly indicate a desire that these programs do not become the raison d'être for the community college.

Most faculty in this study were also not in support of Gleazer's vision of the Community-Based Learning Center. Only 11 percent of the respondents selected this direction as their top choice. Failure of faculty to support this direction may stem from several causes, including the belief that it would not be economically feasible and concern about what role they would play in such an institution.

Faculty in this study may have been deterred from selecting the Community-Based Learning Center as their top choice for institutional direction because of economic considerations. According to Breneman and Nelson,

proponents of such centers will not find in economic analysis strong support for heavy federal or state subsidies of the centers and their students. Arguments stressing other than economic values will have to be developed and sold politically before this vision of the community college becomes reality.8

8 David W. Breneman and Susan C. Nelson, Financing Community
Selling this idea to politicians in Virginia, a fiscally conservative state, may have seemed highly unlikely to VCCS faculty, who thus decided to choose a more feasible institutional direction.

Another reason why so few faculty selected Community-Based Learning Center as their top choice may have been their concern about what their role in such an institution would be. Their concern is valid, for if the community college were to evolve into a Community-Based Learning Center, the role of the faculty member would change drastically. According to Gleazer, faculty would no longer function in a "college of faculty member, desk, classroom, students, and textbook" but would participate in a setting which stressed "laboratory and shop staffing, counseling, assessment, and interpretation of community educational needs, clinical supervision, and the development of learning contracts, and other means toward learning."^{10}

Gleazer acknowledges the difficulty of getting faculty to accept this change in their role. To do so, he says, "demands an educational leadership which is rare and probably not found or understood at many institutions."^{11} He has further stated that extensive use of part-time

---

(quant.)


^{10} Gleazer, p. 173.

^{11} Gleazer, p. 173.
faculty is probably a necessary means for achieving institutional change, since part-time faculty may be less resistant to change than full-time faculty, especially when the present full-time faculty are used to a role which would change dramatically if Gleazer's vision were to become a reality.

Whatever their reasons for not preferring the direction of Community-Based Learning Center, faculty in this study made clear their lack of support for this direction. However, no direction in the study received overwhelming support. Although 51 percent of the faculty selected Comprehensive Community College as their top choice, nearly half of the faculty selected other directions.

Failure of the faculty as a group to support with near unanimity any one institutional direction for the VCCS may stem from their demographic diversity. Community college faculty as a group are more heterogeneous than faculty in other educational institutions, and the faculty in this study were no exception. Their diversity on a number of variables in the study has already been documented.

Even when faculty in the study seemed fairly homogeneous on a specific variable, a closer look might reveal heterogeneity within the homogeneity. For example, data on the variable of highest academic

---

12 Statement by Edmund Gleazer, personal conversation, Hampton, Virginia, April 7, 1983.

degree held indicated that almost 70 percent of the faculty had a master's degree. Thus the academic background of the faculty would seem to be fairly homogeneous. However, the acquiring of this degree may have occurred in several different ways that would affect the commonality of outlook presumed to be indicated by the homogeneity on this variable. One faculty member may have worked part-time on his Master's degree for several years, while teaching full-time at the secondary school level. Another faculty member may have acquired her master's degree, plus some years of advanced study, while also working as a graduate assistant at the institution granting her degree. Still another faculty member in an occupational-technical program may have earned his master's while being a full-time faculty member at the community college. This heterogeneity within a variable on which there seems to be much homogeneity is another factor adding to the unlikelihood of the faculty having a near unanimous viewpoint as a group.

Even though community college faculty's unanimity of perspective on directions for the community college seems highly unlikely because of their heterogeneity, their unanimity or near unanimity should still be desired and sought by national and state community college leaders. As Clark has stated in his theory of organizational saga, the support of senior faculty, the key personnel in an educational institution, is vital if a leader wishes his vision for an institution to survive and flourish.
Without the faculty's support, the leader's attempts to embody the vision will falter and eventually fail.\(^\text{14}\)

Although Clark's belief in the importance of faculty support is just part of his theory of organizational saga, he is not alone in stressing the importance of faculty influence in an educational institution. According to Richard Miller,

> Faculty members are at the heart of the collegiate enterprise and constitute an institution's most stable component. Professors with tenure remain, while deans and presidents come and go. Inasmuch as the teaching and learning of youth and adults are the essence of a college or university, the quality, dedication, and morale of the faculty are crucial to the whole effort.\(^\text{15}\)

Miller and Clark are emphatic that senior faculty are a potent force within an educational institution, for they continue on at the institution long after a visionary leader has left. If committed to a vision, they can "protect it against later leaders and other new participants who, less pure in belief, might turn the organization in some other direction."\(^\text{16}\)


\(^{16}\) Clark, p. 104.
Although Gleazer has acknowledged the importance of faculty support for the mission of the community college,*7 in his proposal to make extensive use of part-time faculty to effect his vision of the community-based learning center, Gleazer seems to be disregarding the importance of full-time faculty's support for his vision. Apparently to Gleazer it seems easier to hire new, part-time faculty for the center than to win the support of the existing full-time faculty. It may be easier initially to do so, but Clark's theory of organizational saga suggests the effort to gain the support of full-time faculty would be well worth the difficulty in the long run. As a stable, enduring group, their support is vital to the sustained success of any institutional direction.

Gleazer's proposed direction of Community-Based Learning Center has received the support of many other community college leaders.*8 It also received the backing of the powerful AACJC during the 1970s when Gleazer was president of this organization.*9 However, the direction does not seem to have the support of the community college faculty, as evidenced in a report of a 1979 field test of the Community College Goals Inventory and by this study. The 1979 field test results indicated that community college faculty believed the two goals of lifelong learning

---

*7 Edmund J. Gleazer, "To Deliver on the Promise - The Central Issue," A Day at Santa Fe (Gainesville: Santa Fe Junior College 19 ), pp. 4-5.


*9 Cohen and Brawer, p. 5.
and community services, both of which are integral to the direction of the Community-Based Learning Center, were given higher priority by their colleges than they should be. Faculty thought the goal of lifelong learning was ranked fourth in priority but should be ranked only tenth (out of 20 goals), while the goal of community services was ranked fourteenth but should be ranked eighteenth. The VCCS faculty in this study were unenthusiastic about this direction: only 11 percent made it their top choice for institutional direction for the VCCS. Thus, many of the leaders of the community college desire a direction for the institution that many of its faculty do not seem to support.

This disparity between what the leaders and the faculty desire for the institution may stem from several sources. When Garrison conducted his study of junior college faculty in the 1960s, one faculty member wrote to him about the claims made for the junior college by its leaders:

I wonder whether maybe our administrators, the American Association of Junior Colleges, and other so-called "spokesmen" for junior colleges may not be confusing incantation with actuality or substituting perfectly honest hopes for reality.

After stating this faculty member's viewpoint, Garrison noted, "In varying

---


degree, depending upon their local situation, faculty on other campuses agreed, both in principle and in detail, to these comments . . . ."

Although Garrison's study was conducted almost twenty years ago (hence the references to junior instead of community college faculty), today's community college faculty still need to be concerned that the "spokesmen" or leaders of the community college do not perceive the actuality of what the community college is and/or aspire to visions for the institution which are probably unrealistic and possibly very undesirable to many faculty. The leaders do not seem to be attuned to the "rank and file" of the community college movement -- the full-time faculty.

One result of the disparity between what the leaders and the faculty desire for the institution is the continuance of the identity problem of the community college. Leaders espouse one vision or possible identity for the institution while faculty desire another or at least do not desire the one espoused by the institution's leaders. The leaders thus become leaders in name only, for no one is following -- at least not the faculty, those people whose daily activities are the literal manifestation of any identity envisioned by the leaders and those people whose support is vital to the success of any desired identity. Until that support is gained, visions of various community college "leaders" will appear in the pages of professional journals and other publications but will find no other reality. The identity of the community college will continue to be vague.

22 Garrison, p. 45.
and indistinct, allowing something for everyone but prohibiting a "definition full of pride and identity"\textsuperscript{23} for its members — in short, an organizational saga.

**Limitations of Study**

The generalizability of the results of this study is limited due to two factors. (1) The sample was a nonprobabilistic one since the faculty were listed in alphabetical order on the lists used in the systematic sampling. (2) Since faculty in this study were members of a statewide system of community colleges, the results may be generalizable only to other community college faculty members who teach in a statewide system of community colleges. As of 1977 seventeen states had systems of community colleges which were regulated or governed by a state board of community colleges.\textsuperscript{24} In such a system, a particular community college's institutional direction is determined not by the community college itself but by the central offices controlling the system. When asked to indicate preferences for institutional directions, faculty in a system of community colleges such as the VCCS may be influenced by their knowledge of system constraints placed upon individual institutions. For example, some faculty in this study may have preferred that their own institution head toward the direction of Academically Oriented Two-

\textsuperscript{23} Clark, p. 99.

\textsuperscript{24} Breneman and Nelson, *Financing Community Colleges*, p. 28.
Year College; however these same faculty may have believed the VCCS would never support such a direction, so there was no point in selecting it.

Another limitation was the methodology itself, the use of a mail survey to elicit faculty responses. Although mail surveys are an efficient way of gathering data since they usually require far less time of respondents than would an interview and they enable the researcher to collect data conveniently when members of the sample group are spread throughout an entire state, still the survey as an instrument for eliciting responses is prone to error from several sources\textsuperscript{25} such as misunderstanding of the questions by the respondents; hasty, poorly thought out replies; "untruthful"\textsuperscript{26} replies; and "subjective evaluation of the responses."\textsuperscript{27}

Since the survey instrument used in this research was created by the researcher and had not been tested in previous research, it too was a limitation. However, appropriate steps such as pretesting the questionnaire were taken to make the instrument as reliable and valid a measure as possible. Since close-ended questions, which are typically used on a questionnaire, "may force an opinion on an issue on which there

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{26} Parten, p. 409.
\item\textsuperscript{27} Young, p. 212.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
is none,“28 an open-ended question was used to conclude the questionnaire so that "the respondent's frame of reference, knowledge and/or experience . . . (could also) be detected."29

Implications for Future Research

One of the major questions which this research attempted to answer was which of the faculty characteristics used as independent variables in the study influenced faculty preferences for various institutional directions. The topic needs further investigation since this study has not clarified just why it is that a specific faculty member prefers a particular institutional direction. Future research could attempt to examine other variables which might affect a faculty member's preferences. For example, desire for greater professional status may be a factor in one's choice of institutional direction. Therefore, questions could be asked to determine if faculty members are pleased with their professional status at the present-day community college or if they would prefer a different status. Responses on this variable could then be examined in relationship to preferences for specific institutional directions to determine if a correlation between the two variables exists.

Another potential area of research would be to examine other aspects of Clark's theory of organizational saga in relation to the


29 Dyer, p. 159.
community college. For example, Clark views the support of three "groups of believers" as necessary to the growth and maintenance of a saga since each of these groups is a key element in an educational organization. The support of one of the groups, the faculty, has been examined in this study. The support of the other two groups, the alumni and the students, might also be examined. Just as faculty in this study were asked to rank order their preferences for various institutional directions for the community college, so too could community college alumni and students be asked. Also, the relationship between selected variables (ex. age, education, major, and grades) and choice of institutional direction could be explored.

Although Clark does not include administrators as one of the key elements in an educational organization, it might be fruitful to study also the preferences of administrators for various institutional directions for the community college. It would be interesting to see if administrators were more receptive to drastic changes in institutional direction or preferred the status quo or more conventional ones as did the faculty in this study.

A study which incorporated all four groups would possibly yield a broader picture of what the various constituencies desire for the community college. A random sample of community college students, faculty, administrators, and alumni in one state could be surveyed as to

---

30 Clark, p. 104.
their preferences for institutional directions. If the results showed a split between some or all of the groups in the sample, this would be additional confirmation of the conclusion of this study that a major reason for the lack of identity of the community college is lack of support for the futures envisioned by the various leaders of the community college.

Studies other than those which focus upon the "group[s] of believers" could also be conducted to examine Clark's other two key elements in an educational organization: 1) the program or any highly distinctive or unique practices of the institution, and 2) the "imagery of the saga," the "ways of sharing memory and symbolizing the institution" such as through special ceremonies or traditions.\(^{31}\) To examine the program or distinctive practices of the community college, perhaps a replication of B.L. Johnson's study as expressed in *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College* could be conducted. In this work Johnson discusses the innovations such as audio-tutorial instruction and developmental teaching which he saw in his tour of seventy-seven community colleges in twenty-two states during the late 1960s.\(^{32}\) Since many of these "innovations" have become commonplace practices both in the community college and in other educational institutions, it would be interesting to see if a study of today's community colleges would find other innovations or unique practices of the institution.

\(^{31}\) Clark, pp. 104-107.

\(^{32}\) B.L. Johnson, *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the*
As well as studying the program and practices of the community college, one could also study the imagery of the community college, both as expressed in professional and popular literature and as expressed in individual community colleges. Some studies have been conducted on images in professional periodicals and in reference works, but few, if any, studies exist on the image of the community college in popular literature. It is likely that so few studies exist partly because there is little mention of the community college in popular literature. A study of the popular literature (defined as popular magazines and books appearing on national best seller lists) for the last twenty years might reveal a lack of references to the community colleges and thus help substantiate the claims of those who maintain one of the community college's greatest problems is its unclear or weak identity with the general public, a problem partially caused by its lack of an organizational saga.

(cont.)


35 Salisbury studied the image of the community-junior college in popular periodicals from 1937 to 1967 but did not examine novels or autobiographies for their images of the community college.
APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE
March 30, 1983

Dr. Elmo Roesler
Director, Planning and Evaluation
Virginia Community College System
P.O. Box 1558
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Dear Dr. Roesler:

As requested in our telephone conversation on March 28, 1983, I am enclosing some relevant materials from my research proposal for a study of VCCS teaching faculty preferences for possible directions for the VCCS.

The questionnaire should take faculty about five to ten minutes to complete. Survey results will be sent to interested parties in the VCCS, SCHEV, and individual VCCS institutions as well as to all participants who request a copy.

If there is any further information you need, I can be reached at (SCATS)564-2895.

Sincerely,

Barbara K. Townsend
Associate Professor
Developmental English

Enclosures: Chapter Three of Proposal with Two Attachments
Sample Questionnaire
Sample Cover Letter for Questionnaire

cc: Dr. Perry Adams
Vice Chancellor/Academic Affairs and Planning
April 27, 1983

Ms. Barbara K. Townsend
Thomas Nelson Community College
P. O. Box 9407
Hampton, Virginia 23670

Dear Barbara:

Thank you for your letter of March 30 and subsequent follow-up of April 21 regarding your doctoral research proposal, "Possible Institutional Directions for the VCCS: A Study of VCCS Faculty Preferences." We have reviewed the research methodology and questionnaire instrument, and you received our comments and suggestions via phone conversation with Dr. Morse on April 26.

Subsequent to this System level approval, your next step is to contact each of the 23 VCCS presidents asking for permission to survey their faculty as determined by your sampling technique. Each president has the final authority to decide about cooperating with your research activities.

At the conclusion of the study, each of the cooperating community college presidents should receive a copy of the study results in the form of a bound dissertation or project report. One copy of the published results should also be sent to my attention at the System Offices.

Best wishes for the successful completion of the study and your doctoral program. Please let me know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Elmo D. Roesler, Director
Planning and Evaluation

EDR: EM/cm

cc: Dr. Perry Adams
    Dr. Thomas S. Kubala
    Dr. Ed Morse
April 29, 1983

Dear President ____________________:

At present there is a lot of discussion about the educational mission of the community college — what it is and what it should be. For example, some believe the community college should continue in its course as a comprehensive educational institution, offering academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service programs. Others believe the community college should change direction and move toward becoming a postsecondary occupational training center, dropping most academic and community service programs. What future direction Virginia's community colleges will take is unknown at this point. Also unknown is what direction the faculty in Virginia's community colleges would prefer for these institutions.

As a doctoral candidate in the higher education program at the College of William and Mary, I would like to examine faculty preferences for various possible institutional directions for the Virginia Community College System by surveying a random sample of all full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS concerning this topic. Since faculty preferences are a factor which those who determine the future direction of Virginia's community colleges may wish to consider in making this decision, the results of this research will be sent to officials within the State Council of Higher Education, the VCCS, and other interested parties.

Several of the faculty in my sample are from your institution, so I am requesting your permission to send these faculty my survey questionnaire, a copy of which is enclosed. The Virginia Community College System has granted me permission to conduct this research as the enclosed letter indicates. So that I can meet my deadline of May 15 for mailing out the questionnaires, I would appreciate it if you would give me your response by May 10. Simply fill out the bottom portion of the next page and return it to me in the enclosed envelope.

If you have any questions, please call me at Thomas Nelson Community College (SCATS) 564-2895/2897, where I am a faculty member. I will be glad to answer any questions or give you any further information you need.

Sincerely,

Barbara K. Townsend
Higher Education Program
College of William and Mary

Enclosures: Sample Questionnaire
Letter from VCCS
Return Envelope
I give my permission for the questionnaire to be mailed to randomly selected faculty at my institution.

I do not give my permission.

President__________________________
(Signature)

Institution_______________________

I would like a copy of the results of the research.
APPENDIX B
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
Q-12 Have you ever taught at a vocational-technical center or a proprietary school? (Write answer in blank space) __________________________

Q-13 During this present academic year, are you performing some administrative tasks for which you receive a lighter teaching load and/or overload pay in compensation? (Write answer in blank space) __________________________

Q-14 Have you ever taught a continuing education (non-credit) course at your institution? (Write answer in blank space) __________________________

Is there anything else you would like to say about the present and/or possible future direction(s) for the community college in Virginia? If so, please use this space for that purpose.

POSSIBLE INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTIONS FOR THE VCC:

A STUDY OF VCC FACULTY PREFERENCES

HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
WILLIAMSBURG, VA. 23185

Your contribution to this research is greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please write the word YES in the space below. We will see that you get it.
When the General Assembly established the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) in 1964, the Assembly mandated that each community college should offer academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service (non-credit personal interest courses and cultural activities) programs.

Q-1 Indicate what percentage of your institution's resources you think both IS and SHOULD BE committed to these program areas. (Write answers in blank spaces.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>SHOULD BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC (TRANSFER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL-TECHNICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100S</td>
<td>100S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-2 Since individual Virginia community colleges serve different types of communities (i.e., rural, suburban, urban), it is possible that your individual community college may be committing its resources to these program areas in a different proportion than does the VCCS as a whole.

Indicate what percentage of the System's resources you think both IS and SHOULD BE committed to these program areas. (Write answers in blank spaces.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>SHOULD BE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC (TRANSFER)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATIONAL-TECHNICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100S</td>
<td>100S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q-3 Using the scale given below, indicate how much influence you think VCCS faculty presently HAVE and SHOULD HAVE in determining the direction of their own institution. (Write answers in blank spaces.)

1. NO INFLUENCE
2. A SLIGHT INFLUENCE
3. A MODERATE INFLUENCE
4. A MAJOR INFLUENCE
5. THE PRIMARY INFLUENCE

HAVE _____ SHOULD HAVE _____

Q-5 Several possible institutional directions for the community college exist. Below are brief descriptions of four of these.

a. Academically Oriented Two-Year College
   Commit most of its resources to degree-credit programs in both academic (transfer) and occupational-technical education; has a general education core curriculum required of all students; minimizes community service activities.

b. Community-Based Learning Center
   Emphasizes lifelong learning and the part-time adult learner; de-emphasizes the formal structure of credit hours and content and serves as a "center" or center of a community learning network where the student is linked up with someone or someplace that can teach him what he wants to know.

c. Comprehensive Community College
   Includes and emphasizes equally academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service programs.

d. Postsecondary Occupational Training Center
   Primarily offers occupational training, often in cooperation with industrial establishments; has very limited offerings in the humanities and social and natural sciences.

Indicate your preference for these possible directions for the VCCS by ranking them. Use the scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the direction least preferred and 5 the most preferred. (Write your answers in the blanks.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMICALLY ORIENTED TWO-YEAR COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to help us interpret the results, please provide us with answers to the following questions.

Q-6 What is your age? (Write answer in blank space)

Q-7 In what field is your highest earned degree? (Write answer in blank space)

Q-8 In which program area (academic/transfer or occupational-technical) are the majority of the courses which you teach? (Write answer in blank space)

Q-9 Counting the present academic year (2018-19) as one year and including all, how many years have you been a teaching faculty member (full- or part-time) in any community college, not just in the VCCS? (Write answer in blank space)

Q-10 Have you ever taught at the secondary level? (Write answer in blank space)

Q-11 How many years have you ever taught at a four-year college or university? (Write answer in blank space)
APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE TO FACULTY

IN SAMPLE
Dear Colleague:

At present there is a lot of discussion about the educational mission of the community college — what it is and what it should be. For example, some believe the community college should continue in its course as a comprehensive educational institution, offering academic (transfer), occupational-technical, and community service programs. Others believe the community college should change direction and move toward becoming a postsecondary occupational training center. What future direction Virginia's community colleges will take is unknown at this point. Also unknown is what direction the faculty in Virginia's community colleges would prefer for the Virginia Community College System.

You are one of a small number of VCCS faculty who are being asked to give their opinion on this matter. Your name was drawn in a random sample of all full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of the VCCS teaching faculty, it is important that you complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. If a mistake has been made and you are not a full-time teaching faculty member (i.e. you are a counselor, librarian, or administrator under a twelve-month contract), please so indicate on the questionnaire and return it without completing it.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality when you give your responses. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. The number is used so that your name can be checked off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this survey will be made available to officials within the VCCS and the State Council of Higher Education and to any other interested parties. If you wish to receive a summary of results, please so indicate on the last page of the questionnaire.

I would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Please call me at Thomas Nelson Community College (SCATS 564-2895/2897), where I am a faculty member.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Barbara Townsend
Higher Education Program
Last week you were mailed a questionnaire asking your opinion about possible directions for the Virginia Community College System. Your name was picked randomly from the list of all full-time VCCS teaching faculty.

If you have already completed and returned the survey to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because the survey has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS, it is extremely important that your responses be included in the study if the results are to represent accurately the opinions of VCCS faculty.

If by some chance, you did not receive the questionnaire or it has been misplaced, please call me right now at (SCATS)564-2895/2897, and I will send you another survey today.

Sincerely,

Barbara Townsend
Higher Education Program
College of William and Mary
June 6, 1983

Dear Colleague:

About three weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your opinion on possible institutional directions for the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). As of the mailing of this letter, I have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

This study was undertaken because of the belief that faculty opinions should be considered in the formation of plans for the future directions of the VCCS. I am writing to you again to ask you to complete the questionnaire because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of the study. Your name was drawn in a random sample of all full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS. About one out of every six of these faculty has been asked to complete this questionnaire. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the opinions of VCCS full-time teaching faculty, it is essential that every person in the sample return his or her questionnaire.

If a mistake has been made and you are not a full-time teaching faculty member (i.e., you are a counselor, librarian, or administrator under a twelve-month contract), please so indicate on the questionnaire and return it without completing it.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Barbara Townsend
Higher Education Program

Associate Professor
Thomas Nelson Community College
APPENDIX D

FACULTY RESPONSES TO
CONCLUDING QUESTION
"Is there anything else you would like to say about the present and/or future direction(s) for the community college in Virginia?"

A. Comments concerning the four possible institutional directions discussed in this study:

1. Academically Oriented Two-Year College

"The balance of program areas must be determined by user needs. Hence emphasis may well change at any one school. Essential however to maintain (or attain) excellence in the academic/transfer area. Tuition at 4-year institutions is prohibitive and we offer a good alternative. Regardless of emphasis, highly qualified faculty is absolutely essential to continuing success or any program. Administrative support of this goal is needed."

"Because of the present economic crunch, many students who would ordinarily go to four-year colleges are now coming to community colleges; therefore, in consideration to them, I think more transfer courses should be offered. I also think the two plus two programs are beneficial."

"Each community college should be different to reflect the needs of the community. As college costs rise along with enrollments, the community college should increase its transfer program both in academics and technical areas to help both the students and the 4-year institutions."

"I believe that the VCCS is slowly moving closer to secondary education, i.e., as 13th and 14th grades, than towards post-secondary education. This is a waste of resources because the system could provide a real service in assisting academic transfers instead of duplicating much of the course work available in vocational schools or trying to conduct 'developmental' courses to remedy deficiencies in secondary institutions and school districts. This direction is partly due to heavy recruitment of high school faculty rather than college-experience faculty and partly due to the low esteem in which SCHEV holds the VCCS."

"I believe that in the future a larger budget will be needed for academic programs if the community college is to serve the needs of students wishing to take two years of work locally before entering more expensive colleges away from home."

"Would suggest some direction or linkage of two-year transfer programs of community colleges to state four-year colleges; maybe a 'feeder' system which some states have."

2. Community-Based Learning Center

"I see a need to include those taxpaying citizens that would like to take recreational type courses. Current fiscal mood dictates that these people (i.e. they would like to take some woodworking, auto courses, etc. for their own personal use with no thought of using them
for any vocational purposes) be squeezed out by putting pressure on the local institutions to have high percentages completing certificate/degree programs. Also there are many students that have no interest in the academia required by humanities types (to insure their continued employment I suppose) but want to learn trade skills to enable them to earn a living now! Again, the local institution is 'beat over the head' to insure that these people complete the certificate, etc. Most of them dropped out of high school because of these humanities requirements."

"In planning for the future, community colleges must, I think, be both practical and realistic. In being practical, we must recognize demographic trends that affect the age and needs of our potential students and be prepared to adjust to change. In being idealistic, we should maintain a commitment to excellence in education, whether the education be technical or in a basic undergraduate transfer curriculum. We should also continue to function as colleges; we should not succumb to the lures of trendiness, turning ourselves into Learning Centers next year, and, perhaps, Experience Centers ten years later."

3. Comprehensive Community College

"I think the philosophy of the comprehensive community college was well founded from the beginning, and I cannot see that the purpose for which the system was created has changed. It is becoming increasingly expensive for any student to attend a major university for all four years; therefore, I see an increased need for serving the transfer student as well as the student who did not intend to seek training beyond a two-year program. The constant need for retraining presents a definite need for educational opportunities within the community for students of all ages and with all kinds of academic needs."

"The VCCS should remain what it was initially meant to be, that is comprehensive in its offerings."

"Should remain comprehensive -- with less administrative levels."

"The comprehensive community college concept as it is practiced in Virginia offers the citizens of this state the greatest access to higher education at the most reasonable of costs. To suggest it needs to be continued and strengthened is to belabor the obvious."

"I feel that it is very important to continue to offer both academic and vocational courses to Virginians at a low cost (as the community college system is currently doing)."

"I feel the community college mission should continue as it is now. I personally do not know how state funds could be raised to absorb the higher cost of students, especially in the two year transfer programs, that would be forced into the four year colleges or universities for four years of training. The community college is more cost effective and efficient than the colleges and universities from what I can glean in the figures on expenditures that I have seen."
Why should we offer less during a period in our history when more training is essential to the well being of the U.S. economy? That kind of thinking is not even penny wise let alone pound foolish."

"The original intention (direction) of the VCCS system must be maintained. To make accessible and affordable the opportunity for every Virginian to grow academically (or at least get started) and/or to develop work skills to enhance his/her employment opportunity. This does imply a comprehensive and cooperative (with senior institutions) effort."

"This particular community college is in a rural setting and, in my opinion, is the primary reason the comprehensive program is needed here. There is probably about equal interest and participation in all 3 areas -- academic (transfer), occupational/technical and community services."

"There is a great need to have a comprehensive academic/occupational/community based program that meets the need of transfer, 4-year, adult, and community programs for students of all types. A closed vision or becoming too specialized does not meet the needs of the vast majority of students. The community college should remain as it is. If a need has arisen for specialized education, then let new institutions be created to serve those specialized expressed needs. Let us improve the system, not destroy the system by creating a system that serves special interests."  

4. Postsecondary Occupational Training Center

"Maximize occupational/technical activity so as to provide for the economy 'super' para-professionals. Eliminate art, music, drama, athletics in localities which have normal, voluntary, adult community activities in these cultural areas. I observe far too many resources devoted to no more than good amateur productions."

"The greatest impact of the VCCS has been in the area of occupational/technical training to the service area. The Community College has been the only source of education and training for people in this area. "Traditional educators" seem insensitive to the values associated with technical programs -- seeing only the 'problems' associated with acquisition of equipment and facilities to conduct such programs. The service area and the Commonwealth recover the higher cost of technical programs through the increased taxbase of its graduates."

"I believe the rapid growth of technology will and should force the VCCS to recognize this force and act accordingly - such action to include response of the individual schools in the system."

"Based upon my experience at NVCC, I would conclude that the current structure provides an incredible bargain to VA -- a quality program at extremely reasonable cost. VA should be very cautious about altering the system in major ways. In particular, the current newspaper headlines about "high tech" must not delude us into the
misconception that narrow technical-skills training (to make millions of computer programmers?) will properly become the new, exclusive role for the VCCS. The future, like the past, needs educated people accustomed to thinking and learning and growing."

"I think it would be a mistake to have the VCCS become a postsecondary occupational training center. Our need for education in Virginia is to continue a strong academic orientation in which occupational training can take place."

"The comprehensive community colleges, regionally located, are a major part of any effort to provide post-secondary education for the citizens of Virginia. To make the colleges postsecondary occupational training centers is to take a major step away from our goal of providing opportunities for college education for our citizens."

"I think the Community College System has taken a dangerous turn toward training technicians, and is turning away from the areas (humanities, arts, languages, history) which give meaning, depth, and a sense of responsibility to life."

"With rising tuition in four year institutions, I believe it behooves the state to make available the first 2 years of college at price levels students/parents can afford. I would be disappointed if community colleges were made into occupational-technical institutions."

"Direction 'D' is being performed by other institutions. If (this) new 'direction' was taken, there would be little reason for the existence of the community college."

"...we must resist the pressure to become purely occupational training centers, funneling the lower and lower middle classes into boring, low paying, dead end jobs. The academic transfer programs provide the opportunity for people to obtain the broad educational background needed for real success."

"I believe it would be extremely short-sighted of the Commonwealth to move farther toward emphasizing occupational training, which necessarily implies de-emphasizing education in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Hopefully the Commonwealth will realize that the educational system needs to produce citizens with all that implies and not just productive automations for the industrial process. It will require all our intelligence and ability to survive humanely in the decades ahead, and that certainly means more than just earning a living!"

5. Miscellaneous

"After having taught at three previous four-year institutions (full-time) plus presently teaching at another four-year institution and having come to this institution from operating a business, I feel that this institution as it is presently formulated is the closest to the 'real world' of any in the academic world. With our Internship programs, Curriculum Advisory Committees, and mix of older/second career
students, we are keeping pace with new technologies and marketplace changes far better than 90% of the four-year institutions. We can assist our students in getting jobs, and monitor their job performance. It would be unfortunate to alter this mix of the community/older student/younger student, and work market as it presently exists."

"I would like to see the VCCS converted to 4-year colleges and offer terminal (graduate) degrees."

"I think we should encourage job training and preparation but before we do so, I think we should see to it that our students receive essential academic exposure.

"There is going to be a great need for retraining the adult population -- we must make provisions to fill this need and it won't be the same at each college location."

"We need to encourage both academic programs and vocational programs equally. I feel that the community college can play an important part in the future of higher education. We need to be more aggressive in seeking out students."

"Since I am in the Social Sciences my opinion can be construed to be biased, but if you sample the articles published in occupational-technical journals now you will find quite a few references to the idea that skilled labor and technology professions must include education in the humanities and social sciences. The community college must and will become responsive to the office-information systems revolution about to take place, but it cannot afford to lose the academic curriculum of the humanities and social sciences which is essential to producing fully functioning human beings."

"As a sociologist I see 'smokestack' America disappearing. For the long term -- as well as the short term -- the VCCS needs to offer a diversity of programs that will fulfill the total educational needs of Va.'s citizens. The general educational level of Va.'s citizens needs to be raised in order that a pool of highly qualified employees can 'lure' technologically advanced industry. Va.'s leaders cannot expect to fulfill the total educational needs of Va.'s citizens nor to prepare a highly qualified labor force on good intentions alone. With an educated citizenry, Va. can assume national leadership. If we don't meet the total educational needs, then Va. will be a second-rate Commonwealth. The choice is being made now by Va.'s present leaders."

"The CC should become more involved with community needs as well as make attempts to stay abreast of changes in academic/transfer and vo tech. areas. This would call for greater communication on the part of colleges and citizens. Some areas of concern:

1. Except in areas of need, colleges should not overlap in function."
2. CC's should provide (at continued reduced rates) the opportunity to obtain academic transfer curr. for interested/underprivileged.

3. CC's should operate more on basis of need for that population that will not respond to transfer or degree type programs. To do this, traditional structure must be broken down and become more intimately involved with comm. life to determine those needs, and best response to them.

4. Traditional approaches of fee-for-service may have to be done away with or altered considerably with greater stability provided to structure through tax base.

5. Ivan Illych has good proposals which I believe to be workable if given proper concern and attention.

"(1) Associate degree academic (transfer) and occupational-technical programs must be emphasized on the community college level and not in the 4-year institutions. (2) More funding to community colleges for freshman and sophomore level transfer courses with 4-year institutions placing emphasis on upper level and graduate courses. (3) A better funding system for lifelong learning for both academic and continuing education courses, especially when the learner is not enrolled in a specific curriculum. Such courses that are used to update skills, learn new skills or prepare one to re-enter the job market. (4) Continuing education courses (non-credit) should not be a profit making endeavor of 30% for the State of Virginia or VCCS. Seminars or workshops should be self-supporting only."

"The 1966 General Assembly mandate for the Va. Comm. College System should not be forgotten in the eighties. The VCCS provides important services to many Virginia residents that would not be offered if it were not for the VCCS. Therefore, the VCCS should be on the same or higher level as Virginia's four year colleges who offer fewer services to fewer Virginians."

B. Other Comments

1. VCCS in general

"The VCCS must understand that opportunity to earn credit and granting of credit are not the same thing. Or, to put it another way, solid standards must be set and observed."

"The NVCC system is destroying itself. The quality teachers are leaving -- are actually being pushed out by the system that destroys motivation, energy, and creativity, not to mention pay!!"

"The VCCS needs to be restructured to allow greater flexibility in the operation of VCCS. Restructuring would allow less paperwork, reduction in cost of operation, and quicker response time in meeting local needs. The VCCS needs to re-evaluate its mission and how to meet today's educational needs. It operates in the 1980s like it is still 1970. Changes are needed in thinking, structure, and operation."
"I have worked in public community college systems in three states including 7 years in this one. My experience with the VCCS has not been ideal. Using the professional resources of the faculty is just not done. Communication has been discouraged. Additionally, salary funding is well below standards."

"Faculty feel that VCCS is (generally) deaf to their professional input. Token stuff only."

"As indicated so often in the press, these decisions are not being made by the system but for it by politicians. Thus, the VCCS seems to have no direction. It ebbs and flows as do the winds of politics. The system needs leadership. Its administrators seek to appease. It is floundering badly. And the effects are evident in faculty morale."

"At a time when public education is being criticized and re-evaluated and when talent is sold cheaply, we still, have no enlightened, creative leadership and no promise of any. Taxpayers deserve better. We do not have the resources to give those students without wealth and status the education they need to seek real equality and play vigorous roles in their society. The VCCS pays lip service to the old idea of quality education at the public expense for the public good."

"I do not believe that the VCCS, as consumer of funds, is justifiable in a period of tight budgets. It seems that they are an obstacle to progress. Requests for course approvals from Richmond take months, not due to coordinating delays, but rather due to bureaucratic delay. Community colleges should adequately fund quality programs that meet 'significant' community and state needs. Areas that are underenrolled (after a reasonable time to test the market) should be eliminated."

2. Desire for more local autonomy

"The system should be de-centralized with individual institutions given greater autonomy. The central staff (VCCS) in Richmond should be cut down to around twenty people."

"I would like to see the VCCS move away from its highly centralized organizational structure and give more autonomy to local institutions. In many ways, running everything through Richmond for approval is counter productive."

"It seems to me that educational mission, needs, goals, etc., need to be determined at the local level in the Va. Community College System by faculty and staff who are unencumbered by burdensome and overly complex procedures of an unresponsive state bureaucracy. Local control will be more effective, more responsive and more pertinent."

"More planning on a local level rather than increased centralization in all functional matters."
"More local autonomy, with greater faculty involvement, is sorely needed, and the administrative structure should be made simpler, and less expensive, at all levels."

"...the recent and proposed steps to centralize administration and to institute narrowly defined concepts of 'efficiency' are leading, at the faculty level, to a factory atmosphere of the worst sort, and at the student level to 'competency based' curricula which produce students who master all the little skills but cannot integrate that knowledge in the usual sense of the word. We must, instead, decentralize management, allowing individual colleges, departments and professors to respond to the variety of situations with which they are faced, trusting that their actions will be intelligent and human. We must encourage the academic programs and the liberal arts by giving them the resources to grow. In short, we must serve all of the community. I suspect I have interpreted the question more broadly than intended. Forgive me. I had a liberal education."

3. Relation to four-year schools

"Quit treating the VCCS as the whipping boy of Va. higher education system."

"...The System is clearly the stepchild of higher education in Virginia -- unwanted by the 4-year schools. Its students are looked upon the same way...."

"The Community College System needs more recognition from the 'conservative' institutions of 4-year higher education. We will 'come of age' by the end of the 1980s as our graduates mature and begin to politically and economically impact the legislature. We will no longer be Jefferson's bastard child. We will become full heirs to Virginia's education future. It's only a matter of time."

"...Of more concern to me is the relationship between the VCCS system and the four-year college system. I feel that generally coordination or direction is not exemplary."

"Need to develop workable articulation agreements with 4-year colleges in all disciplines. Now students in many areas are penalized for attending 2-year colleges. Students should not have to repeat or challenge courses for which they have previously earned credit."

"There should be better working relationships between the 4 year institutions, community colleges and their respective accrediting agencies."

"The purpose of the community college needs to be more closely defined and supported by the VCCS. The community college seems to be in a 'limbo,' as when references are made to 'institutions of higher learning.' Only when convenient does this apply to the community college."
4. Role of developmental studies

"I believe the most critical issue in the VCCS right now is the role of Developmental Studies, which this survey overlooks. Each year we have greater numbers of students needing Developmental Studies prior to curriculum entrance, but SCHEV is making a lot of noise about cutting back that part of our mission. That conflict will overshadow your selected issues during the next five years, at least in my opinion."

"The infinite amount of money the federal and state governments are pouring into remedial education is going to dwindle, making the VCCS a partially closed door institution."

"Remedial, or developmental type courses should be taught at community colleges, not at 4-year institutions. It should be a role of the comm. coll., not 4-year institutions to bring students to a level where they can succeed in college level courses."

"I agree with the push to reduce remedial work provided by VCCS in reading and math. Along with this should be a trend to monitor more closely admission standards within the VCCS."

5. Faculty concerns

"The pay faculty are receiving is not keeping pace with local public school systems' pay. I would foresee a gradual exit of teachers especially in the math/science, electronics and data processing areas."

"I feel that the VCCS headquarters ought to keep summer pay for faculty on a statewide formula rather than allow some colleges (community) to pay faculty differently, at lower than stated rates."

"Faculty at VCCS should be paid at the same scale as faculty at 4-year Virginia colleges and universities, i.e., George Mason, VCU, etc., etc."

"If faculty members don't get paid more, we will not have any quality people to keep the VCCS growing!"

"Recognize the value of the VCCS teaching faculty. Give us equal stature and workloads as compared to our peers in four-year institutions."

"There must be less reliance on part-time faculty. Faculty members should be on a 12-months contract -- (or at least given the option) -- which includes the equivalent of 6 credits to 9 credits in summer as guarantee -- if that can be justified. Then spread it out over 12 months so faculty members can have better retirement benefits."

"A constant struggle between administration and faculty. I would like to see harmony at some point in time. I think the pay should be based on credits. Meaning establish what 1 credit is worth. English
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101, Math 118 or whatever demands hours of prep. and then the actual lecture. Not so in my field (automotive technology). We worry about safety, products, tools, grease and oil on the floor, fire hazards, type of clothing and shoes worn. And yet my courses are (I feel) weighed in at less value, credit-wise. I have been through the CC system as a student (AAS) (Lab Tech.) and now have 7 years full-time faculty and all things considered I tell you truthfully I would rather teach 3 classes of Math 118 or 119 than teach auto tune-up (3 credits). We must clean our blackboards, empty out trash, wash our laboritories and commodes."

"Present directions have a very negative demoralizing effect on faculty. For the last 2 years there has been no item of good news. At each faculty meeting we are informed of:

- budget cuts
- more VCCS and institutional constraints, adverse to teaching and faculty
- need for greater 'productivity'

We are told our goal for productivity is 104%. (This equates to filling each class to the maximum permitted figure and somewhat above). 'Productivity' (sheer numbers) is now being equated with quality of teaching. This is very depressing since the main motivations of faculty have been true quality education and love of teaching and concern for our students as our rewards; as clearly our low pay and long hours are not rewards. Faculty now gets the implicit message: cut standards and keep your classes full. That will not only devastate pride in our work, destroying dedication, but ultimately, perhaps even sadder, will knock out the bottom of the educational pyramid in Virginia, with the impact felt all the way up through graduate programs."

6. Miscellaneous

"1. Recognize the superb planning in establishing the 23 community colleges.
2. Everyone is talking about high technology. Most community colleges have been involved in it since 1966.
3. JLARC should accent the positive aspects more and help gain space, faculty, and budget to provide training for departments of high-tech that are turning away students at the present time. Instead they nitpick about a few unproductive areas."

"Critical problem (as I see it) is how to reduce student attrition."

"Some comments I feel like making! 1) We should switch over from quarters to semesters. Then more of our courses could be academically transferred to 4-year schools. 2) We need to raise our standards, whichever direction we take. Our students are of a very low quality, in general."

"Education budgets for all Virginia schools should be increased not decreased!"
"... the image of the Comm. College should be altered from the place you go if you can't get in the 4-year schools to a respected place for all learners which is close to their homes."

"The community college, especially here in Northern Virginia, should be on the semester system -- would save money and be in tune with other area universities. The humanities should not neglected -- but science and math should be strengthened."

"Legislators have to realize that all VA citizens do not live in metropolitan areas!"

"Funding levels for services and salary cannot continue low; the VCCS will lose teachers and students both."

"Stronger academic requirements for those entering the academic/transfer programs."

"1. Cut down on numbers admitted to programs and achieve quality. 2. Have more selected admission policies to some programs. 3. Cut down on grade inflation in some curricula."

"Some students who took the con. ed classes (noncredit) eventually became students at the college. It if were not for a community college near my home, I would not be where I am today. I would not have gone on to college!"

"With rising costs of education, we should provide more opportunities in our local areas to these students seeking a 4-year education. Much cheaper to attend a community college the first year or two."

"Need to have more flexibility to respond to curriculum needs in rapidly changing areas. The present review process in secretarial science is an example of the hopeless delays in bringing needed change. Need review process for continuing update of technology and resources so that vitality is maintained with state-of-the-art equipment/facilities. Transfer programs need to be transferrable -- to be of a quality to be accepted at other state schools, then to be accepted. Continuing or community educ. needs closer coordination with college divisions."

"We are going to have a learning resources center, but not sure when. Probably in the fall. I believe it will be community oriented."

"I would like for all students to take a reading comprehension test and a specified score be obtained before the student could enroll in a curriculum."

"I'd like to see more sensitivity to the needs of industry and business as well as schools, municipalities, military bases, etc. I see this as a function of administration, but no one is doing it. We need a liaison -- perhaps a separate position; perhaps through released time or overload pay it could be accomplished -- to search out needs for
new course offerings, expansion of present areas, and consulting work. Business and industry are presently largely unaware of the potential of the community colleges to help meet their needs."

"I . . . favor the notion of combining several small institutions into a large one and reducing administrative needs."

"I . . . believe that far too often we educators tend to dictate rather than respond to student needs. We often tend to forget that our educational resources belong to our taxpayers rather than providing a fiefdom for educators."

"The huge gap between the business of education and the process of education is more and more evident. Large classes, late registration, and poorly paid teachers are all designed to meet the needs of the business end. Unfortunately, the quality of education suffers as class size goes up and students show up 10 days late and the better teachers are hired away by better paying jobs. While we're assessing our purposes, we ought also to be assessing our priorities and what we have to offer the student once we have his money."

"I would appreciate a clearer understanding of the role and future operation of the recently created VCCA (Virginia Community College Association), especially what role it will play in academic curriculums, etc., decisions in VCCS."

"In view of A Nation at Risk report on education, we'll probably be establishing more stringent, if departmental, exit requirements. (We already have expanded the developmental programs in Engl., Math, Reading, and Engl. as 2nd lang., and TV courses and computer offerings). Future ideas! More internationally-oriented, 'world-village' thinking in course offerings, planning, etc. (in addition to BASICS!!). More opportunities for faculty to get degrees in other fields, to do research -- or creative projects -- with release time or some incentive/reward; smaller classes!! We need more GENERALISTS to solve complex issues!"
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Abstract

FACULTY'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE IDENTITY PROBLEM OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: A STUDY OF FACULTY SUPPORT FOR SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONAL DIRECTIONS FOR THE VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

Barbara Kate Townsend, Ed.D

The College of William and Mary in Virginia, December 1983

Chairman: John R. Thelin

The purpose of this study was to determine Virginia Community College System (VCCS) faculty preferences for four possible institutional directions for the VCCS and to explore possible relationships between specific faculty characteristics and preferences for individual directions. Information derived from the study was to be used to clarify whether or not community college faculty support the broad institutional directions envisioned by community college leaders in their efforts to instill a strong identity for this institution. Faculty support is viewed as vital to the development of a strong identity or "organizational saga" as defined by Burton Clark.

The population for this study was all full-time teaching faculty in the VCCS for the academic year 1982-83. 323 faculty were systematically selected after first being stratified along the variable of institutional size as determined by full-time student enrollment. Those selected for the sample received a survey questionnaire primarily asking them to rank order their preferences for four possible institutional directions for the VCCS and requesting information about specific faculty characteristics.

It was hypothesized that 1) the majority of VCCS faculty would rank first the direction of Comprehensive Community College, 2) that they would least prefer the direction of Community-Based Learning Center, and 3) that specific faculty characteristics would affect specific preferences.

Information derived from the completed questionnaires (70 percent response rate) was statistically analyzed using multiple discriminant function analysis. The results supported the first two hypotheses but failed to show any correlation between specific faculty characteristics and specific directions with one exception: faculty teaching the majority of their courses in occupational-technical courses were likely to most prefer the institutional direction of Comprehensive Community College.
The results also support the overall conclusion that the heterogeneity of community college faculty negatively affects their unanimity for any one institutional direction desired by national and state leaders of the community college. The lack of support by the majority of community college faculty for any one institutional direction may be an important factor in the community college’s continuing identity problem with the general public, legislators, and those in higher education.

Further study is needed to clarify which faculty characteristics, if any, affect preferences for institutional directions. In addition, student, administrator, and alumni preferences should also be investigated. The manifestations in the community college of other key elements in Clark’s organizational saga could also be studied.