

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

7824902

STANTON, HENRY THOMPSON, JR.
A STUDY OF FACTORS RELATED TO THE
DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED BY TWO-YEAR BUSINESS
TRANSFER STUDENTS MATRICULATING AT A PRIVATE
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION: AN ARTICULATION
INVENTORY INDEX.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1978

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

A STUDY OF FACTORS RELATED TO THE DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED
BY TWO-YEAR BUSINESS TRANSFER STUDENTS MATRICULATING
AT A PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION:
AN ARTICULATION INVENTORY INDEX

by

H. T. Stanton, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1978

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

Alvin C. Grabber

Committee Members

Richard H. Waller
Fritz M. ...
Stephen E. ...
Stephen K. ...

March 20 1978
Date of Acceptance by Committee

STANTON, JR., HENRY THOMPSON. A Study of Factors Related to the Difficulties Encountered by Two-Year Business Transfer Students Matriculating at a Private Four-Year Institution: An Articulation Inventory Index. (1978)
Directed by: Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. Pp. 93.

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the influence of certain personal-social and educational variables on perceived articulation barriers of two-year transfer students matriculating at a private four-year institution. The predictor variables were sex, employment status, decision-making stage, institution type, and grade point average. The criterion variable was the scores on the Articulation Inventory Index.

The sample consisted of 57 two-year business transfer students from a total student population of 1700. Four hundred and fifty of these students were majoring in a business-related program and 75 of these students were two-year transfer students.

The data collected were from two instruments developed by the investigator: (1) the Demographic Questionnaire and (2) the Articulation Inventory Index. Analyses of Variance and F tests set at the .05 level of confidence were used to test the significance of findings.

Four sets of null hypotheses were formulated. The first set, that there would be no significant difference between male and female transfer students on the Articulation Inventory Index was rejected. Null hypotheses regarding the differences among institutional type and the interactive effects of sex differences and institutional type were accepted. The

second set, that there would be no differences between and among academic grade categories and sex differences and their interaction was accepted. The third set, that there would be no differences between transfer students employed and unemployed was accepted. The fourth set, that there would be no differences among the four decision-making stages to enter the four-year institution was rejected. Significant differences were found between those students who decided to transfer before enrolling in the two-year institution and those who decided to transfer during the first year at the two-year institution. Significant differences were also found between those students who decided to transfer during the first year at the two-year institution and those who decided to transfer after graduation from the two-year institution.

The following conclusions seemed to be warranted on the basis of this study: (1) Female transfer students tended to perceive greater articulation barriers than male transfer students. (2) The type of institution that a transferring student previously attended, did not tend to influence articulation scores. (3) Academic grade categories did not tend to influence articulation scores. (4) Employment status was not a factor regarding articulation scores. (5) Students who decided to transfer during the first year at the two-year institution tended to perceive more articulation barriers than students who decided to transfer before enrolling in the two-year institution. In addition, students who made a decision to transfer during the first year tended to

perceive more articulation barriers than students who decided to transfer after graduation from the two-year institution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator is sincerely grateful to many persons for their encouragement and assistance throughout the doctoral program that culminated with the writing of this dissertation.

I am especially appreciative to Dr. Dale L. Brubaker, chairperson of my committee, whose patience, encouragement, and professionalism made this investigation and future career values possible.

Sincere appreciation is also due to Dr. Richard H. Weller, Dr. Fritz Mengert, Dr. Benton E. Miles, and Dr. Stephen R. Lucas for their guidance and support as members of the committee.

A special thank you is extended to Dr. Richard H. Weller for the astute orientation to the university doctoral program. The investigator is indebted to Dr. Roger Woodbury of the Wilson County Technical Institute, Wilson, North Carolina for assistance in research design and statistical analysis.

Sincere appreciation is also expressed to my wife, Susan, and my daughter, Chris, whose patience, understanding, and support were a constant source of strength.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
General Problem Area	1
Contemporary Statistics	3
Evolution of the Sixties	4
Articulation Implications	7
Statement of the Problem	8
Significance of the Study	9
Assumptions and Limitations	10
Definition of Terms	11
Summary	13
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	15
The Articulation Process	15
Attitudinal Barriers	18
Institutional Barriers	22
Business Student Inference	24
Summary	25
III. RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES	26
Pilot Study	26
Subjects	27
Research Instruments	27
Procedure	29
Pilot Study Item Analysis	30
Summary of the Pilot Study	33

CHAPTER	Page
The Sample	33
Institution of the Study	33
Subjects	34
Procedure	34
Instrumentation	36
Variables	38
Null Hypothesis	39
Statistical Methods	40
Summary	41
IV DATA AND ANALYSIS	43
Summary	52
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	54
Summary	55
Set I	55
Set II	55
Set III	56
Set IV	56
Discussion	57
Conclusions	68
Suggestions for Future Research	69
Reference Notes	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
APPENDIXES	82
A. ARTICULATION BARRIER INDEX	83
B. GENERAL INFORMATION SECTION: Part One	84
C. DATA SOURCE: Part Two	85
D. GUIDELINES FOR TRANSFER	88
E. DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	90
F. ARTICULATION INVENTORY	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Item and Total Mean Scores on the Data Source . .	32
2. A 2 x 3 Factorial Analysis of Variance and <u>F</u> Tests for the Factors Sex Differences and Institutional Type Regarding Transfer Students' Mean Scores on the Articulation Inventory	44
3. Means and Standard Deviations for Male and Female Transfer Students Regarding Mean Scores on the Articulation Inventory	45
4. Means and Standard Deviations of Male and Female Transfer Students by Institutional Type	45
5. A 3 x 2 Factorial Analysis of Variance and <u>F</u> Tests for the Factors Academic Grade Categories and Sex Differences, Regarding Transfer Students' Scores on the Articulation Inventory	47
6. An Analysis of Variance and <u>F</u> Test Between Transfer Students Employed and Those Unemployed in College	48
7. Means and Standard Deviations for Transfer Students Employed and Unemployed in College . . .	49
8. An Analysis of Variance and <u>F</u> Test of the Differences among Decision-Making Stages Regarding Students' Mean Scores on the Articulation Inventory Score	50
9. Means and Standard Deviations of Mean Scores on the Articulation Inventory by Decision-Making Stages	51
10. Newman-Keuls Significance Values Between Mean Scores on the Articulation Inventory Between Decision-Making Stages	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of certain personal-social and educational variables on perceived articulation barriers (Note 1) of two-year transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution majoring in a business-related program. A conceptual base for this study was provided by the researcher's former work interest, concerned students, and change agents (Gleazer, 1968; Medsker & Tillery, 1971; Sartre, 1973; Kintzer, 1973a; Alstyne, 1974; Menacker, 1974; Darnes, 1974). It is important to understand this investigation will not address the past historical significance of the two-year institution, with the exception of pertinent reference, but will approach the two-year institution's concerns with contemporary implications.

General Problem Area

Much of the literature on two-year institution students focuses on past, present, and future student characteristics of this incipient educational phenomenon that is appearing to challenge the traditional avenues of higher education. The rapid growth of two-year institutions in the sixties has produced a unique category of American institutions, unique

in that the only common denominator appears to be that all of them offer two-year postsecondary education (Medsker & Tillery, 1971).

The two-year institution basically is of three parts; junior colleges, community colleges, and technical institutes. Thornton (1972) reported that there have been many uncoordinated influences that have necessitated these different yet often competing agents for postsecondary students. Institutions which were chartered for one purpose are now so different in scope that their original purpose would be difficult to define.

This seemingly ambiguous purpose does have a central core that permeates the heart of the two-year college movement. The assumption that educational opportunity and growth terminates at a particular period is not accepted in contemporary society (Gleazer, 1968). Researchers Templin (1976) and Woodrum (1976) reached similar conclusions on the basis of their studies in the role of technical institutes and community colleges. Our rising and changing civilization will necessitate and subsidize educational opportunities longer than 12 years. This will be the challenge of public education as it develops post-high-school programs to assist the individual to be a better citizen and to be more adequately prepared for his life work (Epler, 1955).

The key institutions which will bear this responsibility will be area technical institutes and community

colleges offering both the more practical foundation of trade, technical, and business vocations while pursuing liberal education or semi-professional training (Gleazer, 1968). These postsecondary educational challenges and responsibilities had a significant impact on student enrollment in higher education.

Contemporary Statistics

The role of the two-year institution is enhanced by the 1977 statistical report, The Condition of Education, which reflects that colleges and universities have experienced a rapid growth during the past 15 years. The report further reveals that while four-year institutions have shown larger numerical increases than two-year institutions, proportionate growth has been larger for the two-year institution. From 1960 to 1975, total enrollment in four-year institutions grew $1\frac{1}{2}$ times from 3,171,000 to 7,314,000 persons with the two-year institution increasing five-fold from 617,000 to 3,871,000 persons. In view of these figures, articulation by two-year students to four-year institutions would be a serious concern.

The four-year institution enrollment is expected to level off while the two-year enrollment projects continual increments into the early 1980's. Drake (1977) supports this trend by reporting that the 1976 postsecondary enrollment of 11,337,000 persons will be represented by 4,086,000

two-year students (36 percent). This represents a 10 percent increase since 1970.

Data reflect some ambiguity in the actual number of two-year students who will transfer; however, Medsker and Tillery (1971) reported that of the two-thirds who indicate transfer expectations, one-third do matriculate to a four-year institution. Using Drake's (1977) data, 1,362,000 students could be personally concerned with articulation processes in 1978. The magnitude of these figures is significant; yet it is important to understand that the two-year student is a product of a changing society, a society that will provide a "new educational credential" of paramount importance in the articulation process.

Evolution of the Sixties

The two-year institution represented one of the fastest growing educational institutions in America (Cohen, 1969; Bushnell, 1973; Gleazer, 1974; Zwerling, 1976). The late 1960's and early 1970's represented a period of history that was characterized by a new awareness of contemporary problems: social injustice, an unpopular war, and social institutions with values that heretofore had remained unquestioned. It was to generate a new population mix (Sethi, 1971). The conceptual aftermath would provide the two-year institution with new students: disadvantages minorities, unemployed, senior citizens, women, full-time

employed, parolees, and all segments of society which have normally been disenfranchised because of the prevailing orientation toward the traditional educational target (Park, 1976). Park and Gleazer reported that people were searching for new life goals and raising serious questions about the utility of the college degree as the vehicle to a good job. Toffler (1970) in Future Shock described this time as a break with the past and death of permanence.

The two-year community college was a vivid departure from the traditional mold of higher education (Solomon, 1976). The academic, economic, and social barriers to post-high-school education would be eliminated (Medsker, 1960; Jennings, 1970; Zwerling, 1976). Menefee (1973) describes the movement:

Here they come . . . recent high school graduates and drop outs, young adults now at last ready to settle down to the business of getting and holding an education, middle-aged men and women seeking of a second career, and assorted other students of all ages who would like to take a course once in a while. (p. 16)

Menefee described the trend as a fresh vitality with its debarkation of tradition as unprecedented numbers of students are "pursuing learning in new kinds of places, in diverse ways, and at their own most comfortable pace" (p. 22). The writer reported that some students are seeking job-related programs and others are attending for the purpose of transferring to a four-year institution. Students were allowed to register at any time, drop and add courses

without penalty, and even obtain degrees without attending formal classes by attending "TV College." This type of innovative education led to articulation barriers for the two-year student expecting to transfer to a four-year institution.

Maslow (1971) described his humanistic education in similar non-traditional and innovative language:

Students would come of their own volition . . .
 . . . intrinsic education would be available to
 anyone who wanted it . . . a person would
 learn what he wanted to learn it
 would be a kind of educational retreat which
 you could try to find yourself . . . what
 you like and want . . . moving toward the
 discovery of vocation, and once they found
 it, they could make good use of technological
 education. (p. 182-183)

Menefee (1973) stated that because of this flexibility, it is not surprising that the two-year educational institutions have become the significant factor of educational change.

The community college perceives itself as having a mandate to meet the postsecondary educational aspirations of all the people. It envisions its role as the sovereign "people-changing institution," (Jennings, 1970, p. 15) which all people will use as their vehicle to the mainstream of our way of life. It will play a significant role in the demands of a learning society (Turnbull, 1977).

Jenning's (1970) and Turnbull's (1977) descriptions are quasi-legalized by the purpose statement of the North

Carolina Community College System:

The technical institutes and community colleges offer academic, cultural, and occupational education, and training opportunities from basic education through the two-year-college level, at a convenient time and place and at a nominal cost, to anyone of eligible age who can learn and whose needs can be met by these institutions (1974-76 Biennial Report, p. 1).

Not everyone goes to the two-year institution; however, the present and future trend of its enrollment significance has been established. It has been represented to contemporary society as all things to all people, "the people's institution" (Merlo, 1964, p. 52).

Jencks and Riesman (1968) reported that the reason two-year institutions have not experienced any difficulty in securing students is because their purpose allows and encourages them to service low marginal students. Against a thesis of this magnitude, it would seem axiomatic that two-year transfer students would experience articulation barriers.

Articulation Implications

This egalitarian enrollment democracy in action (Schwartz, 1964) has not been fully accepted by an important faction. Medsker and Tillery (1971) reported there are educational leaders that are concerned about the quality of education that is purported to emanate from the two-year institution. Darnes (1974) stated that the two-year institution is not an equal partner with the four-year

institution. This attitude is not without some foundation, as four-year institution faculties perceive their counterpart and transfer student in low esteem (Leister & Maclachlan, 1976). Senior division faculties have reservations about the depth and quality of the two-year curriculum (DeFore, 1974) and in general, they find two-year students less able than native four-year students (Cooley & Becker, 1966; Calcote, 1971; Fleishans, 1973).

One of the most significant purposes of the contemporary two-year institution has been its preparatory educational function to the senior division. For many people, the four-year degree remains as the meaningful mechanism to participate in the mainstream of our way of life and for various reasons, the new population mix selected the two-year institution as its "initial" entry vehicle. It has been an unexpected shock to learn that it is an academic reality that four-year institutions have constructed monumental transfer hurdles (Kuhns, 1973) and their credentials are considered "second best" (Zwerling, 1976).

These barriers and the inference from the literature that imply these barriers no longer exist, led this investigator to examine the two-year student articulation process.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate the influence

of certain personal-social and educational variables on perceived articulation barriers of two-year transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution majoring in a business-related program. The independent variables included in this study were the effects of personal-social variables--namely, sex differences, employment status, and stage of decision making; and educational factors--namely, two-year institution type, and grade point average. The dependent variable under investigation was the perceived articulation barriers as measured by scores on the Articulation Inventory developed by the investigator. The investigator has in fact constructed an Articulation Barrier Index.

Significance of the Study

This pioneer investigation represented an attempt to develop an instrument that can be utilized in measuring articulation difficulties that have been shared with the researcher over a period of five years by affected two-year business transfer students. Many concerned writers have methodically recognized and reported these "articulation barriers," but no attempt was undertaken to develop an Articulation Barrier Index. This represents a significant aspect of this investigation.

As a result of this investigation, two-year and four-year articulation personnel will have a conceptual communication link; minute yet significant enough to

increase and explore dialogue to more understanding of the articulation problem from the "student orientation."

There have been studies involving two-year transfer students (Buckley, 1971; Donato, 1973; Moore & Hartsell, 1974) matriculating at four-year institutions, but none investigating variables that may interact with perceived articulation barriers. The literature concerning business transfer students, although not extensive, also reflects no such data. The third significant facet of this investigation was its attempt not only to identify and measure articulation barriers, but to determine the correlation between these barriers and personal-social variables and educational factors. The findings from this investigation should assist interested persons in the area of articulation to initiate practices to determine existing articulation utilization and effectiveness between the two institutions.

Assumptions and Limitations

The researcher acknowledges the limits of reliability of this study. In Chapter Two, a review of the literature reflects that the apex of research concerning articulation interest to be approximately 1973-74, with some appearing in 1975-76 and very little in 1977. The current literature dilemma is further emphasized by the lack of sources specifically related to the two-year business transfer student. Manual search, Educational Resources Information

Center (ERIC), and Dissertation Abstract International (DATRIX) data banks confirm this limitation.

The instruments (Articulation Inventory and Demographic Questionnaire) were developed by the researcher with only face validity being established in an early pilot study. The investigator was not aware of instruments that were purported to gather and measure data of this nature. Chapter Three discusses the methodology of research employed by the investigator.

Another limitation was that factors other than those investigated may have caused the variances in the results. These uninvestigated factors may be of anthropological and sociological origin.

Finally, the small size of the sample, which includes a total of 57 two-year transfer students from a college transfer two-year population of 75, was another limiting factor. Though this sample was taken from a four-year institution, there is no assurance that it will reflect the transfer populations from other four-year institutions, public or private, or diverse geographical areas of the country.

Definition of Terms

To clarify the terminology and meaning (Scheffler, 1960) used in this study, the following definitions are offered:

1. Open Door - This concept means that any person who is a high school graduate or who is over eighteen is welcome to attend a two-year institution (Monroe, 1972).

2. Two-Year Transfer - A student who has transferred from a technical institute, community college, or junior college to a four-year institution of higher learning.

3. Native Students - In this study, these students are defined as having first enrolled in a four-year institution and have junior or senior status.

4. Two-Year Institution - Postsecondary educational institutions such as technical institutes, community colleges, and junior colleges that are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or a comparable regional accrediting association.

5. Technical Institute - A postsecondary institution with the "open-door" concept that offers vocational and technical programs that may lead to an Associate in Arts or Science degree, diploma, or certificate.

6. Community College - This is a comprehensive institution:

designed to serve the most diverse populations of youths and adults in all education, encompasses six main functions - - preparation for advanced study, career education, guidance, developmental education, general education, and community service (Medsker & Tillery, 1971, p. 53).

7. Junior College - A two-year college, usually privately owned, which prepares students for transfer to a four-year institution (Thornton, 1972). This study will not delineate between private and public supported junior colleges.

8. Contemporary - This is a chronological frame of reference implying a period from 1965 to 1977.

9. Articulation - This is the method or manner in which students join an educational institution.

10. Matriculation - This implies a student from a two-year institution enrolling in a four-year institution.

11. Senior Division - In this investigation, this division will infer those institutions legally chartered to offer at least the first four years of postsecondary education.

12. Upper Division - This division will infer those institutions that have been legally chartered to act as a receiving institution for two-year students. They do not offer the first and second year of postsecondary education.

Summary

This chapter identified the two-year institution as consisting of three types; junior colleges, community colleges, and technical institutes. These institutions would have a significant impact on student enrollment in higher education. The two-year institution would provide an

educational credential for a new population mix of society that had normally been disenfranchised because of prevailing attitudes toward the traditional educational target. A brief description of the articulation implications for this new student was described. The chapter was concluded with the identification of the problem to be investigated, factors of influence perceived in the articulation process by two-year business transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution. Chapter Two describes a review of the literature concerning the articulation process, attitudinal barriers, institutional barriers, and business student references.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A significant amount of contemporary literature in the area of articulation between the two-year institution and the four-year institution has focused on the academic success or failure of two-year transfer students matriculating at the senior division. This research emphasis presupposes that cooperative articulation between the two institutions has been accomplished and the transfer student can expect a smooth transition into four-year institutions (Menacker, 1974). This outcome ignores the possibility of individual programs of articulation being formulated on the basis of "one person" feelings about the process (Anstett, 1973), or the loss in efficiency of transfer is so minute (Blackwell, 1975) that it does not merit further investigation. The review of literature relevant to this investigation covers (1) the articulation process, (2) attitudinal barriers, (3) institutional barriers, (4) business student inference.

The Articulation Process

There are more beginning freshmen enrolling in two-year institutions than four-year institutions (Jennings, 1970), as community colleges are now appealing to everyone (Gleazer, 1974). For many reasons, a large proportion of

those students seeking two-year degrees will desire to continue toward further degrees immediately or at a later time (Dearing, 1975). Koos (1921) reported that two-year transfers are not a new trend, in that more than 50% of the two-year college graduates of that time went on to four-year institutions if the local facilities were available.

Carmody and Shevel (1972) reported that two-year colleges appeared to raise the degree aspirations of two-year students who previously had indicated a need for only two years of postsecondary education. Carmody and Shevel were supported by Templin's (1976) study describing an increasing proportion of students in nontransfer programs who have expectations of extending their education beyond their present program.

The vehicle for the cooperative transfer is the "articulation process." It consists of recognizing the special needs that two-year transfers require such as planned orientation sessions for only transfers, assistance in securing financial aid and in scheduling required courses, acceptance of two-year courses, full acceptance by the native students and faculty, follow-up advising, and removal of "second-class" stigma (Kintzer, 1973b; Furniss & Martin, 1974; Dearing, 1975; Zwerling, 1976).

Palinchak (1973) reported there is clear evidence that community colleges are preparing "a large number of

students for success in advance studies" (p. 192). The writer stated that without this preparation, the four-year institution would not have the opportunity to service this student potential.

Many students, having been introduced to the opportunity of "open doors" and having met that challenge successfully, expect a smooth articulation to the four-year institution (Kintzer, 1973b; Hostetter, 1975). This universal access to higher education is best represented by The Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education (1970) which stated that qualified graduates of community colleges should be provided full transfer rights by comprehensive state colleges and universities. Two-year institutions are being accepted as educational partners with four-year institutions as many states have adopted higher educational agreements. Palinchak (1973) reported that colleges and universities in 20 states now accept such credit and Kintzer (1973b) stated that statewide articulation authorities in most of the fifty states are working on systematized policies to provide equal opportunity for the transfer student. The North Carolina 1976-78 Educational Guide reported that students who complete two years of a planned program and maintain a "C" average should be able to transfer to the junior year of most senior institutions without loss of time or credit. Kintzer reported that students transferring from junior colleges to senior

institutions can now expect to be given preference; however, the researcher was aware that final evaluation of the articulation process was composed of the baccalaureate granting institution. Knoell and Medsker (1965) acknowledged this articulation criterion when the writers reported that articulation involves more than procedures, referring to the four-year academicians who must implement the procedures.

Attitudinal Barriers

Many entrance officials in the four-year institution find it difficult to believe that two-year institutions can effectively prepare students for advanced college work. Knoell and Medsker (1965) stated that "articulation is both a process and an attitude" (p. 102). Of the two, attitude was reported to be more paramount because without a cooperative attitude, there can be no workable process (Dearing, 1975). The writer reported most of the attitudes that impede the articulation process emanate from senior division registrars, counselors, faculty, and administrators.

Dearing reported that most of the hostility toward the two-year institution transfer student persist in the traditional "pecking order" in educational institutions. This allows and perpetuates a hierarchy of status encompassing faculty and students from graduate divisions to kindergartens. The university outranks colleges,

baccalaureate colleges outrank junior colleges, junior colleges outrank community colleges, community colleges outrank technical and vocational institutes and on down the order. This places the two-year transfer in a position of being evaluated in a rank order, rather than from a competence position. Leister and Maclachlan (1976) reported that a college that enjoys a strong reputation among its students, faculty, and public must be careful not to engage in a process that has the potential to lessen its image.

The cooperative articulation process was further impeded by the evolution of the nineteen-sixties reported in Chapter One. The "open-door" college represented a philosophy that some university personnel felt was a version of watering down traditional curricula and lowering standards (Kastner, 1972; Defore, 1974). Their concern was about the quality of the institution, its faculty, and its student characteristics.

The two-year institution had a difficult time attempting to erase its high school affiliation. Early community colleges were not established with their own physical facilities and had to rely on local high schools. Many of these institutions opened their doors with this physical image as evening schools (Darnes, 1974). Cook, Hoss, and Vargas (1968) reported that students initially think of community junior college as another high school, as they still live at home, see their high school friends, and

actually spend very little time at the community junior college. Friedman (1966) stated that even community college faculty members perceive the comprehensive nature of the junior college more like that of a comprehensive high school. Darnes (1974) reported these early two-year institutions were also funded and governed by the local board of education for that school district. The writer reported, "there are still university professors who believe community colleges to be operating in that manner" (p. 416).

Many early junior colleges seemed to attract their faculties from high schools, dropouts from graduate programs, and failures from the faculties of baccalaureate colleges and universities (Hills, 1965; Jencks & Riesman, 1968). Jennings (1970) reported that most of the high school teachers and many of the administrators of similar academic origin, enter as two-year personnel with much of their secondary school educational training. Cohen (1969) reported this is of little significance because there is little difference between the preparation of public school teachers and junior college instructors.

This senior division attitudinal questioning is further augmented by Hills who states that the opinion exists among junior college faculty that they reject the "scholarly implications of college membership" (p. 210). This point of difference is totally unacceptable to certain college and university professors who believe that research and graduate

training must be an essential part of quality education (Darnes, 1974). The issue that two-year instructors are not in a "real" college is not especially relevant (Jencks & Riesman, 1968), as Hills (1965) reported they justify their position "as missionaries attempting to salvage the educational lives of border-line students" (p. 210). Even this conclusion is subject to question, as Medsker and Tillery (1971) reported that a nationwide faculty study of 57 community colleges revealed that 44% of the two-year personnel would really prefer to be in the four-year institution.

Bushnell's (1973) analysis of 2,491 usable two-year faculty responses with a weighted faculty population of 69,350 supplemented the questionable attitude of four-year personnel in reference to the two-year professional qualifications:

Two-year college faculty background characteristics with the exception of ethnic status, demonstrate that the full-time faculty members of community junior colleges come from backgrounds comparable to those of whom they teach. (p. 31)

The significance of the Bushnell study is extremely relevant when you consider the implications of an earlier investigation. Medsker and Tillery (1971) reported that the societal belief in post-high-school education will increase, and since a high proportion of those from upper ability and socioeconomics already attend college, it is axiomatic that the new students will be from lower levels

on all scales of college measurement. The writers' conclusion amplified Cross's (1968) earlier study:

We picture America's newest college student as being less adequate than his peers at the task of higher education - - tasks which have been developed over the years for a different type of student. We must conclude that intellectual dimensions sharply differentiate junior college students, as a group, from senior college students. The junior college student is less able on our present test; he is less intellectually oriented - - on our present measurement; and is less motivated to seek higher education - - in our traditional colleges. (p. 42)

Articulation in educational vocabulary semantically portrays a method that enables a smooth flow of students from one institution to another institution (Kintzer, 1973b). This connotation assumes an additional meaning as a result of the low esteem in which senior institutional personnel hold toward two-year students and their faculties (Furniss & Marshall, 1974). The significance reveals itself in the form of barriers.

Institutional Barriers

It is self-evident that a two-year transfer can find a four-year institution that will accept his Associate in Arts/Science degree. The transfer will be able to matriculate at the four-year institution; however, the new educational direction may take from two and one-half to three years to complete (Sartre, 1973) because of

"articulation barriers." Articulation barriers are a set of procedures, practices, and behaviors which are illustrated in the literature as:

Loss of transfer credit and financial assistance which normally go to the native students (Alstyne, 1974).

Loss of transfer credit that approximates 8% to 13% (Menacker, 1974).

Necessity of having to take upper-division courses at the receiving institution, even though they were satisfactorily completed at the lower level and transfer cannot be admitted to sections of courses until all native students have been enrolled (Darnes, 1974).

Overlooked in planning orientation programs, counseling services, and appropriate academic advising and assistance (Higbee, 1973).

Comparative difficulty in earning grades, difficulty in forming close relationships with native students and professors, and stigma of coming from two-year institution (Kintzer, 1973a).

The investigator has identified a succinct list of the barriers used in this investigation in Appendix A. Each barrier in the list is followed by the item(s) in the Articulation Inventory reported in Appendix F that relate to it.

Kintzer reported that in a new environment, the transfer, like any other student, wants to belong; however, he faces a set of ambiguous selections in his search of consequences, both academic and personal. Hills, (1965); Giesenking, (1971); Elliott, (1972) identified a summation

of this search for consequences as "transfer shock." The researchers reported that academic performance of transfer students normally suffered immediately after entering the new environment. Once the shock was over, the transfer student generally performed within satisfactory parameters.

Business Student Inference

The articulation literature involving the two-year business transfer student is practically extinct, with the exception of data concerning how well or poor the business transfer is doing in relation to the native business student (Taylor, 1970; Brady, 1971; Fleishans, 1973; Beavers, 1974).

Researchers (Knoell & Medsker, 1965; Brady, 1971; Klapper, 1976) reported data concerning two-year business transfer samples and other two-year curricular students. Each of these studies reflected a larger sample from the business curriculum. This data indicates that business transfer students are significant factors in the two-year transfer population and represent a comparable likeness to the traditional two-year institution transfer reported in this investigation. This is supported by Taylor's (1970) and Brady's (1971) data in that two-year business students experienced similar "transfer shock" to those reported by Hills (1965) and Giesenking (1971) in their studies of non-business two-year transfers who experienced transfer shock.

Summary

The review of previous research in this chapter described the cooperative articulation process. A description of senior division attitudinal and institutional barriers to the cooperative articulation process was discussed. It was concluded that most of the institutional barriers were caused by the attitudes of four-year personnel toward the quality of the two-year institution, faculty, and student. The literature regarding the two-year business transfer student was minute; yet, there exist some data reflecting an indication that two-year business transfer students should experience articulation barriers. Chapter Three describes the methodology used in this investigation to determine articulation barriers perceived by two-year business transfer students.

CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methods and procedures utilized in this study. This chapter will discuss the following topics: (1) The Pilot Study; (2) The Sample; (3) Institution of the Study; (4) Subjects; (5) Procedures; (6) Instrumentation; (7) Variables; (8) Null Hypotheses; and (9) Statistical methods.

Pilot Study

The purpose of this pilot study was to determine if two-year business transfer students experience articulation barriers in the transfer process and to develop an instrument that could be used to assess the perceived articulation process of two-year business transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution.

The pilot study represented an attempt to collate the articulation barriers that were reported to the investigator by many former two-year business students who had experienced the transfer process. It also represented an effort to use those articulation barriers appearing in the literature that were reported in Chapter Two and to develop an instrument that would have face validity for this investigation. Face validity is important in this investigation, as

the initial instrument was not developed from a previous model. Helmstadter (1970) reported that face validity is paramount in developing original instruments.

Subjects

The sample for this pilot study consists of 30 juniors and seniors from a small private four-year college in North Carolina who were majoring in a business related program of study. All of the students had attended one of the following two-year institutions: (1) technical institute; (2) community college; or (3) junior college. The subjects volunteered to be participants in the study.

Research Instruments

The instruments used in this pilot study were developed by arranging interviews with students who had transferred to the four-year institution. Two students known to the investigator were used in the initial interview. Neither of these students had previously discussed the nature of their transfer experience with the investigator.

Each interview was arranged individually and at two different four-year institutions. The researcher explained that the current process was an attempt to determine whether the barriers reported in the literature were similar to the actual transfer experience. Both students confirmed the existence of these barriers.

This information was used to develop two survey instruments which were mailed to the students for their reaction. Upon receipt of this information, the researcher initiated a final contact with these two students for additional feedback which could be used in revising the instruments developed for this pilot study. There were no recommendations for revision.

The instruments used to measure the students' perception of articulation barriers were composed of two parts. A copy of these instruments is reported in Appendixes B and C. Part One consists of data reflecting general information items such as sex, institutional type, grade point average, and anticipated college major. Part Two was a 19-item Likert scale with categories available for an expression of five concerns: (1) Strongly Agree; (2) Agree; (3) Undecided; (4) Disagree; and (5) Strongly Disagree. Item 20 was an open ended question for free expression.

The scale has items defined as positive and negative depending on whether the item stem is positive or negative. Scores of each item are summed over items to produce a total score. The Likert scale has two major advantages: its high reliability and its ease of interpretation (Guilford, 1954).

The following Likert scale scoring format was used to record the responses from Part Two, the Data Source.

A. <u>Positive Items:</u>	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Undecided	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1
B. <u>Negative Items:</u>	Score
Strongly Agree	1
Agree	2
Undecided	3
Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	5

Consequently, high scores would be an indication of perceived strengths in the articulation process, while low scores would indicate perceived articulation barriers. The score ranges were from 19 to 95.

Procedure

The researcher was given permission by the business department chairman to visit each business class from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. for two consecutive days and announce the intent, date, and time for the pilot study. It was scheduled during an hour when there were no official classes in session to assure a convenient time.

The students assembled in one room and the researcher acknowledged his appreciation for their participation in this pilot study. There was a brief question and answer session before the questionnaires were distributed and the researcher randomly selected three individuals for follow-up interviews. The subjects were asked to complete the questionnaires at this time and leave them with the researcher before they left the room. Follow-up interviews revealed one suggestion for instrument re-development. This suggestion related to the ambiguity of various four-year institutional personnel in regard to academic courses that would actually transfer. This recommendation was incorporated as item 20 in the revised instrument used in this investigation. Interviews did confirm the suspected opinion of the researcher that an uncertain or undecided category was necessary. This was supported by statements from the interviewed students that from an honest reporting relationship, there were items about which they were uncertain.

Pilot Study Item Analysis

In order to ascertain whether the item scores on the Data Source related to the total scores calculated from the sum of the nineteen items scores, Pearson product moment correlations between item and total scores were calculated. The rationale for computing product moment correlations between item total scores is that each item contributes to,

or correlates with, the total score (Nunnally, 1967). Item total correlations were reported in Table 1.

Table 1
Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between
Item and Total Mean Scores on the Data Source

Item	Correlation
1	.36
2	.45
3	.30
4	.48
5	.31
6	.30
7	.32
8	.34
9	.30
10	.35
11	.38
12	.44
13	.49
14	.51
15	.53
16	.47
17	.39
18	.34
19	.40

The item total correlations indicate that each item has a moderate correlation with the total mean scores of students. The moderate correlations show that each item does contribute to the total score variance. Item 20 was used only two times. This free expression item was used in both instances by the students for the purpose of acknowledging their appreciation for the investigator's interest in their situation.

Summary of the Pilot Study

From observation of all the data, it appeared that two-year business transfer students seem to experience articulation barriers that were reported in the literature in Chapter Two and these barriers can be measured with moderate correlations.

The Sample

The sample for this investigation was selected from a small private four-year educational institution with a department of business located in North Carolina.

Institution of the Study

The total student population of the institution used in this investigation consists of 1700 students. Four hundred and fifty of these students were majoring in a business-related program. Seventy-five of these business students were transfer students.

This institution was selected because of the investigator's personal contact with the Chairman of the Department of Business. It was due to this individual that the investigator was granted the opportunity to conduct this investigation. This institution was also selected because of its established policy and recent history of accepting the two-year transfer business student.

The institution's transfer guidelines were established from Guidelines For Transfer, sponsored by the North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities in cooperation with the University of North Carolina, State Board of Education, and Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. Appendix D contains a 1977 copy of the guidelines established for transfer purposes for the two-year business student.

Subjects

The sample for this investigation consisted of 57 business students from a transfer business population of seventy-five. All the students were in a business-related major and had attended one of the following two-year institutions: (1) technical institute; (2) community college; or (3) junior college.

Procedure

The investigator was given permission by the Chairman of the Business Department and each professor of a business

related course to enter their classroom from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. Two consecutive days were used to initiate the investigation in an attempt to assure all transfer students an opportunity to participate in the investigation. The days selected for the class visitation were determined at the advice of the Business Department faculty to consider the highest possible attendance.

The investigator entered each class and was introduced by the professor. The professor made no reference to the investigation at this time, other than indicating that the researcher would like to make an announcement and seek the students' assistance.

The investigator made a brief introductory statement concerning the nature of the investigation and asked those applicable transfer business students to participate in the study. The Demographic Questionnaire and Articulation Inventory were distributed at this time with instructions to complete and return them within one week to a designated central location in the business department complex.

Upon completion of each distribution, the investigator acknowledged his appreciation for the students' participation and informed them that he would be available during the week of the investigation. The final phase of each class visitation was concluded with a statement from the professor indicating that the current investigation had the sanction of the business department.

At the conclusion of the investigator's two-day class visitation and during the current week, each professor was asked to make an additional announcement in an attempt to inform all the population of the present investigation. A total of 66 instruments were distributed and 57 were returned.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in this investigation. A copy of these instruments is reported in Appendixes E and F. The first instrument was the Demographic Questionnaire, which contains general information items such as sex, decision-making stages, and institutional type. The information extracted from this questionnaire was used to form some of the independent variables in this investigation. This was identical to the questionnaire reported in the pilot study of this investigation with the exception of the following: (1) the name was changed; (2) a more lucid format was utilized; and (3) information was requested regarding student decision-making stages.

The second instrument was the Articulation Inventory, which was a 20-item Likert scale developed from a domain of items described as articulation barriers. The scoring format for this investigation was identical to the pilot study reported on page 29 of this investigation. The scale had items that were defined as positive or negative depending on

whether the item stem was positive or negative. The total score was derived by summing the items. Mean scores on the scale were the dependent variables of the investigation.

The following Likert scale scoring format was used to record the responses from the Articulation Inventory:

A. <u>Positive</u>	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Undecided	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1
B. <u>Negative</u>	Score
Strongly Agree	1
Agree	2
Undecided	3
Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	5

The Likert summative scale makes it easy to interpret the results. High scores on the Articulation Inventory would indicate perceived strengths in the articulation process; whereas, low scores would be an indication of perceived articulation barriers. The score ranges were from 20 to 100.

Pfeiffer, Heslin, and Jones (1976) reported that

researchers are using the five category Likert scale rather than seven categories because of the ambiguity in the scales. The writers also reported that an undecided or uncertain category allowed the respondent to avoid committing himself to certain statements; however, this investigator, on the basis of the pilot study, retained this category.

The Articulation Inventory was identical to the instrument used in the pilot study with the exception of the following: (1) the name was changed; (2) a more lucid format was used; and (3) one additional question was added. This question was included as a result of the interviews conducted in the pilot study. The open-ended question was deleted because of the lack of written responses reported in the pilot study.

Variables

The dependent variable in this investigation was the students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory.

The five independent variables utilized in this investigation were the following: sex differences, institutional type, academic grade category, employment status, and decision-making stages. These variables were extracted from the Demographic Questionnaire.

Sex Differences. This variable has two levels, male and female.

Institutional type. The type of two-year institution

that the student transferred from has three levels: technical institute, community college, and junior college.

Academic grade category. This variable transforms grade point average data which are ordinal scale values into letter grade categories. There are three levels of this variable: A, B, C.

Employment status. This variable indicates whether the transfer student is employed or unemployed during the current term. The variable has two levels: employed and unemployed.

Decision-making stages. This variable indicates at what stage during the student's educational career a decision was made to seek a four-year degree. This variable has 4 levels: before enrollment in the two-year institution (S-I), during the first year at the two-year institution (S-II), during the second year at the two-year institution (S-III), after graduation from the two-year institution (S-IV).

Null Hypothesis

This investigation was designed to determine the influence of certain personal-social and educational variables on perceived articulation barriers of two-year transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution majoring in a business-related program. These influences are expressed in four sets of null hypotheses.

First set. There are no significant differences between levels of factors, sex differences and institutional type and their interaction regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory.

Second set. There are no significant differences between and among the levels of the factors, academic grade categories, sex differences, and their interaction regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory.

Third set. There are no significant differences between transfer students who are employed and those unemployed in the four-year institution regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory.

Fourth set. There are no significant differences among decision-making stages to enter the four-year institution regarding transfer students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory.

Statistical Methods

Several interrelated statistical procedures were used to test the null hypotheses. First, the total scores of the Articulation Inventory were summed and then divided by the number of items in the Inventory ($n=20$), resulting in a mean total score per student. The rationale for using mean total scores instead of summations was the belief by Woodbury (Note 2) that the mean total scores were more accurate representations of subjects' attitudes toward articulation.

Second, null hypotheses testing simple group differences were tested by a one-way analysis of variance and F tests with level of confidence set at the P .05 level. Those null hypotheses concerning differences between and among main effects of factors and their interactions were tested by factorial analysis and F tests with the levels of confidence set at the P .05 level of confidence.

Since the study dealt with a small number of students, the attainment of balanced designs (equal n 's in each group and/or cell) was not possible. To adjust for the existence of unbalanced designs, the investigator used a special analysis of variance model developed by Searle (1971) for both one way and factorial analyses of variance. The model contained in the Statistical Analysis System at North Carolina State University adjusts the sums of squares of the main effects. Consequently F test statistics are interpretable like those emanating from balanced designs.

The post priori test used to test the significance between specific means within the levels of the independent variable decision stages was the Newman-Keuls method for unequal numbers (Weiner, 1962). The confidence level was set at the P .05 level of confidence.

Summary

This chapter included a description of the research methods and procedures. A description of a pilot study was

discussed. It was concluded that on the basis of this pilot study, articulation barriers seem to be present for two-year business transfer students. Fifty-seven subjects from a small four-year college were used as the sample for this investigation. Two instruments developed by the researcher were used to gather the data in which the variables and null hypotheses were formulated. The chapter was concluded with a discussion of the statistical analysis procedure. Chapter Four describes the data and analysis used in the investigation.

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND ANALYSIS

The major purpose of the current investigation was to study the influence of personal-social and educational variables on perceived articulation barriers of two-year transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution who are majoring in a business-related program. The investigation studied the influence of sex differences, institutional type, employment status, grade categories and decision-making stages singly and their interactive effects on the scores of the Articulation Inventory. The results are reported by sets of null hypotheses.

The first set of null hypotheses was that there are no significant differences between levels of the factors, sex differences and institutional type and their interaction regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The level of confidence was set at the P .05 level. The factor, sex differences, had two levels: male and female; while the factor, institutional type, had three levels: technical institute, community college, and junior college. Mean scores for each subject on the Articulation Inventory were used as the dependent variable. A 2 x 3 factorial analysis of variance and F tests were used to assess differences between and among levels of the two

factors regarding students' mean Articulation Inventory scores. Data from the analysis of variance and F tests are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

A 2 x 3 Factorial Analysis of Variance and F Tests
for the Factors Sex Differences and Institutional
Type Regarding Transfer Students' Mean Scores
on the Articulation Inventory

Groups	SS	df	MS	<u>F</u>
Sex (S)	.1650	1	.1650	4.10*
Institutional Type (I)	.0917	2	.0459	1.00
Interaction S x I	.0530	2	.0260	1.00
Error	2.0910	51	.0410	
Total	2.4007	56		

*p .05

Data from Table 2 indicated an F value of 4.10 significant at the P .05 level of confidence. The F values regarding institutional type and the interaction were not significant at the P .05 level of confidence.

The means and standard deviations for males and females reported in Table 3 indicated that males had significantly higher mean scores on the Articulation Inventory than female transfer students.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Male and
Female Transfer Students Regarding Mean
Scores on the Articulation Inventory

Groups	N	Mean	SD
Male	31	3.268	.83
Female	26	2.130	.92

The means and standard deviation regarding transfer students by institutional type reported in Table 4 indicated that little differences existed among means regarding those transferring from technical institutes, community colleges, or junior colleges to a four-year college.

Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations of Male and Female
Transfer Students by Institutional Type

Student Groups	Technical Institute		Community College		Junior College	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Males	3.18	.76	3.21	.83	3.23	.81
Females	3.14	.78	3.17	.79	3.20	1.02

Data from Table 2 indicated the null hypothesis regarding the differences between male and female transfer students on the Articulation Inventory was rejected at the $P .05$ level of confidence. The other null hypotheses regarding the differences among institutional type and the interactive effects of sex differences and institutional type on mean articulation scores were accepted.

The second set of null hypotheses was that there were no significant differences between and among the levels of the factors, academic grade categories, sex differences, and their interaction regarding transfer students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The level of confidence for the null hypotheses was the $P .05$ level. The factor, academic grade category, has three levels: A, B, and C; and the factor, sex differences, has two levels: male and female.

Mean scores on the Articulation Inventory for each student were used as the dependent variable. A 3 x 2 factorial analysis of variance with F tests assessed the differences between the main effects of each factor and the interaction. Data from the analysis of variance and F tests are reported in Table 5.

Table 5
 A 3 x 2 Factorial Analysis of Variance and F Tests
 for the Factors Academic Grade Categories and
 Sex Differences Regarding Transfer Students'
 Scores on the Articulation Inventory

Groups	SS	df	MS	<u>F</u>	
Academic (A) Grade Categories	.0740	2	.0370	1.00	NS*
Sex Differences (S)	.0395	1	.0395	1.00	NS
Interaction A x S	.0098	1	.0098	1.00	NS
Error	3.7021	52	.0071		
Total	3.8254	56			

*Non-Significant

The data reported in Table 5 indicated the existence of no significant main effects of interaction. The second set of null hypotheses regarding no significant differences between and among levels of the factors academic grade categories and sex differences, as well as their interaction, is accepted.

The third null hypothesis was that there were no significant differences between transfer students who are employed and those unemployed in college regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The level of confidence

set for the rejection of the null hypothesis was the P .05 level. Mean scores on the Articulation Inventory for each student were used as the dependent variable. A one-way analysis of variance and F tests assessed the differences between the two groups. Data from analysis of variance and F test are reported in Table 6. Means and standard deviations for both groups are reported in Table 7.

Table 6
An Analysis of Variance and F Test Between
Transfer Students Employed and Those
Unemployed in College

Group	SS	df	MS	F
Employment Status	.0009	1	.0009	1.00 NS*
Error	3.9230	55	.0713	
Total	3.9239	56		

*Non-Significant

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations for Transfer Students
Employed and Unemployed in College

Group	N	Mean	SD
Employed	30	3.14	.89
Unemployed	27	3.12	.93

Data from Tables 6 and 7 indicate the presence of no significant differences between those transfer students employed and those unemployed in college. The null hypothesis is accepted.

The fourth hypothesis was that there were no significant differences among decision-making stages to enter the four-year college regarding transfer students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The independent variable has four levels: (1) before enrollment in the two-year institution (S-I), (2) during the first year of the two-year institution (S-II), (3) during the second year of the two-year institution (S-III), (4) after graduation from the two-year institution (S-IV). Mean scores on each student's Articulation Inventory was the dependent variable. A one-way analysis of variance and F test assessed the differences in mean scores among the decision stages.

Data from the analysis of variance and F test and means and standard deviation of the mean Articulation Inventory scores are reported in Tables 8 and 9 respectively.

Table 8
An Analysis of Variance and F Test of the
Differences Among Decision-Making Stages
Regarding Students' Mean Scores on the
Articulation Inventory

Groups	SS	df	MS	<u>F</u>
Decision-Making Stages	.5808	3	.1936	3.07*
Error	3.3419	53	.0630	
Total	3.9227	56		

*p .05

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations of Mean Scores
on the Articulation Inventory by Decision
Making Stages

Decision Stages	N	Mean	SD
I Before Enrollment	13	3.08	.93
II During First Year	3	2.73	.84
III During Second Year	25	3.02	.96
IV After Graduation From Two-Year Institution	16	3.16	.97

Post priori tests of significance using the Newman-Keuls method for unequal N's (Weiner, 1962) between the means of each of the four decision-making stages found significant ($P .05$) differences between the first and second and the second and fourth decision stages. These data are reported in Table 10.

Table 10
 Newman-Keuls Significance Values Between Mean
 Scores on the Articulation Inventory Between
 Decision-Making Stages

Decision-Making Stages	Newman-Keuls Value (gr)	Significant Level
I vs II	4.3500*	p .05
I vs III	1.0100	NS**
I vs IV	.1150	NS
II vs III	.7239	NS
II vs IV	5.4900*	p .05
III vs IV	.1790	NS

*F of 2.83, sig at p .05 level with 53 df
 p .05
 **Non-Significant

Regarding differences between the first and second decision stages - a gr value of 4.35 was significant beyond the p .05 level with 53 degrees of freedom. Differences between the second and fourth stages are reported with a gr value of 5.45 significant beyond the p .05 level with 53 degrees of freedom.

Summary

Regarding the first set of null hypotheses, there were significant differences between males and females regarding

scores on the Articulation Inventory. Male transfer students had significantly higher mean scores on the Articulation Inventory than their female counterparts. The second set of null hypotheses was accepted. There were no significant differences between and among levels of the factors academic grade categories and sex differences as well as their interaction. The third set of null hypotheses was also accepted. There were no significant differences between those transfer students who were employed and those unemployed regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The fourth set of null hypotheses revealed significant differences exist among decision-making stages regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Specifically, significant differences existed between the first and second and the second and fourth decision stages regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Chapter Five describes the summation and conclusions of this investigation with some possible implications for future research.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The problem of this research was to determine the influence of certain personal-social and educational variables on perceived articulation barriers of two-year transfer students matriculating at a four-year institution majoring in a business-related program. The independent variables under investigation were sex differences, employment status, stage of decision making, two-year institution type and academic grade category. The dependent variable was the perceived articulation barriers, as measured by scores on the Articulation Inventory developed by the researcher.

Sixty-six business students from a transfer population of 75 participated in the investigation. A 20-item Likert scale (Articulation Inventory) and a Demographic Inventory were distributed to the students in the sample. Eighty-six percent (N=57) of the students returned the research instruments.

There are two sets of related hypotheses. Three hypotheses are in Set I and two hypotheses are in Set II. Two separate hypotheses follow the two sets. The hypotheses were expressed in the null form and were tested to determine the influence of certain independent variables on students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Low scores on the

Articulation Inventory would indicate perceived weaknesses or difficulties in the transfer process; whereas, high scores would indicate strengths in the transfer process. Each hypothesis was tested at the $P .05$ level of confidence using an appropriate statistical test.

Summary

Set I

This set included three null hypotheses. The first hypothesis was that there was no difference between males and females regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. This hypothesis was rejected at the $P .05$ level of confidence. The second hypothesis was that there was no significant difference among the institutions: (1) technical institute, (2) community college, and (3) junior college regarding the students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. This too was accepted. The third hypothesis was that there was no significant interaction among the levels of the factors sex differences and institutional type regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The third null hypothesis was also accepted.

Set II

This set included the fourth and fifth null hypotheses. The fourth hypothesis was that there was no significant differences among the academic grade categories of A, B, and C,

regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. This null hypothesis was accepted. The fifth hypothesis was that there was no significant interaction among the academic grade categories and sex differences regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. This null hypothesis was also accepted.

Set III

There was no significant difference between transfer students who are employed and those unemployed in the four-year institution regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Data revealed no significant difference at the P .05 level of confidence and the sixth null hypothesis was accepted.

Set IV

The seventh null hypothesis was that there were no significant differences among the decision-making stages: Stage I, before enrollment in the two-year institution; Stage II, during the first-year at the two-year institution; Stage III, during the second year at the two-year institution; Stage IV, after graduation from the two-year institution regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The seventh null hypothesis was rejected at the P .05 level of confidence. An F value of 3.07 significant at the P .05 level of confidence indicated the need to test specific differences between the various decision stages regarding

mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Newman-Keuls tests (Weiner, 1962) revealed significant differences ($P .05$) between the first and second, and second and fourth decision stages.

Discussion

This investigation was not the first attempt in using sex, academic grade category, and employment status as variables in an investigation of the two-year transfer student. There are many studies (Smith, 1968; McCormick, 1971; Kintzer, 1973A; Nutt, 1974; Hughes, 1975; Thompson, 1976) using these variables in relation to other relevant factors.

The current investigation employed two variables, which, in the judgment of the investigator, had not been previously used in the following context for assessing their significance on two-year transfer students. The variables were the four decision-making stages that confront the two-year transfer student and the three different types of two-year institutions that transfer students to the four-year institution. Previous studies (Cross, 1968; Medsker and Tillery, 1971; Hughes, 1975) used variations of these two variables. This research emphasis classified decision-making stages according to these two categories: (1) before enrolling in the two-year institution and (2) after graduation from the two-year institution. Studies using the type

of institution that transfers the two-year student to the four-year institution primarily has focused on the public or private institution without further delineation of the institution.

The writer believed that findings from this research would offer some generalizations, as there were some unanticipated results and some expectations that did not occur. While the results of this investigation were limited to the specific methods and subjects used, the investigator considers that some implications can be drawn from the following discussion.

The first null hypothesis revealed significant differences between males and females regarding their articulation experiences. Female transfer students experienced more perceived articulation barriers than male students. Female transfer students appeared to select and come to a four-year institution with a different behavioral orientation than their male counterparts. Like any other transfer student, the female student wanted to belong and sought satisfactory outcomes in her new environment; however, it seemed that because of her previous orientation, she experienced more traumatic transfer.

There are a number of possible explanations for this effect. Hughes (1975) reported that men were more inclined to transfer than women and that women appeared to vacillate more than men about whether they actually wanted to transfer

to a four-year institution. Similar female indecisiveness is reported in the Knoell and Medsker (1965) study reflecting that female students were more likely to make several changes in their major. These findings are complemented by the Thompson (1976) study which reported that males were more prone to select a transfer program, whereas females tended to select occupational programs in the two-year institution.

Another pertinent explanation may be found in the Moore and Hartsell (1974) study. The researchers reported significant difference between male and female two-year transfer students when selecting a four-year institution, with "ease of transfer" being a variable. Female students were more likely to select a four-year institution because of "ease of transfer" than male students. The Moore and Hartsell study also reported significant differences between male and female transfer students regarding the variables of "desirable location" and "advice from family and friends." The female was more likely to be influenced by these variables than male students.

This study tends to support the existing data that females perceive the articulation process differently than males. The investigator suggests these differences may occur as a result of the socialization process that differentiates the female from the male. Previous data (Anstett, 1973; Brocher, Note 3; Donelson & Gullahorn, 1977)

tended to support this interpretation. Anstett reported that transfer students are faced with problems within an environment that normally is perceived as unfriendly, inconsiderate, and often causing great emotional stress. This type of environment is not conducive for the female, as she is considered to be more affiliative and cooperative (Donelson & Gullahorn, 1977). There appears to be a paradox operating in this non-conducive female environment that may explain the difference in female and male transfer students. Brocher reported that females know more about their own feelings and can better deal with stress than males. Donelson and Gullahorn confirm this and report that females are more honest about feelings concerning themselves and are more likely to give information to other people.

To summarize these implications for the difference in female and male articulation scores, it would appear that these differences may emanate from traditional societal sex roles. Females are more open in expressing their feelings and sharing information than males.

The second null hypothesis revealed no significant differences between the three institutions -- (1) technical institute, (2) community college, (3) junior college -- regarding the transfer students' perceived articulation experience. This null hypothesis was formulated with the belief that it would be statistically rejected. The investigator had expected to find significance between the

three types of institutions, particularly between students from the technical institute and students from the junior college.

This belief originated from the traditional "pecking order" that participants in society have accepted. The educational milieu, being a part of society, has its own institutional rank order of importance. This order was expected to confirm the pecking order and experience more articulation barriers than the junior college transfer students. The reason this expected result did not occur could have been because there may be very little perceived social-economic difference among the students that now attend the three types of two-year institutions in this investigation. In addition, Deutsch and Krauss (1965) reported that most of society can be described by a large number of status systems. Some of this status is awarded upon contention of what a person is. This refers to a person's age, sex, or family connections. These positions are referred to as "ascribed statuses." There are other means by which a person can acquire status. Another system distributed status in relation to what a person can contribute. These positions are referred to as "achieved statuses."

Deutsch and Krauss cite that an ideal status system would consist of a mixture of both status systems. It may

be that students who now attend the various two-year institutions with questionable "ascribed statuses" compensate and acquire an imbalance of individual "achieved statuses." This could account for the lack of significance between the students who transferred from the three types of institutions.

The data regarding the third hypothesis revealed no significant interaction among the levels of the factors of sex differences and the three institutional types regarding the students' perception of the transfer process. There were no findings from previous research that could contribute any insight into this result.

Data regarding the fourth hypothesis revealed no significance among the academic grade categories A, B, and C, in respect to students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Moore and Hartsell (1974) reported similar results in their study of academic grade category as a factor in relation to the selection of a four-year institution for transfer by two-year institution students. The present investigation is not a replication of the Moore and Hartsell study, as they researched the effect of academic grade categories on 10 variables, of which "ease of transfer" was a variable in the investigation. Their research found no significance between academic grade categories and ease of transfer. It had been anticipated by the writer that differences would exist between the academic grades of "A"

and "C." It had been expected that a student with an average grade would perceive the transfer process differently from the more academically successful student.

The fifth hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant interaction among the academic grade categories and sex differences regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. The lack of research regarding perceived articulation barriers prevented any explanations for this effect.

The sixth null hypothesis was accepted. Data revealed no significance between transfer students who are employed and unemployed in the four-year institution regarding the students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Hughes (1975) reported similar results using employment status as a variable to determine if it has an effect on the decision to transfer to a four-year institution. No relationship was established. It had been the investigator's contention that hypothesis six would be rejected based on evidence from the literature (Knoell & Medsker, 1965; Sandeen & Goodale, 1972; Kintzer, 1973a; Hughes, 1975) indicating the importance and need for two-year transfer students to finance their education.

In the normal transfer process it would be expected that a student who is employed, and therefore obviously with less time for educational concerns, would experience the transfer process differently from a transfer student who is unemployed.

There were no findings from previous research studies that could offer any explanation for this effect. The writer suggests that because of the previous necessity and experience of many two-year students of having to defray the prior educational expense, the employed transfer student has become acclimated to this situation; therefore, making more effective use of time and resources.

The seventh null hypothesis was rejected at the $P .05$ level of confidence. There were significant differences among the four decision stages regarding transfer students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory. Significant differences ($P .05$) were found between the stages: before enrollment (S-I) and during the first year (S-II) and during the first year (S-II) and after graduation (S-IV) from the two-year institution. Students who decided to transfer to a four-year institution before they enrolled (S-I) in the two-year institution had higher mean scores on the Articulation Inventory than students who decided to transfer during the first year (S-II) at the two-year institution. This would indicate that students who made the decision to transfer prior to enrolling (S-I) in the two-year institution perceived the articulation process more favorably than students who made the decision during (S-II) the first year at the two-year institution.

There are possible explanations for these differences. A student who makes a decision upon graduation (S-I) from a

high school to attend a two-year institution and then transfer to a four-year institution is more likely to seek assistance from appropriate sources. This early decision to transfer would enable the student to take correct courses, select an appropriate academic major and choose a cooperating four-year institution; whereas, a student who makes the decision to transfer during the first year (S-II) at the two-year institution is more likely to have already taken some courses and may even be in an academic major or program that will not transfer as efficiently as alternative programs of study.

No data exists that can contribute any significant difference between decision stages, during the first year (S-II) and after graduation from the two-year institution (S-IV). Common sense would seem to dictate the result. It would appear that students who made the decision to transfer to a four-year institution after graduation (S-IV) would perceive the articulation process more negatively than students who had the opportunity to make more appropriate transfer plans. Data did not support this theory. Students who made a decision to transfer to a four-year institution after graduation (S-IV) from the two-year institution perceived the articulation process more favorably than students who had more time (S-II) to plan the transfer.

This represents somewhat of a paradox in relation to the investigator's conclusions regarding the previous differences

between the decision Stages I and II. The writer, however, suggests that something else may be operating, particularly within the transfer student who makes the decision after graduation from the two-year institution.

Festinger (1957) reported that a situation after a decision may differ from the situation before a decision. This is based on his theory of cognitive dissonance, which means that there is a tendency for people to seek consistency in their thoughts, actions, and beliefs. Any inconsistency in these beliefs or actions will cause a person to experience some discomfort and motivation to reduce the inconsistency. According to Festinger, this can be done by two ways, change one's behavior or change one's beliefs. He reported that dissonance is a consequence of having made a decision. This implies that once a decision is made between alternatives, dissonance is aroused and necessitates pressure to reduce it. This reduction process occurs when a person changes his opinions about the attractiveness of the alternatives. The chosen alternative becomes more attractive than the unchosen alternative.

The difference between the state of dissonance before and after a decision is made is important. This is when conflict becomes more impartial and objective because it does not lead to any separation of the attractive alternatives. However, after a decision is made, the dissonance reduction process occurs, as the chosen alternative becomes

more attractive. This would imply that there may be more subjectivity and bias in the evaluation of alternatives after a decision is made (Festinger, 1964).

Extrapolating from Festinger, it would appear that students who made a decision to transfer after graduation (S-IV), would experience little predecision dissonance because it is too late to be objective. There is no opportunity to plan their articulation; therefore, they would experience less dissonance at the predecision stage. To the contrary, it is the opinion of this investigator that the dissonance-reducing mechanisms of the postdecision process are what contribute to the significant differences between the two decision stages (S-II and S-IV).

It would appear that the transfer difficulties would be perceived more favorably because of the postdecision dissonance process. This student (S-IV), once having made the decision to transfer, would appear to seek beliefs that would favor his decision. The difficulties that could be perceived (loss of course credit or increased educational costs) in the transfer process would not be that significant. The alternative of not transferring is seen in less favor and therefore, the perception of transfer difficulties would be less conflicting because of the attraction that is associated with the transfer, a baccalaureate degree.

Conclusions

The previous section of this chapter discussed the most salient findings of the investigation. Even though broad generalizations are not justified, the writer believes the results produced new information concerning perceived articulation barriers of two-year business transfer students at a selected, private, four-year institution.

First, significant differences between the mean Articulation Inventory scores of males and females tended to indicate that articulation barriers were greater for females than males. Second, the type of institution that a transferring student previously attended, surprisingly, was not a major influence on articulation scores. Third, academic grade categories did not tend to influence articulation scores. Fourth, employment status was not a factor regarding articulation scores. Fifth, significant differences ($P .05$) among decision stages regarding students' mean scores on the Articulation Inventory necessitated the testing of specific differences between decision stages regarding mean articulation scores. Significant differences ($P .05$) were found between the stages; before enrollment and during the first year, and during the first year and after graduation from the two-year institution. The conclusions reached were that students who decided to transfer to a four-year institution during the first year at the two-year institution tended to perceive more articulation barriers than students who decided

to transfer before enrolling in the two-year institution. In addition, these same students who made the decision to transfer during the first year tended to perceive more articulation barriers than students who decided to transfer after graduation from the two-year institution.

Suggestions for Future Research

At this point in a dissertation, the investigator asks, "If I were to write an article on what I've learned or if I were to begin this research project again, what should be said?"

It is apparent to the investigator that the two-year transfer business student is not a reasonable facsimile of the two-year institution student reported by Cross (1968). With this in mind, if I were to begin this project again, I would concentrate my entire effort in attempting to research and establish the true identity of the present two-year business transfer student.

The investigator sincerely feels that a large part of society, within and without the academic community, does not have an accurate representation of today's two-year business transfer student. I believe this inaccurate student profile is part of the difficulty that contributes to the barriers that confront this student in the articulation process.

There are data that indicate two-year business transfer students are being accepted into the four-year institution.

It is because of this articulation and an apparent lack of literature regarding the business transfer student that a recommendation is made to conduct periodic research into the two-year business transfer student articulation process.

This investigation was limited to only one private institution and its conclusions are confined to that parameter. Future research should be concerned with articulation barriers of various public and private institutions. This would make it possible to generalize the results with broader implications for the affected members of academe.

It is apparent that the two-year articulation process is a national concern. It is recommended that research measuring articulation barriers perceived by two-year business transfer students should be expanded to include a broader geographical area. This would enable investigators to identify the possibility of different variables that could be endemic to their geographical location, thus, effecting the articulation process.

Another study which could be of heuristic value would be the expansion of the above geographical recommendation to include a random sample of two-year business transfer students from a variety of college and university settings. This would encompass the educational milieu of both small and large, urban and rural, colleges and universities.

It is also recommended that this study be replicated using a larger sample because of the size of the investigation

(n=57). This would enable a more general reliability for the effect of the factors of influence on articulation barriers.

Future research should also be concerned with developing adequate research instruments to measure articulation barriers. The instruments used in this investigation were developed by the investigator and need more validation. This would require a study to develop and validate instruments to measure articulation barriers, experienced by students matriculating in a variety of settings in higher education. Instrument development would be based on recommended procedures developed by the American Psychological Association.

Further studies should be undertaken to address the relationship between perceived articulation barriers and the socialization process of female and male two-year business transfer students. This would allow the investigation of those socializing variables that may contribute to the differences between female and male articulation barriers.

Another specific concern, which is related to the previous recommendation, is to investigate the effects of the female and male ego and its relationship to perceived articulation barriers. These data would attempt to determine whether the male transfer student actually experiences fewer articulation problems than the female transfer student, or whether it just is an egotistical factor in students that prevents the male student from revealing the true nature

of the articulation experience.

Still another study of heuristic value would involve the relationship between the articulation process and personality variables, such as risk-taking, achievement motivation, vocational maturity, and independence-conformity. Results from such a study would suggest that these personality and/or attitudinal behaviors were apart or shared common variance with the variables associated with the articulation process.

Recognizing the increasing numbers of black minority students who are now attending two-year institutions, additional research should be conducted to determine if adequate numbers of black minority students are majoring in a business-related program and are transferring to four-year institutions. With these data, research can be conducted to determine the relationship of articulation barriers between black and white two-year business students transferring to four-year institutions.

Accepting the premise that an adequate sample exists, another concern worthy of examination is whether the perceived articulation barriers of two-year black minority transfer business students are related to their attitudes toward society, such as their feelings of meaninglessness, helplessness, and hopelessness or anomie, and alienation. Such data would depict articulation barriers as an integral part of the students' negative belief toward society in

general, rather than the actual collegiate articulation process.

Finally, it is further recommended that since data are subject to interpretation, a different method of research could be utilized. This study would have specific business student reference. Perhaps a historical or case study of the articulation process in relation to the male and female two-year transfer student could be employed. The value of this method of research could increase the general understanding of the business transfer student by those investigators who interpret the data.

These recommendations are made with the belief that they will provide necessary data to make the articulation process more compatible for the two-year business transfer student.

Reference Notes

1. The investigator is using the term "barrier" to mean an obstacle to progress. Those who do research and writing on articulation processes use the term "articulation barriers." The investigator has chosen to use the same term in the interest of communication with scholars in this area.
2. Woodbury, R. Personal communication by research design person for this dissertation, June, 1977.
3. Brocher, T. Opinion of the Director of the Center for Applied Behavioral Science of the Menninger Foundation, cited in Stress has no gender. Business Week, November 15, 1976, p. 73.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alstyne, C. V. The hidden cost of transfer: Hidden penalties. Community and Junior College Journal, 1974, 45 (2), 12-14.
- Anstett, Robert R. A study of transfer student perceptions of a campus environment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 10, 198-205.
- Beavers, L. H. A study of the elementary accounting achievement of junior college transfer students in selected institutions of higher education in Oklahoma (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 4967A. (University Microfilm No. 75-2961)
- Blackwell, B. B. The efficiency of transfer from community colleges to universities within a state system of higher education (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 7761A. (University Microfilm No. 76-12,044)
- Brady, W. J. A comparison of the academic performance of native students and junior college transfer students in the colleges of agriculture, business, and education at the University of Georgia (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 5561A. (University Microfilm No. 72-10, 921)
- Buckley, H. D. A comparison of freshman and transfer expectations. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, 186-188.
- Bushnell, D. S. Organizing for change: New priorities for community colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.
- Calcote, R. D. Academic success of two-year college transfer students as compared to native students in accounting in the University of Mississippi (Doctoral Dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 1694A. (University Microfilm No. 71-27032)

- Carmody, J., and Shevel, L. Two year follow-up of responses to selected biographical inventory items among junior college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 126-128.
- The Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education. The Open-Door College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Cohen, A. M. Dateline '79. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Glencoe Press, 1969.
- Cook, J. B., Hoss, M. A., & Vargas, A. The search for independence. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968.
- Cooley, W. W., & Becker, S. J. The junior college student. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 464-469.
- Cross, P. K. Higher education's newest student. Junior College Journal, 1968, 39 (1) 38-42.
- Darnes, G. R. The two-year and four-year college partnership: Myth or reality. College and University, 1974, 49, 414-420.
- Dearing, B. Broadening transfer opportunities. Liberal Education, 1975, 61, 238-248.
- Defore, J. J. Engineering technology education. Community College Review, 1974, 1 (4), 16-23.
- Deutsch, M., & Krauss, R. M. Theories in social psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.
- Donato, D. J. Junior college transfers and a university environment. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 254-259.
- Donelson, E. & Gullahorn, J. E. Women: A Psychological Perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.
- Drake, S. L. Enrollment for 76. Community and Junior College Journal, 1977, 47 (5) 4.
- Elliott, E. S. The academic achievement of transfer students and the college comprehensive tests. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13 266-269.

- Epler, S. E. The comprehensive American college. In S. Lehrer (Ed.), Leaders, teachers, & learners in academe. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Festinger, L. Conflict, decision, and dissonance. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Fleishans, J. T., III. Junior/community college transfer students' success in a collegiate school of business administration (Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 32, 579A-580A. (University Microfilm No. 73-18, 207)
- Friedman, N. L. Comprehensiveness and higher education: A sociologists's view of public junior college trends. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 1966, 52, 417-422.
- Furniss, W. T., & Martin, M. Toward solving transfer problems--5 issues. Community and Junior College Journal, 1974, 44 (5), 10-15.
- Giesenking, A. L. G. Differences among junior college transfer students, four-year college transfer students, and native students in academic performance and attitudes in home economics at a selected California State College (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 195A. (University Microfilm No. 71-16, 412)
- Gleazer, E. J. This is the community college. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.
- Gleazer, E. J. What now for the two-year college. Community and Junior College Journal, 1974, 44 (4), 6-11.
- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1954.
- Helmstadter, G. C. Research concepts on human behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

- Higbee, J. M. Upper-division colleges: An end to transfer hurdles. Community and Junior College Journal, 1973, 43 (6) 44-48.
- Hills, J. R. Transfer shock: The academic performance of the junior college transfer. The Journal of Experimental Education, 1965, 33 201-211.
- Hostetter, J. N. Current issues affecting statewide articulation between two- and four-year institutions. College and University, 1975, 50, 372-378.
- Hughes, R. D. An analysis of the intentions of community college students from a selected number of community colleges to transfer to four-year colleges or universities (Doctoral Dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 1259A. (University Microfilm No. 75-18, 761)
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1968.
- Jennings, F. G. The two-year stretch. Change Magazine, March-April 1970, p. 15-25.
- Kastner, H., Jr. Fact versus fiction: Articulation from 2-year to 4-year colleges. College and University, 1972, 47, 241-248.
- Kintzer, F. C. Middleman in higher education. London: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1973. (a)
- Kintzer, F. C. The transfer student dimension of articulation: Arlie house conference on college transfer. Warrenton, Va., 1973. (b) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 088 408)
- Klapper, O. S. A follow-up study of the occupational and educational experiences of A.A.S. degree graduates of career programs at Kingsborough Community College of The City University of New York (Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 1364A-1365A. (University Microfilm No. 76-20, 870)
- Knoell, D., & Medsker, L. L. From junior to senior college: A national study of the transfer student. Berkeley, CA: University of California, American Council of Education, 1965.

- Koos, L. V. Where to establish junior colleges. The School Review, 1921, pp. 413-433.
- Kuhns, E. A resolution to end transfer hurdles. Community and Junior College Journal. 1973, 43 (5), 36-38.
- Leister, D. V., & MacLachlan, D. L. Assessing the community college transfer market. Journal of Higher Education, 1976, 47, 661-679.
- Maslow, A. H. The farther reaches of human nature. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.
- McCormick, L. W. Factors related to persistence of withdrawal of students in the college of agriculture and home economics at the University of Arkansas (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 850A. (University Microfilm No. 71-19, 558)
- Medsker, L. L. The junior college: Progress and prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.
- Medsker, L. L., & Tillery, D. Breaking the access barriers: A profile of two-year colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- Menacker, J. Two-year and four-year curricular articulation. Improving College and University Teaching, 1974, 22, 201-203.
- Menefee, S. Two-year college: In step with today. American Education, 1973, 2 (10), 22-26.
- Merlo, F. P. The burgeoning community college. Saturday Review, December 1964, pp. 50-52; 65.
- Monroe, C. R. Profile of community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972.
- Moore, E. B., Jr., & Hartsell, H. E. From community college to university. Community College Review, 1974, 2 (3), 50-56.
- North Carolina Department of Community College. 1974-76 North Carolina Community College System Biennial Report. (Rev. ed.). Raleigh: Author, 1976.
- North Carolina Department of Community College. 1976-78 Educational Guide (Rev. ed.). Raleigh: Author, 1975.

- Nunnally, J. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.
- Nutt, J. H. A comparison of selected dropouts and persisters of Shoreline Community College with respect to selected nonacademic characteristics (Doctoral Dissertation, Washington State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35,220A. (University Microfilm No. 74-16, 387)
- Palinchak, R. The evolution of the community college. Cranbury, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973.
- Park, Y. A conceptual basis for nontraditional study. Community and Junior College Journal, 1976, 46 (6), 29-31; 76.
- Pfeiffer, J. W., Heslin, R., & Jones, J. E. Instrumentation in human relations training (2nd ed.). La Jolla, Cal.: University Associates, 1976.
- Sandeen, A., & Goodale, T. Student personnel programs and the transfer student. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 1972, 9, 179-200.
- Sartre, R. I. 2+2=4 or 5. Community and Junior College Journal, 1973, 43 (6), 35-36.
- Scheffler, I. The language of education. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Co., 1960.
- Schwartz, B. Is it really higher education. Saturday Review, December 1964, pp. 52-54; 64.
- Searle, S. R. Linear models. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Sethi, S. P. Up against the corporate wall. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Smith, H., Jr. The relationship of prematriculation characteristics to subsequent institutional-status in a public community-junior college (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1968). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 29, 2970A-2971A. (University Microfilm No. 69-4707)
- Solomon, R. B. A different drummer: The community college. Atlanta: Life Long Learning Library, 1976.

- Taylor, G. B. Factors related to the academic performance of students transferring from Mississippi public junior colleges to the department of business education, University of Southern Mississippi (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 5805A-5806A. (University Microfilm No. 71-13,586)
- Templin, R. G., Jr. Profile of students in North Carolina community colleges and technical institutes, 1974 (Doctoral Dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 3368A. (University Microfilm No. 76-28, 525)
- Thompson, J. A. An analysis of the differences in self-concept and selected demographic characteristics of freshmen in Dekalb Community College (Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 1951A. (University Microfilm No. 76-22, 894)
- Thornton, J. W. The community junior college. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972.
- Toffler, A. Future shock. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.
- Turnbull, W. W. Coping with a new learning society. Community and Junior College Journal, 1977, 47 (4) 14-15.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The condition of education: A statistical report. Washington, D. C.: Author, 1976.
- University of North Carolina. Guidelines for transfer. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Author, 1977.
- Weiner, J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1962.
- Woodrum, T. E. The role and programs of six selected public community junior colleges in Kansas (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 2594A-2595A. (University Microfilm No. 76-26, 396)
- Zwerling, L. S. The crisis of the community college. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.

A P P E N D I X E S

Appendix A
ARTICULATION BARRIER INDEX

<u>Barriers</u>	<u>Relevant Items</u>
Extended time at the four-year institution	1, 2
Scheduling difficulties	3, 6, 9
Inadequate advising	4, 5, 10
Registration difficulties	6, 9, 18
Inadequate orientation program	7, 8
Poor instruction - Faculty relations	11, 12, 15, 19
Sanctions from upperclassmen	13
Inadequate transfer credit	14, 20
Inadequate financial assistance	16
Peer relations	17

Appendix B

GENERAL INFORMATION SECTION: Part One

In this questionnaire you will have the opportunity to describe your experience in transferring from a two-year institution to a four-year institution. Please complete the General Information Section: Part One (fill-in-the-blank) as accurately as possible. If you cannot arrive at a correct or reasonable estimate for this information, please leave the item blank.

Part One

Age____; Sex____; Marital status____; Institution granting the two-year degree: (check one) Technical Institute____, Community College____, Junior College____; Associate of Arts Degree (major)____; Grade Point Average____; Anticipated four-year college or university degree____and academic major____; Number of semester hours transferred to the four-year institution____; Number of semester hours presently completed at the four-year institution____; Number of semester hours attempting this semester____; If you are employed on a full or part time basis, list the number of hours worked per week____; Current student status: freshman____sophomore____junior____senior____; Current Grade Point Average accumulated "only" at the four-year institution____; Number of semesters you anticipate in order to receive your degree (assuming a normal load of 15-17 semester hours each semester and if applicable, both sessions of summer school counting as one semester)____; Number of hours that did not transfer____; Check one: live in dorm____, own apartment____, with parents____, other____.

Appendix C

DATA SOURCE: Part Two

In order to make this part quick and easy, all you have to do, is to check one of the five categories that is used to describe each of the experiences that are illustrated.

Example: Strongly Agree (SA)___, Agree (A)___, Uncertain (UN)___, Disagree (D)___, Strongly Disagree (SD)___.

Example: 1. All boys and girls with red hair have hot tempers.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.

1. It will take longer than two additional years (four semesters) to graduate.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
2. It will probably take at the least six or more semesters to graduate.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
3. It is easy to obtain the necessary additional courses for graduation because of good scheduling by the college or university.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
4. There is satisfactory advising available.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
5. Upper-level students are a better source of needed information than the college/university counselor or advisor.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
6. Registration and scheduling procedures did not provide any noticeable difficulties.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
7. There was an adequate formal orientation program for "only" transfer students.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.

8. A formal orientation program is needed for transfer students.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
9. "Spoon-feeding" during registration and scheduling at the two-year institution, contributed to scheduling difficulties at the four-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
10. Assistance was rendered to the transfer student in obtaining "required" courses at the freshman and sophomore level at the four-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
11. The quality of instruction at the two-year institution is equal to that of the four-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
12. The faculty attach a noticeable "stigma" to a two-year transfer student.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
13. The native students (juniors-seniors) attach a noticeable "stigma" to a two-year transfer student.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
14. Satisfactory transfer credit was granted for courses taught at the two-year institution, even though these "same" courses at the receiving institution such as Marketing, Advertising, Office Management, etc., were taught as upper-level.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
15. The faculty at the four-year institution is easier to develop a personal relationship (rapport) than the faculty at the two-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
16. The two-year transfer student has more difficulty in securing financial assistance than the regular student at the four-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
17. It was more difficult to form new friendships at the two-year institution than at the four-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
18. Transfer students cannot enroll in sections of courses until the regular students have enrolled.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.

19. It is more difficult to make the same or better grades at the four-year institution than at the two-year institution.
(SA)___(A)___(UN)___(D)___(SD)___.
20. PLEASE USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE TO INDICATE ANY INFORMATION THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS REGARDING THE TRANSFER PROCESS.

Appendix D

GUIDELINES FOR TRANSFER

Freshman and/or Sophomore Years

1. Business Administration or Economics

- a) In the case of a student intending to pursue a bachelor's degree in business administration or economics, senior institutions should accept the following courses from two-year institutions accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or a comparable regional accrediting body:

	<u>Sem. Hrs.</u>	<u>Qtr. Hrs.</u>
Principles of Accounting	6	9
Principles of Economics	6	9
Business Statistics	6	9
Business Law	3	5
Electronic Data Processing	3	5
Introduction to Business	3	5

- b) Any courses other than those listed above and any courses classified as junior or senior level courses at the senior institutions may not be acceptable as transfer credit. However, an institution may, at its option, allow students to earn credit for courses in this category on a course-by-examination basis or some similar validating procedure.

2. Business, Occupational, and Distributive Education

- a) In the case of a student intending to pursue a bachelor's degree in business, occupational, or distributive education, senior institutions should accept the following courses from two-year institutions accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools or a comparable regional accrediting body:

	<u>Sem. Hrs.</u>	<u>Qtr. Hrs.</u>
Principles of Accounting	6	9
Principles of Economics	6	9
Shorthand	6	9
Business Statistics	6	9
Typing	4	6
Personal Finance	3	5
Introduction to Business	3	5
Business Mathematics	3	5
Business Law	3	5

- b) Any courses other than those listed above and any courses classified as junior or senior level courses at the senior institutions may not be acceptable as transfer credit. However, an institution may, at its option, allow students to earn credit for courses in this category on a course-by-examination basis or similar validating procedure.

Appendix E

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire you will have the opportunity to describe your experience in transferring from a two-year institution to a four-year institution. Please complete the Demographic Questionnaire (fill-in-the-blank) as accurately as possible. If you cannot arrive at a correct or reasonable estimate for this information, please leave the item blank.

Age____; Sex____; Marital status____; Institution granting the two-year degree: (CHECK ONE) Technical Institute____, Community College____, Junior College____; Associate in Arts/ Science Degree (major)____; Grade Point Average____; Anticipated four-year college or university degree____and academic major____; Number of semester hours transferred to the four-year institution____; Number of semester hours attempting this semester____; If you are employed on a full or part time basis, list the number of hours per week____; Current student status: freshman__sophomore__junior__senior__; Current Grade Point Average accumulated "only" at the four-year institution____; Number of semesters you anticipate in order to receive your degree (assuming a normal load of 15-17 semester hours each semester and if applicable, both sessions of summer school counting as one semester)____; Number of hours that did not transfer____;(CHECK ONE): live in dorm____, rent apartment____, with parents____, other____; At what stage in time did you make the decision to transfer from a two-year institution to a four-year college: (CHECK ONE) Before enrollment in the two-year institution____, During the first year at the two-year institution____, During the second year at the two-year institution____, After graduation from the two-year institution_____.

Appendix F
ARTICULATION INVENTORY

In order to make this part quick and easy, all you have to do, is to check one of the five categories that is used to describe each of the experiences that are illustrated.

Example: Strongly Agree (SA)___, Agree (A)___, Undecided (UN)___, Disagree (D)___, Strongly Disagree (SD).

Example: 1. All boys and girls with red hair have hot tempers.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.

1. It will take longer than two additional years (four semesters) to graduate.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.
2. It will probably take at the least six or more semesters to graduate.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.
3. It is easy to obtain the necessary additional courses for graduation because of good scheduling by the college or university.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.
4. There is satisfactory advising available.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.
5. Upper-level students are a better source of needed information than the college/university counselor or advisor.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.
6. Registration and scheduling procedures did not provide any noticeable difficulties.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.
7. There was an adequate formal orientation program for "only" transfer students.
(SA)____(A)____(UN)____(D)____(SD)_____.

8. A formal orientation program is needed for transfer students.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
9. "Spoon-feeding" during registration and scheduling at the two-year institution, contributed to scheduling difficulties at the four-year institution.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
10. Assistance was rendered to the transfer student in obtaining "required" courses at the freshman and sophomore level at the four-year institution.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
11. The quality of instruction at the two-year institution is equal to that of the four-year institution.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
12. The faculty attach a noticeable "stigma" to a two-year transfer student.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
13. The native students (juniors-seniors) attach a noticeable "stigma" to a two-year transfer student.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
14. Satisfactory transfer credit was granted for courses taught at the two-year institution, even though these "same" courses at the receiving institution such as Marketing, Advertising, Office Management, etc., were taught as upper-level.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
15. The faculty at the four-year institution is easier to develop a personal relationship (rapport) than the faculty at the two-year institution.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
16. The two-year transfer student has more difficulty in securing financial assistance than the regular student at the four-year institution.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
17. It was more difficult to form new friendships at the two-year institution than at the four-year institution.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.
18. Transfer students cannot enroll in sections of courses until the regular students have enrolled.
(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.

19. It is more difficult to make the same or better grades at the four-year institution than at the two-year institution.

(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.

20. There was confusion among various four-year personnel (Admissions Director, Registrar, Advisor) regarding the courses that would or would not be accepted for transfer credit.

(SA)_____ (A)_____ (UN)_____ (D)_____ (SD)_____.