

ED 032 071

JC 690 334

By-Collins, Charles C.

Some Student Characteristics and Their Implications for Student Personnel Work.

Pub Date [69]

Note-25p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.35

Descriptors-\*Counseling Effectiveness, \*Junior Colleges, \*Student Characteristics, \*Student Personnel Services

To give them effective personal and vocational counseling, student personnel workers must consider certain facts about junior college students. Although they usually have lower academic ability, they have other attributes worth enhancing. Testing and other selection tools generally apply only to academic aptitude, not to other qualities, and have a negative effect on the expectations of minority students. If they are expected to move upward from a low socioeconomic status, they step into conflict with background and family. While they are in great need of new ideas and life styles, they need not reject all their existing values. Even though wanting their children to prosper, parents give them little real encouragement. If they must work while in school, the time thus spent is at the expense of their grades. They often scorn the junior college because it is cheap, forgetting that it makes their mobility possible. They are rarely intellectually oriented and must be shown the worth, to themselves and their careers, of the many other choices. They need co-curricular activities for the sharing of cultural experiences. Since those most in need of counsel rarely seek it, counselors must devise ways of going to them. They must learn to live with a normal amount of ambiguity, working into their career through a narrowing process of choice. The writer discusses many other pertinent characteristics and suggests ways for the counselor to make them work to the advantage of the students. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

SOME STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND  
THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK

Charles C. Collins  
Junior College Leadership Program  
University of California, Berkeley

ED032071

JC 690 334

The eminent biologist, Thomas Henry Huxley, once told his students, "The great end of life is not knowledge but action". And W. H. Auden said to all who read his poetry:

"Act from thought should quickly follow: What is thinking for?" Facts, left in isolation, are inert. Drawing implications from facts, though hazardous, creates a ferment with a potential for thrust toward action. Thought centered on these implications should give direction to this potential thrust. The sequential order, then, is: facts → implications drawn from facts → thought on suggested options and their consequences → action. Or, related to the subject at hand: facts on junior college students → implications of these facts for student personnel services → thought on the consequences of the options these implications suggest → development, innovation, change, action.

Facts, even in the social or behavioral sciences, can be hard, neat, precise, objective. Implications grow out of the perceptions of the person drawing them, hence are softer, perhaps a little messy, somewhat imprecise, and admittedly subjective. It might be comforting could it be otherwise, but it cannot. The validity of the implications

will depend on the breadth and depth of the contextual knowledge of the person who draws these implications--and upon his unstated assumptions and the internal logic that follows from these assumptions. Step 3 of the sequential order, thought on the consequence of the options suggested by the implications, and step 4, action go beyond the responsibility of the gatherer of facts or the drawer of implications. At least in matters pertaining to curriculum or student personnel, step 3 and step 4 must be taken by those who know all the complexities and nuances of the local situation and who will have to carry out and live with the action which is taken.

#### Academic Characteristics

For an opener, take the fact that more and more people are going to college: the 3% going to college in 1900 has grown to 50% in the 1960's; an average of one new junior college is created every week; presidents of the United States as well as presidents of colleges have said that everyone who wants and can profit from higher education should have it. What are the implications of this colossal fact?

When 60%, 70%, 80% of high school graduates are enrolled in college, most will not be going to such institutions as Stanford or Yale or the University of California. These millions will be swelling the ranks of the community colleges. In California, for example, 60% of California high school graduates now enter a two or four-year college. In 1968, total enrollment was 878,580 students of whom 568,147 were in California's 86 community colleges as opposed to 98,780 students in the eight campuses of the University of California.<sup>7</sup>

When higher education is almost as universal as secondary education, the college population will, in nearly all respects, be the

same as that found in the high schools. On the scale of academic aptitude, the junior college average may actually be lower than that of the high school, for the people's college will have abandoned whatever selection processes they may have had, while the state and private four-year colleges and universities will continue to skim off the academic cream. Of course, both junior and senior colleges may come to see that man is not one-dimensional, that he is a lot more than just his academic aptitude. The community colleges may make reappraisal, come to see that academic aptitude is only one of the many facets of man, and realize that by opening the door to everybody, they have allowed all the plural riches of humanity to flow in.

If community colleges make such a reappraisal, they may decide to go off the academic gold standard. They may begin looking for more valuable gems: social ethics, human understanding, ethnic sub-cultures, affective wisdom. They may tell the senior colleges that they are not looking for academic excellence alone and therefore refuse to use the single A-to-F yardstick to measure a student. Junior college instructors and student personnel workers may teach their more rigid senior college colleagues that the plural qualities of man require plural modes of cultivation and call for plural criteria of evaluation. As a more and more diverse population swarms into the junior colleges, there will have to be an institutional re-ordering of priorities with some de-emphasis on the academic, on cognitive learning, and a new valuation of affective learning, a new concern with human relationships and with the morality and ethics involved in those relationships.



The valuation of human qualities by counselors and other student personnel workers has already undergone significant reappraisal. Those in the vanguard have sought means (course work, self-analysis, encounter groups) to broaden their knowledge of meaningful ways to release and develop the varied qualities they find in their students. They have disabused themselves of the single-standard definition of college and find it arrogant, if not absurd, when others speak of a course being "college level" or of a student being "college-calibre".

#### Resistance to Testing

The antagonism toward testing has grown so strong that testmakers have become anxious about loss of handsome profits. Community college professionals in student personnel are asking, "Who needs selection devices in an open-door college?" And their few counterparts in the more selective senior colleges are asking, "Are we not measuring that which happens to be measureable rather than that which is significant?" Some student personnel people in the junior colleges are objecting that the tracking system should be allowed to die a well-deserved death, but that testing props it up and makes a moribund system look viable. Those professionals most disenchanted with testing claim that the achievement testmakers become the curriculum committee determining what will be taught, and that the academic aptitude testmakers jerry-rig a façade of scientific legitimacy to justify the one-eyed view that the cognitive, the academic, is the be-all and end-all of the college experience.

Criticism of testing by the professionals is genteel and decorous compared to the bad-mouthing by disadvantaged Blacks, Browns, and Whites who feel they have been victimized by testing. To many of those with

rising educational and vocational expectations, testing has been used by the haves to make the have-nots doubt their own competency, to make their self-image ugly, to pile failure upon failure, and to make school a foreign game where the ground rules are fixed to make them lose. Much of this negative feeling toward testing has rubbed off on the counselors, contributing significantly to the low esteem in which they are held by many Blacks and others from the Third World. The upshot of all this is that student personnel people find themselves in a professional quandry: They know that some testing, particularly in the affective areas of attitudes, interests and values, is of real worth, and they do not want to throw the good out with the bad. At the same time, they know they will be obliged not only to take the threat out of testing but to demonstrate its positive values if they are ever to recapture the trust of Blacks, Chicanos, and others who see tests as the switch used to shunt them off onto dead-end tracks.

#### Socioeconomic Background

Junior college students, as a group, come from families in the lower socioeconomic classes. Put more accurately, the educations, incomes, and occupations of their fathers are lower than those of fathers of most four-year college students.<sup>2</sup> If this is true now, it is going to be more true in the future, for the middle and upper classes have always sent their children to college, while the children of the lower-middle and lower classes make up the bulk of the astonishing number and percentage increase in enrollment in higher education. Third World militancy on the issue of education may beat down closed doors and may throw a wedge into those revolving doors

designed to make exit follow hard on the heels of entry.

This palpable fact of socioeconomic class has some subtle and perplexing implications for student personnel. The junior colleges have with pride staked a claim on the democratization of higher education. Community colleges allege, although Burton Clark and others have questioned it, that they are the escalator upon which those students who can hang on, can ride to whatever class level they choose.<sup>4</sup> Even if this is true, it becomes an area of concern for counseling. Those who move out of their class divorce themselves somewhat from the parents, family, and friends they leave behind. This cannot be done without some feeling of guilt and some emotional losses.

Students who are upwardly mobile need, in a self-conscious way, to take a hard look at what is happening to them and to make some studied choices in class values. It does not necessarily follow that the student must first learn and then adopt the values of the higher class to which he is moving. A strong case could be made for his learning a greater appreciation of the values, *more's*, traditions of the class, or caste, or sub-culture, from which he comes. Perhaps this is what the struggle for Ethnic Studies is all about. Maybe the Black student does not want to divorce himself from his Black heritage, and maybe the Chicano student wants to hold to the values of La Raza. Maybe, too, the White student should undertake his own ethnic studies by casting a critical look at the life style of the middle and upper class WASP.

The college experience, the whole academic ethos, is so foreign to those parents who have had no contact with it, that it is



difficult for them to give understanding and encouragement to their college-bound children. In a general way, they want their children to "get ahead" and even to surpass them. However, they find moment-to-moment encouragement difficult: like an American trying to cheer enthusiastically at a British cricket match. They also find a widening gulf between themselves and their children, who may correct their grammar, reject their politics, and scoff at their religion. But to return to the point at hand: Encouragement of influential and understanding adults is a vital factor in the motivation of college students.<sup>13</sup> If the psycho-logic of circumstances disqualifies the parents as the significant adults, then the student personnel staff should conjure up some parent surrogates to provide this intelligent encouragement.

Although social mobility does not necessarily require rejection of existing values and on-going cultural patterns, college as the vehicle for social mobility should lead to broader interests, to more catholic tastes, to partaking in a richer cultural fare. The formal curriculum can only take the student part way toward this goal. Junior colleges, even more than senior colleges, should develop and financially underwrite such an attractive co-curricular program that it will seduce even the practical-minded, working, commuting student. As a matter of fact, it is just such a student who should be exposed to an enticing motley of new ideas and life styles, and lured into new cultural and intellectual experiences.

#### Finances

It is an irony that many students select the junior college

because of its low cost and then discount the education they get because it is "on the cheap". Further, 63% of junior college students, as opposed to 18% of senior college students, work while attending college. The basis for their dividing time and energy between work and college is partly need and partly this discounting of the seriousness of the enterprise.<sup>2</sup>

At the moment, it is part of Black and Third World rhetoric to label junior college education second-rate because the junior college is lower in cost and because it admits virtually everyone. This reflects one of the neurotic valuations of a materialistic society: if it is cheaper and if it is not selective, it must not be very good. Some counter must be made to the materialistic tendency to judge things good or bad, valuable or worthless, on the basis of what they cost. Since it is among the functions of student personnel to interpret the college to the student, and to help the student explore the effect of his value system on his behavior, this whole problem falls directly in the laps of the various student personnel workers, particularly in the laps of the counselors.

Financial assistance officers have an even tougher job. More academically disadvantaged students from poorer families, particularly Black and other Third World students, are entering the community colleges. Helping them find jobs does not solve the problem, for time on the job is time away from study. If they work enough to earn subsistence, they are likely to flunk out of college. There are only token amounts of grants-in-aid to meet the need, and the scramble for the few dollars thrown out by the Federal Government is

both humiliating and cutthroat. The issues of financial aid--insufficient funds, unmet promises, sudden cutbacks, withholding of aid as a punitive measure--have already resulted in the eruption of violence on some campuses and, predictably, will be the source of many confrontations in the future.

The notion that a student who works his way through college gets more out of it and appreciates it more probably never was true. Now, for most junior college students, it is a grim joke. There is no evidence that working while enrolled in a junior college builds character, but there is evidence that it results in lower academic achievement and a higher drop-out rate.<sup>10</sup> No doubt, student personnel should include an employment office and the more able student probably can handle fifteen or twenty hours of work per week. Nonetheless, major attention must be turned to campaigning for adequate financial aid, perhaps on a work-study program where the academically strong student is paid for being a tutor and the academically weak student is paid for being a tutee. Community fund-raising drives may generate a thousand dollars or so for an emergency loan fund, but the kind of campaign being suggested is a political one where the stakes are for millions of Federal or state dollars. Failure on this issue may indeed make the revolution of rising expectations into a bloody one.

#### Values, Self-Concept, and Personality

As a group, junior college students are not committed to intellectual values; they do not seek an intellectual atmosphere, nor do they find it.<sup>8</sup> This is true despite the fact that most junior colleges serve the academically oriented (transfer) better than the vocationally oriented (terminal). The typical junior college student's

outside work, his commuting, his high school background, the interests and value patterns of his family--all of these are contributing factors. The fact remains, however, that values are a strong determinant of behavior, and unless a student does come to value intellectual pursuits, his moment-to-moment motivation in enterprises of the mind is not likely to be strong.

To a large extent, what is described here is a restriction of freedom. The usual junior college student does not seek option B (intellectual--cultural activities) because he is much more aware of option A (practical--materialistic activities). To increase his freedom, he needs to be made more aware of the alternatives open to him. And these alternatives need to be experienced as pleasure, to bring him reward, not just present themselves as onerous requirements he must meet to get the ticket to a better job and to more material benefits. What is being suggested is that the co-curriculum within the student personnel function can more than supplement; it can be an equal partner to the formal curriculum in the development of intellectual-cultural values. The co-curricular program can so fascinate with intriguing personalities, can so delight with the pleasures of the arts, can so broaden the student's world with its diversity, and can so stimulate the imagination that only the case-hardened know-nothing will be able to escape its lure. Further, those student personnel people involved in the co-curriculum can encourage students to band together for the pleasure of shared experience in the intellectual-cultural realm. They can help create on the junior college campus what spontaneously arises on the university campus, namely, little communities of people who feel comradeship and pleasure from the shared experience of a common

interest.

Junior college students more or less comprise a cross section of the general population hence should not be thought of as an homogenous group. Even so, there are some measureable group differences between them and senior college students. They appear to have a more practical orientation to college and are less likely to value humanitarian pursuits. They are more cautious and controlled, lack confidence in themselves, are less likely to venture into new and untried fields; they seek more certain pathways to the occupational success and financial security which they value so highly. They are, from the research evidence, less autonomous and more authoritarian.<sup>8</sup>

As might be guessed, junior college students appear to be more unsettled about future plans than either four-year college students or than youngsters who do not go on to college. Actually, they are eager for guidance regarding future planning even though they may not have the initiative, the confidence, or the know-how to seek it out. It is congruent with all the other facts that those planning and effecting transfer to senior colleges make more use of the counseling services and are more pleased with them than the non-transfer students.<sup>8</sup>

All of these statements should carry a rather loud and clear message to student personnel workers. Certainly there is agreement on the goals of helping the student to become more autonomous and less authoritarian, of increasing his self confidence, of helping him to see and be willing to consider bolder options. There is a need to take counseling, particularly the value analysis involved in vocational counseling, to the student. If the students won't come to the counselors, then let the counselors go to the students. One way to



assure this is to decentralize so the counselors must leave the security of the fort, the barrier of their little cluster of offices, and team up with their faculty colleagues in divisional centers spotted throughout the campus. Or if this is not the way to put the counselors where the action is, then let them find some other natural clustering so they are readily accessible to the students who need and want their help.

Counselors should help keep junior college students from settling too quickly for the commonplace. They need to help them live with ambiguity: to help them see that vocational choice should begin with an imaginative look at a host of options and should then proceed toward a progressive narrowing of choice as the person analyzes the congruence of his own values, interests, and abilities with those demanded by various occupations. The most valuable thing the student can learn in this whole process is the attitude, the posture, of commitment within a wider frame of tentativeness.<sup>6</sup> But this is difficult. "Almost all students and some counselors will expect a definite, almost irrevocable, occupational decision as the end result of vocational counseling. Considering the truth that 'There is nothing permanent except change,' this is an impossible, and really foolish expectancy. The whole concept of work is going to change. The nature of occupations will change even more rapidly than in the recent past. The prediction that 50% of all jobs a decade hence will be jobs that are not known today, will come to pass. In such a changing environment, the individual himself is going to change, to be transformed, to undergo a veritable metamorphosis. Yet, like all before him, he will have to live the days of his years; he will need to be committed for today

yet remain tentative for tomorrow."<sup>5</sup>

Junior college students are often quite uncertain of their interests and doubt if they have the motivation to sustain them through a full college program. Many do not feel confident that their high school work prepared them adequately for college. They are more critical of the high school courses and teachers than are those who go directly to four-year colleges. They estimate their teachers would rate them lower and, in fact, agree that their teachers should rate them lower.<sup>8</sup> All of this, of course, adds up to a self-fulfilling prophecy. Too frequently, the junior college student begins with doubts, sinks to depression, and then stops trying in areas where he experiences little, if any, success. The vicious cycle can only be broken if instructors, counselors, and other student personnel workers begin to insist that self judgment and evaluation by others be made on a more pluralistic basis.

Obviously, those with high aptitude and lots of experience in manipulation of verbal and mathematical symbols are going to shine like Day-Glo if the learning experience is all at the highest level of abstraction. But symbol manipulation is not the only form of learning. Perceptive Blacks living in the ghetto understand the sociology of that sub-culture in a different and probably more significant way than the White student who has read all the books on it. John Dewey called for learning by doing, and Paul Goodman appears ready to write off most of learning at 2nd or 3rd or Nth level abstraction and substitute a 20th Century version of the apprenticeship system.<sup>9</sup>

Of course, student personnel workers cannot wait for a radical revamping of higher education; in the long meantime they must arrange

for a goodly portion (25% to 35%) of junior college students to develop skill in handling the written and spoken word and the mathematical symbols. In accommodating themselves to this reality, they should still keep pointing to the absurdity of a college which accepts all comers but maintains the narrow learning system and an even narrower evaluation system designed to serve elitist colleges. Junior college students could learn psychology and sociology and government and ecology and ethics and all the arts and a lot of other subdivisions of man's knowledge by experiencing them, by participation, by doing; if learning were this real, they would not tolerate for long an evaluation system as one-dimensional and as meaningless as A to F.

#### Educational Aspirations

"Generally speaking, junior college students have lower educational and occupational aspirations than their peers who begin their education in four-year colleges."<sup>8</sup> Most observers find this understandable, although they might ask what is meant by "lower". What they cannot find understandable is that 70 to 75% of junior college freshmen assert their intention to transfer to a senior college and earn a bachelor's degree or more. Most observers of the junior college scene echo the statement made by K. Patricia Cross, "We know, of course, that the educational aspirations of both junior and senior college students are unrealistically high".<sup>8</sup> And they agree with what Burton Clark called the "cooling out" function of higher education, junior colleges using the soft response: ". . .to let down hopes gently and unexplosively. Through it, students who are failing or barely passing find their occupational and academic future being redefined".<sup>3</sup>

It is a fact that 70 to 75% of beginning junior college students label themselves as transfer students, whereas 35% or fewer of these students actually transfer.<sup>1</sup> Is the implication of this fact that counselors should dissuade all but top academic students from taking transfer courses? Let the charge be loud and clear: on this issue, junior college staff, including those in student personnel, fall into their own semantic traps. They ask a premature, value-loaded, badly-phrased question and then give face validity to the answer. When a student is asked if his major is terminal or transfer he is really being asked, "Are your vocational and educational aims highly specific and limited or are they still rather general and unlimited?" If the student is uncommitted, or if his commitment is to general education, or if he doesn't know whether he will eventually be a data processor or a teacher of data processing, or if he likes the sound of saying he is going on to Princeton, or if he wants to keep the options open or if, in hard fact, he fully intends to transfer--under all these conditions, the student is likely to label himself as a transfer student. When the terminal/transfer dichotomy really means low-prestige-specific vs. high-prestige-general, it should not be so astonishing that 70 to 75% are smart enough to make the second choice.

It is also a fact that junior colleges, like senior colleges, "cool out" their students, perhaps more gently but just as effectively. To say that junior colleges use the soft response, ("let down hopes gently and unexplosively, -- students who are failing or barely passing find their occupational and academic future being redefined") is to indulge in conscience-soothing euphemisms. It should be put more harshly: out of every 100 students who enter junior colleges,

65 to 70 say, "Oh, to hell with it!" or, by means of probation/disqualification, are told by those who piously espouse universal higher education "Get the hell out!" Either way, this is somewhat analogous to hospitals discharging the sick and keeping the well.

Part of the error in this thinking begins with the assumption that there is a clear-cut distinction between terminal and transfer. This is a myth without foundation. Most terminal courses in vocational training are as difficult and demanding as transfer courses: industrial electronics is every bit as tough as History 17 A-B. Most courses with terminal numbers are, in fact, transferable to one senior college or another, and, since this is true, instructors teaching these courses apply what they think to be transfer grading standards. Add to these points the fact that the general education function of the junior college is, with few exceptions, met by transfer-type courses. The logic of these assertions leads then to this: if transfer courses are unrealistic (too difficult) for 2/3 of junior college students, if most technical-terminal courses are as difficult as transfer courses, if most general education courses are really designed and graded as transfer courses, then for 2/3 of the students the transfer, the terminal, and the general education functions of the junior college are all unrealistic. By this reasoning, it would make more sense--and would be cheaper--for the academically able students to be sent directly from high school to the senior colleges. The junior colleges would then be left as remedial schools trying to do what the elementary and secondary schools failed to do.

Again, it comes to this: the idea of universal higher education demands a plural, not a single, absolute definition of what college is.



Student personnel workers should be the first to exorcise that devilish mind-set that transfer is unrealistic for many, if not most, junior college students. What is really unrealistic is for an affluent society to fail to educate each of its citizens to his highest potential, for it is self-evident that this serves both the individual and the general welfare.

Counselors and other junior college staff members should first resist and then reject this artificial distinction between transfer and terminal. Student personnel staff members should work with curriculum committees and with instructors on disabusing students, and their parents, of the vision of step-ladder prestige in society's job structure. They should actively set out to instill a higher valuation for para-professional and for all mid-level jobs in management, in technology, and in the social services, for in the economy of the future that is where most junior college graduates are going to be. If all of the above reasoning is essentially sound, then the most important implication is the necessity of convincing senior colleges to broaden their range of curricula to accept a much broadened range of transfer students. They should find, as the junior colleges are finding, that the definition of college has to stretch to fit the new societal goal of universal higher education.

#### Black and Third World Students

The head-count facts on Black and Third World students are not yet documented, but it would take an hysterical blindness to fail to see that the junior colleges, particularly urban community colleges, are getting and will get more Black, Brown, Yellow, and Red students. The militancy of those already in is going to force changes in

admissions, retention, financial aid, and other such barriers, so the way will be cleared for the brothers who are out. Many are going to enter very hostile about the kind of counseling and the kind of teaching they received in high school and are going to look upon the junior college as another tracking system where they get shunted on to the lowest track. They are not going to be very tolerant of dead-end tracks or of those that fail to lead to the senior colleges.

It is an open question whether it takes a Black counselor to counsel a Black student or a Third World financial aid officer to handle the explosive issue of assistance to Third World students. Caucasian student personnel workers whose racial awareness is as white as their skins would be well advised to limit themselves to White students. Most student personnel staff members have basic understanding and empathy, but even these people will need to learn lots more about Third World students than can be got from reading Soul on Ice or Black Rage or from taking another sociology course or so. They will need to work with and for these ex-colonials in their communities and with and for them in their struggle on the campus.

This kind of involvement is not without its dangers, and not too many have a strong enough stomach for it. Those White professionals who are involved enough in mankind to respond to this challenge, may have to accept the rebuff of a self-imposed segregation and be tolerant of strident ethnocentrism during the transitional identity crisis. Interracial relations will remain up-tight and often irrational until the WASPs prove themselves worthy of trust and until the Third Worlders no longer feel compelled to shout, "I am me and I like what I see me to be!"

An example to develop the point: California's population is about 25% non-Caucasian, but something less than 5% of students in California institutions of higher learning are non-Caucasian. If racial equity were to be achieved tomorrow, as it almost has to be, old standards would simply have to be changed, dropped, circumvented. The logic must be faced that the same academic admission, retention, and graduation standards cannot be applied to students who have been singularly disadvantaged in academics, who have marched to the beat of a different drummer, who are rich in other dimensions of the human genius. The argument here is for multiple criteria, not for lower standards. The logic also has to be faced that during all those years of disadvantage, Third World counselors, instructors, and other professionals were not being prepared, certainly not at a 25% rate. Now they are desperately needed, and some personnel selection standards are going to be bent and broken to get them in. The purist who sees all this as a lowering of the barriers, as a watering down of education, should have shown his concern long ago when gradualism was still an option. Again, this is not to say that the standards should be lower but that the criteria should be different, should be plural, should have latitude in interpretation. Besides, staff members who come in through the side door are likely to enter unencumbered with many of the hang-ups typical of those taking the orthodox path; en route they will have picked up some different forms of wisdom that will enrich the whole college community.

#### Sense of Community

The community college student does not have much sense of

community, on campus or off. There does not seem to be much of a "we" feeling among most junior college students, and there is, therefore, only faint loyalty to the college and even a more pallid identification with the wider community. In a study of junior college drop-outs, Jane Matson came to the conclusion that a lack of community feeling was one of the factors distinguishing between those who held on.<sup>11</sup>

Though junior colleges are often called community colleges, some question exists whether there is real community out there or only some businesses and some families who happen, geographically, to live next to each other. And on campus, for many <sup>students</sup>, there is no little universe in which they find they can revolve. Part of the difficulty stems from the fact that students are usually commuters and often part-time workers. "For the usual student in a commuter college, his office, his file cabinet, his locker, sometimes his lunch room, and sometimes his trysting place, is his car. The reason for this is very simple: he has no home base on campus. The confused bedlam of the student center serves this need no better than the quiet hardchaired decorum of the library. The student is not likely to work out his problems of personality identity sitting in his car waiting for his next class. Neither is the college, nor the intellectual and cultural values for which it stands, likely to become the object of his identification."<sup>5</sup>

One of the best ways to establish a "we" feeling is for "us" to do some significant things together. Projects in the outer community, wide work in some types of social service, discussion in small student-faculty retreats, participation in co-curricular activities of an active, non-spectator, type, involvement in sensitivity groups--all

of these fall in the category of doing significant things together, and all fall within the scope of student personnel. Instead of relying only on the typical first semester orientation class, counselors might consider voluntary continuation of encounter or other types of group sessions for student exploration of the self and the significant other; these sessions would be open to the student for the duration of his enrollment in the community college.

As suggested before, the counseling function might be profitably decentralized and in the process become the hub of little universes to which the student could attach himself. There are any number of models for this: William Rainey Harper College in Illinois and Monterey Peninsula College in California are among those having decentralized counseling along divisional lines. De jure recognition of de facto clustering by color or ethnic origin might tie in neatly with current demands for separate Ethnic Studies. Even arbitrary clusters, as long as they allowed for mobility, might be worth a try.

#### Age and Sex

In age, students in junior colleges are more senior than students in senior colleges. Only 15% of entering four-year college students are over 19 years old, whereas over 30% of junior college freshmen have left their teens behind them. Actually, Leland Medsker reported almost 50% of junior college students had reached and passed their majority, but his data of the late 1950's may have been skewed to the high side by the veterans of the Korean War.<sup>12</sup> If all part-time students in the junior college evening divisions were included in the computation, the 50% figure would be a conservative



estimate. An aggressive campaign by student personnel staffs to take vocational and educational counseling to the adults in their communities (now being done in some ghetto areas) would actually make those under 21 a minority in the junior colleges.

The implications of this age factor seem to have been largely ignored. Only a few junior colleges have counseling programs specially designed for older students, and many do not even have regular counseling services available for the thousands of adults in evening divisions. Older students returning to school after many years of absence have fears, aspirations and attitudes different from those of the recent high school graduate; they doubtless require a kind of orientation different from the stock "ease-them-out-of-puberty" introduction to college. They also need a different approach in counseling, one that recognizes their greater maturity, experience, and definitiveness of purpose and one that affords them not only respect but the dignity of being peers with the counselor.

Although some older students may want to merge completely with the younger students, most find themselves a little uncomfortable in any facilities outside the classroom and the library. Perhaps they deserve and would enjoy a special lounge within the student center, a retreat which would be quieter and less bouncy, where they could feel free to show their age. It is a rare junior college indeed which has any kind of organization for evening division students, and only the more aggressive adult students in the day division involve themselves in student politics. These older students are often shining lights in the classroom but have little to say and, consequently, feel little involvement in the co-curricular program. This is

unfortunate, for they would add richness to it and would gain richness from it. They are a large segment in a college system which claims to be student-centered. To be more or less blind to their presence in the total student personnel function is to negate a cardinal premise of the junior college philosophy.

No doubt there are other significant characteristics of junior college students that have implications for junior college student personnel programs. Even so, an end must be called at some point, and in this instance conclusion will be reached with brief mention of the factor of sex ratio. In studies done during the 1950's and reported by Leland Medsker, the ratio varied from 3 to 1 to 2 to 1 in favor of men over women.<sup>12</sup> This ratio, without question, reflects social values; education is highly valued for men and not so highly valued for women. Values can, of course, be taught, and if student personnel people believe that what is good for the gander is good for the goose, then it is incumbent upon them to try to recruit more girls among high school graduates and more women from the community. Beyond recruitment, counselors and other student personnel workers need to take a critical look at what the junior college has to offer women. If the curriculum is oriented towards male occupations, male interests, male predilections, then why should women enroll in numbers equal to the men's? The same goes for the co-curriculum. Too often the major role for girls in student activities is that of sex-symbol, which is rather limiting both as to numbers who qualify and as to scope. The budget, the nature of activities, the ease of involvement, and every aspect of the co-curricular program should be co-sexual, should reflect the fact that there are as many women as there are men and, more to the point, that as many women as men should be in college.

Bibliography of Supporting References

1. American College Testing Program. College Student Profiles: Norms for the ACT Assessment. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1966.
2. Astin, A. W., Fanos, R. J. and Creager, J. A. "National Norm for Entering College Freshmen"--Fall, 1966. ACE Research Reports. Washington: American Council on Education, 1967.
3. Clark, Burton R. "The Cooling-out Function in Higher Education". American Journal of Sociology 65: pp. 569-576; 1960.
4. Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
5. Collins, Charles C. College Orientation: Education for Relevance. Boston: Holbrook Press, 1969.
6. Collins, Charles C. Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
7. Coordinating Council for Higher Education. "Fall 1968 Enrollment in California Higher Education". California Higher Education 3: p. 3; June, 1969.
8. Cross, K. Patricia. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.
9. Goodman, Paul "The Present Moment in Education". The New York Review of Books, pp. 14-24, April 10, 1969.
10. Knoell, D. M. and Medsker, L. L. From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.
11. Matson, Jane E. Characteristics of Students Who Withdraw From A Public Junior College, unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1955.
12. Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
13. Trent, J. W. and Medsker, L. L. Beyond High School: A Study of 10,000 High School Graduates. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1967.