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A SAMPLE OF 60 SENIORS IN A UNIVERSITY'S COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION INDICATED THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AS AN INSTITUTION BY THE USE OF A 7-POINT RATING SCALE INVOLVING TEN DIMENSIONS--(1) USEFUL-USELESS, (2) DOMINEERING-LAX, (3) MOTIVATED-AIMLESS, (4) TIMELY-UNTIMELY, (5) POTENT-IMPOTENT, (6) DIFFICULT-EASY, (7) INFLUENTIAL-UNINFLUENTIAL, (8) VIGOROUS-FEEBLE, (9) MOVING-STILL, AND (10) IMPORTANT-UNIMPORTANT. ON ITEMS 3, 4, 5, 9, AND 10 THE 20 SUBJECTS WHO HAD ATTENDED JUNIOR COLLEGES RANKED THE JUNIOR COLLEGE HIGHER (TOWARD THE LEFT-HAND TERM OF EACH PAIR) THAN DID THOSE WHO HAD NOT ATTENDED JUNIOR COLLEGE. THE REVERSE WAS TRUE FOR THE OTHER FIVE ITEMS. IN 9 ITEMS, THE FORMER JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS SHOWED GREATER VARIANCE IN THEIR RESPONSES. SUCH VARIATION MAY BE THE RESULT OF THEIR EXPERIENCES AT AND RECOLLECTIONS OF SPECIFIC INSTITUTIONS. VARIATIONS AMONG COLLEGES MAY BE THE RESULT OF THEIR IDENTIFICATION WITH ONE OR MORE SEGMENTS OF ADULT EDUCATION, SECONDARY EDUCATION, AND HIGHER EDUCATION, AS WELL AS OF THEIR NEED FOR IDENTIFICATION WITH THEIR SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES RATHER THAN WITH A STEREOTYPE.

THIS ARTICLE IS PUBLISHED IN "FEABODY JOURNAL OF EDUCATION." VOLUME 44, NUMBER 3, NOVEMBER, 1966. (WO)
One of the most widely discussed educational topics today is the junior college. A rather large segment of the population appears to be interested in what the institution is, what it does, what characteristics it exhibits, and the intensity levels of some of those characteristics. Certainly there is a keen, inquiring interest among all educators regarding these points (1).

The junior college offers curricula that appeal to several types of students, including those who are continuing to update or acquire occupational skills, those who plan to go to work immediately after junior college, and those who plan to go on to a university or four-year college. This paper deals primarily with the last named type.

In an attempt to throw some light on the perceived characteristics of the junior college, the author conducted a small-scale inquiry among the senior class in the college of business administration of The University of Texas. He used the semantic differential, which was developed several years ago by a group of University of Illinois psychologists, on a sample of 60 persons from that class. Twenty of these seniors had attended a junior college and forty had not. There were thirteen different junior colleges in the backgrounds of these students.

Ten bi-polar adjectival scales were used to measure some of the aspects that were thought to be interesting. As recommended by the developers of the technique, seven spaces on the scale were provided the respondents. An example showing the value of each space is the following:

```
Junior College

Vigorous: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 Feeble
```

Mean averages and standard deviations were computed for each of the two groups of seniors and are presented in the accompanying table.

Survey Findings and Discussion

The patterns in the data should prove provocative to people seriously concerned with the junior college as a living, functioning institution. The students who had attended such an institution rated the concept "junior college" higher than did the students...
who had not attended on five of the
ten bi-polar scales: motivated-aimless,
timely-un timely, potent-impotent,
moving-still, important-unimportant.
The reverse was true on the follow-
ing scales: unless, domineering-lax,
difficult-easy, influential-uninfluential,
vigorous-feeble.

The two groups assigned the four
lowest scores to the same four scales
in exactly the same order. In other
words, the two groups were in close
agreement with each other on the
characteristics which they regard the
junior college as poor in (given the
limited number of adjective pairs, 10,
available to the respondents). The
worst score was on difficult-easy, fol-
lowed in order by domineering-lax,
vigorous-feeble, and influential-unin-
f l uential. Of course the interpretation
of the scale domineering-lax is par-
ticularly unclear.

An intriguing finding was that there
was far more disagreement on ratings
within the group of seniors who had
attended a junior college than among
those who had not. This is reflected
in the standard deviation data pre-
sen’ed in the table. The sole excep-
tion was on the scale potent-impotent,
in which the amount of internal
scatter of attitudes was almost identi-
cal in the two groups. The greatest
difference between groups in amounts
of internal disagreement was on the
vigorous-feeble scale. This scale also
showed the greatest instance of dis-
agreement in the entire study. That
was among the students who had at-
tended a junior college.

Based on these data, one may
reasonably infer that the junior col-
lege as an institution measured by
these ten adjectival scales was not
stereotyped in the perceptions of the
respondents. Instead, there was a
considerable scatter in views, particu-
larly among those who had attended a
junior college.

Of course this study does not furn-
ish the rationale for the attitudes ex-
pressed by the 60 seniors. However,
it should be noted in connection with
the most critical views toward the
junior college that these students
were completing at least their second
year in a rather special environment.
That environment included several
measurable factors for which the stu-
dents undoubtedly had some fairly
accurate approximations. The stu-
dents’ awareness that their university
had a faculty in which most members
held the doctorate, that many faculty
members in the school of business
administration were business consul-
tants, and that most were engaged in
research and writing very possibly
caused them to view the junior col-
lege somewhat harshly. After all,
given present philosophies of junior
college administration, these are some
of the very points on which junior
colleges would be expected to score
cw. The respondents were not asked
to make a contrast between junior
colleges and their university, but
their frame of reference was such as
to encourage using their university as
a sort of bench mark.

No one can say with any assurance
why the seniors who had attended a
junior college were so far from gen-
eral agreement. However, one can
conjecture that the students’ percep-
tions of the concept “junior college”
were massively influenced by the
recollections of the specific junior college attended and that the thirteen junior colleges they had attended were in fact quite different on the aspects examined. This type of institution does have a great variety of academic standards, faculty competence, and physical facilities from school to school. Administrative policies on research, writing, and consulting also vary considerably. Perhaps the respondents recorded “true” differences among the schools attended.

However, to be fair, one must say these great variations also occur among four-year colleges. It is suggested, then, that the explanation may lie in the fact that junior colleges have identified with three different entities in education—secondary education, higher education, and adult education. At times they have identified with only one, at times with two, and at other times with all three. Leaving aside the question of whether junior college goals should include one, two, or all three orientations, one can argue that students are confused by this blurred image of the junior college movement. And probably the general public is just as confused. The educator has begun to take note of the anxiety business management feels when it determines that a product brand or line of products carries a blurred image and the usually careful direction of activities thereafter by that management to build toward some new image goal. It is not suggested that all junior colleges should or can band together and collectively build an image as easily as a marketing vice-president can do so for a product. Nevertheless, there is some food for thought here.

As long as the junior colleges have as their objectives the specific needs of the local community, the worth of which is not challenged here, can there be an over-all program of image construction in the United States for the junior college? The answer is far from clear but is probably in the affirmative. However, that program is outside the scope of this paper.

The “best” junior colleges probably suffer greatly from the reputations of the “worst” junior colleges. It is perfectly understandable that the administrator of the “better” junior college is disturbed by reputational influences he considers adverse emanating from the “inferior” junior college. Practically all administrators, as well as all other personnel associated with a school, want people to think well of that school. But cannot the so-called “inferior” junior college actually be facing and meeting the specific needs of a specific community during a specific period of time and doing the job well? Cannot the most important single dimension of reputation for the junior college be the local prestige accorded by the well-served community? This is not to deny another dimension, the prestige of the junior college as a type of educational institution. But all too often those involved in the emotional vortex of the junior college movement appear to the author to lose perspective.

There are several shortcomings to this study, the greatest of which is the fact that the sampling did not conform perfectly with scientific stan-
dards of randomness. Therefore, no tests of significance were calculated for the differences between the two groups. Another important limitation is that the same was rather small. And it was restricted to the seniors in only one field of study, business administration, and only one university. Also only ten adjectival pairs could not fully describe all aspects of a functioning educational institution.

Nevertheless, the results of the study do provide at least some fragmentary information on the perceived characteristics of the junior college as an institution and provide a basis for conjecture and further research. Although knowledge is desirable for its own sake, the research which the author hopes will be performed regarding this type of educational institution would include some with immediate application. That application would be in the perplexing problem of planning and organizing for the more effective education of a growing and school-conscious population.

Means and Standard Deviations of Views
Of Business Administration Seniors
Toward the Concept of “Junior College”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean Attended jr. college (n = 20)</th>
<th>Did not attend jr. college (n = 40)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Attended jr. college (n = 20)</th>
<th>Did not attend jr. college (n = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Useful-useless</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domineering-lax</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated-aimless</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely-untimely</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potent-impotent</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult-easy</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential-uninfluential</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigorous-feeble</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving-still</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important-unimportant</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The seven space semantic differential technique of psychologist Charles Osgood was utilized. The left hand adjective in each pair was the “7” pole.
