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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES OF DIRECTORS AND
INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENT RATINGS IN REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL
STUDIES IN TENNESSEE'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Carolyn H. Brown

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the attitudes of remedial and developmental directors and instructors and student ratings.

A population of 230 full-time directors and instructors and 3,269 remedial students were surveyed in the Fall of 1990. The return rate was 95% for the directors and instructors with the student rate dependent upon instructors administering the instruments. Two instruments were developed—one to measure the attitudes of directors and instructors and one for student ratings of instructors.

Seven null hypotheses were formulated; 5 were retained and 2 rejected, at the .05 level of significance. Factor analysis identified four student factors and six director and instructor factors. The Pearson $r$ was used to test for relationships in hypotheses 1 through 4, with 24 possible correlations on each hypothesis. The $t$-test was used to test for differences in hypotheses 5 through 7.

Even though findings revealed a low percentage of correlations, significant relationships were found on several factors. A relationship existed between student ratings and instructor willingness to provide extra assistance, and demonstrating a nurturing, caring concern for students. Students and instructors viewed a sense of 'belongingness' and being an integral part of the college environment as an important factor.

Directors and instructors who held strong, egalitarian philosophies believed in open door policies. A difference did not exist between student ratings of faculty who taught remedial and developmental courses only and fully-integrated faculty. A significant difference was found in student ratings of instructors based on age. Differences were noted in the areas of instructor concern, course value, and classroom adaptations among students older than 24.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Over the past two decades there has been a dramatic increase in remedial and developmental programs in higher education. This increase has occurred largely as a result of the nation's commitment to make higher education accessible to all. As more emphasis is placed on improving quality and raising standards, while at the same time maintaining access to college, large numbers of students are enrolling in colleges and universities underprepared for college-level work.

American higher education has had almost a century of experience with remedial education. Cross stated that the "first course in remediation for academic deficiencies was introduced at Wellesley College in 1894" and "the notion that colleges bear some responsibility for helping students overcome weaknesses in academic backgrounds and skills has been a part of the American college scene ever since."

The majority of the early remedial courses focused on the poor study habits of students. How-to-study courses continued until the late 1930s and early 1940s when remedial reading projects were introduced and the perceptions of the

---

problems of low achievers were broadened to include inadequate development of fundamental academic skills in reading, writing, and comprehension. Remediation efforts and the plight of the low achiever were concerns of only a limited number of students and educators until events of the 1950s and 1960s.\(^2\)

As more and more Americans sought educational opportunities in the 1950s and 1960s as a result of educational equality, dramatic enrollment pressures were felt by universities and four-year colleges. As major universities and four-year colleges were faced with more students than they could possibly admit, these institutions moved to selective admissions policies and to what Cross termed "the heyday of educational meritocracy."\(^3\)

Four-year institutions, especially in the 1960s, turned away students who had any discernible learning problem. Efforts at remediation shifted dramatically to the "open-door" policies of community colleges as a result of selective admissions development of four-year universities during the 1960s. Roueche and Snow remarked that "by the late 1960s, practically every two-year institution was making some effort to provide redemption for the increasing numbers of students enrolling with the basic rudiments of a

\(^2\) Cross, 26-27.

\(^3\) Cross, 26.
high school education."⁴

In a 1977 national sample of over 300 two- and four-year public institutions of higher education conducted by Roueche and Snow, findings disclosed that "eighty-six percent of today's colleges are providing some special service for the academically disadvantaged. . . . ninety-three percent of the community colleges and seventy-eight percent of the senior colleges are providing remedial courses."⁵ Roueche and Snow reported that in a period from the early 1970s to mid-1970s, there was a forty percent increase in special services for the academically deficient student.⁶

Coffey, Director of Planning for the California Postsecondary Education Commission, conducted a study in 1981 which focused on this problem. The study was implemented as a result of the growing concern over the number of students who entered postsecondary education without the necessary preparation to do college-level work and required remedial courses. The methodology of the study involved a statewide survey of all public colleges and universities in California regarding postsecondary remedial programs and services, and included on-site interview visits to seven community


⁵ Roueche and Snow, 19.

⁶ Roueche and Snow, 19.
colleges, four state universities and three campuses of the University of California. The findings of this study confirmed that community college faculty and administrators generally viewed remediation as part of their mission. Coffey disclosed that the "perceptions and attitudes of faculty and administrators played an important role within which to view the problem of remediation."

A rationale statement issued by the Tennessee Board of Regents in developing and implementing a remedial and developmental studies division in 1984 confirmed, "Underpreparedness of students for success in post-secondary education is not unique to Tennessee. . . . What is new in Tennessee and elsewhere is the attention that underprepared students are receiving from educators, policy makers, and the general public. What is new to Tennessee as elsewhere is the magnitude and degree of underpreparedness." Since larger proportions of student enrollments are academically unprepared, it is important that research in the area of remedial and developmental studies be continued. Roueche commented that "the literature on remedial and

---

7 Janis C. Coffey, Remedial Education in California's Public Colleges and Universities: Campus Perspectives on a Serious Problem (ERIC, ED 230 227, April 1983), 1-2.

8 Coffey, 11.

developmental education overwhelmingly suggests that the level of success in terms of student outcomes is directly related to the level of state or system institutional commitment."\textsuperscript{10} Therefore, a study of the attitudes of directors and instructors of remedial and developmental studies toward institutional, classroom, and personal accommodation should provide insight into approaches, behaviors, and specific strategies that students perceive and rate as beneficial.

\textbf{Statement of the Problem}

It appears that the attitudes of directors and full-time remedial and developmental instructors may be related to the attitudes of college students toward college remedial and developmental instructors and courses.

\textbf{Purpose of the Study}

The purpose of this study is to compare the relationship between remedial and developmental student ratings of instructors and courses and the attitudes of directors and instructors of remedial and developmental courses.

\textbf{Significance of the Study}

Changing roles of community colleges require new directions in educating the underprepared student. As more emphasis is being placed on raising college admission

\textsuperscript{10} Roueche et al., in State Board of Regents, White Paper, 4.
standards, as evidenced by the Tennessee Board of Regents admission requirements for freshmen entering college in the fall of 1989, the problem of the underprepared college student has only become more prominent.

Do the attitudes of students influence accommodation levels of directors and instructors more than the attitudes of directors and instructors influence student ratings? If a relationship exists between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings, which one influences the other more? Further significance of this study would be the determination if attitudes, either positive or negative, affect student learning and motivation. If attitudes are related to student learning and motivation, could staff development programs lessen or help alleviate these negative attitudes?

Due to the newness of the program which was implemented in Tennessee in 1985, information compiled from this study could prove beneficial for future assessment and follow-up studies. The Tennessee Board of Regents undertakes very thorough on-site visits and institutions conduct research. No statewide study has been completed to measure the attitudes of directors and instructors and how those attitudes relate to student ratings, and to identify factors that directors, instructors, and students deem important.

The Tennessee Board of Regents is in the process of conducting a system-wide five-year study of remedial and
developmental programs in institutions governed by the Tennessee Board of Regents. Findings from this study could be beneficial to the Tennessee Board of Regents as the state undertakes their assessment in the spring of 1991.

In an effort to learn more about the relationship of attitudes of instructors and student ratings, two instruments were developed: one to measure the attitudes of directors and instructors and one for student ratings of instructors and courses. Items constructed primarily for directors were related to individual philosophies and institutional integration of remedial and developmental courses. Items more relevant to instructors dealt with flexibility of task demands, variability of instructional strategies, support services, individual student attention, and other questions focusing on meeting the needs of special students. There is further expectation that the instruments will have the potential to identify philosophies, instructional strategies, or procedures that tend to be more successful toward fostering a positive attitude in students.

Research Questions

The following research questions were examined in the survey instruments to meet the objectives of the study:

1. Is there an overall relationship between attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors or courses in remedial and developmental studies?
2. Is there a relationship between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings in the content area of remedial and developmental English or writing?

3. Is there a relationship between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings in the content area of remedial and developmental math?

4. Is there a relationship between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings in the content area of remedial and developmental reading?

5. Is there a relationship between beliefs in open door, egalitarian philosophy and attitudes of directors and instructors as outlined in the July 1984 White Paper?\(^\text{11}\)

6. Is there a significant difference between the attitudes of younger (24 and under) traditional students, either positive or negative, toward instructors or courses and the attitudes of older (over 24) nontraditional students?

7. Is there a significant difference between the attitudes of students enrolled in courses taught by full-time remedial and developmental faculty and courses taught by integrated faculty members?

**Hypotheses**

Given the statement of the problem and findings from

\(^{11}\) State Board of Regents, White Paper, 2.
the review of related literature, the following research hypotheses were developed for testing in this study:

H1. There will be an overall positive relationship in attitudes of directors and instructors of remedial and developmental courses and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H2. There will be a positive relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental English (writing) courses and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H3. There will be a positive relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental Mathematics courses (Basic Arithmetic, Elementary Algebra, and Intermediate Algebra) and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H4. There will be a positive relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental reading courses (Basic Reading and Fundamental Reading) and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H5. There will be a significant difference in the attitudes of directors and instructors who hold strong beliefs in open door, egalitarian philosophies and directors and instructors who hold weak beliefs in open door, egalitarian philosophies.

H6. There will be a significant difference in the attitudes of younger (24 and under) traditional students and
the attitudes of older (over 24) non-traditional students towards remedial and developmental studies.

H7. There will be significant difference in the attitudes of remedial and developmental students toward regular full-time remedial and developmental instructors and instructors from integrated or other disciplines.

Assumptions

1. The survey instruments accurately reflected the attitudes of the directors, instructors and students.
2. The survey instruments were appropriate for the purpose of this study.
3. Directors, instructors, and students responded honestly to the items on the survey.
4. The stratified random sampling of student respondents was representative of the total population of remedial and developmental students in Tennessee's eleven community colleges.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to the eleven community colleges in Tennessee.
2. The directors in the study were limited to the eleven full-time directors, acting or interim directors of remedial and developmental studies in Tennessee's eleven community colleges.
3. The instructors were limited to full-time
instructors, including full-time adjunct and temporary instructors carrying a teaching load of 12 or more hours, or full-time faculty members from the math, reading, English, or other department teaching at least one section of remedial or developmental studies in Tennessee's community colleges.

4. The students were limited to those currently enrolled either full-time or part-time in remedial and developmental classes during the fall semester of 1990, and present during the administration of the survey.

Definitions of Terms

Accommodation

Accommodation is defined as an environmental responsiveness to the needs and/or desires of students. It represents a willingness on the part of the school to reconcile student needs and school demands.12

Miller, Leinhardt and Zigmond cite three basic operating levels of accommodation:

Institutional accommodation is reflected in schoolwide rules and policies and their waiver, classroom accommodation is reflected in the adjustments that instructors make to tasks and setting demands, and personal accommodation is reflected in the responsiveness of teachers to the

personal needs of individual students.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Attitudes}

Shaw and Wright offer the following definition of attitudes:

A relatively enduring system of evaluation, affective reactions based upon and reflecting the evaluative concepts or beliefs which has been learned about the characteristics of a social subject or class of social objects.\textsuperscript{14} Attitudes are relational . . . referents are specific. . . . [A]n attitude is a characteristic which implies a type of relationship between the person and specific aspects of his environment.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Basic Arithmetic (Remedial)}

A course or courses emphasizing basic operations with whole numbers, fractions, decimals and percents, ratio, proportion, measures, and application.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Basic Reading (Remedial)}

A course or courses designed to strengthen reading skills through emphasis on vocabulary usage, literal and

\textsuperscript{13} Miller et al.: 472.


\textsuperscript{15} Shaw and Wright, 4.

critical comprehension, and dictionary usage.\textsuperscript{17}

**Basic Studies English or Writing (Remedial)**

A course, or courses in grammar, spelling, usage and mechanics, and writing in the context of the paragraph.\textsuperscript{18}

**Developmental Courses**

Developmental Studies courses are defined as a program of instruction that is distinct from Remedial Studies . . . and that leads to the level of proficiency in the "Basic Academic Competencies" and in the "Basic Academic Subjects" defined by the Educational EQuality Project of the College Board as required for successful pursuit of college studies.\textsuperscript{19} Developmental studies courses "which build on the Basic Studies curriculum help students achieve proficiency . . . defined in the College Board's Educational EQuality Project as what students need to know and be able to do when they enter college."\textsuperscript{20} Cross expands the definition of developmental, often referred to as compensatory education, as purposive in "giving attention to the fullest possible development of talent and to develop strengths as well as correct weaknesses."\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{17} Student Information Bulletin, 10.

\textsuperscript{18} Student Information Bulletin, 10.

\textsuperscript{19} State Board of Regents, White Paper, 6.

\textsuperscript{20} Student Information Bulletin, 10.

\textsuperscript{21} Cross, Accent on Learning, 31.
Developmental English or Writing

A course, or courses in constructing sentences, paragraphing, and outlining with emphasis on conceiving ideas for writing, varying writing style, and developing revision and proofreading skills in the context of the short story.\textsuperscript{22}

Developmental Reading

A course, or courses designed to expand reading skills through emphasis on vocabulary application, logical reasoning, comprehension, and rate development.\textsuperscript{23}

Elementary Algebra (Developmental)

A course, or courses emphasizing the fundamental operations of integers, polynomials, exponents, factoring, algebraic fractions, linear equations and applications, solving quadratic equations by factoring, and introduction to graphing.\textsuperscript{24}

Instructor

Instructor is defined as a faculty member teaching full-time, including adjunct, and temporary, with a teaching load of at least 12 or more hours, or full-time faculty members from departments other than remedial and developmental studies who teach at least one course of remedial or developmental studies.

\textsuperscript{22} Student Information Bulletin, 10.

\textsuperscript{23} Student Information Bulletin, 10.

\textsuperscript{24} Student Information Bulletin, 11.
Integrated Faculty

Integrated faculty is defined as remedial and developmental courses taught by faculty members from other departments outside of remedial and developmental or faculty who have split appointments. Split appointments are defined as instructors who teach both non-remedial and developmental courses and remedial and developmental courses within the same semester. Integrated faculty teach in programs in which remedial and developmental courses are integral parts of the regular curriculum with no remedial or developmental studies division or faculty distinction.

Intermediate Algebra (Developmental)

A course, or courses emphasizing sets, the real number system, fundamental operations of algebraic factoring, rational expressions, linear equations and liner inequalities, stated problems, exponents and radicals, relations, linear functions, graphs, quadratic equations, system of equations and inequalities, ratio, proportion, and variation.\textsuperscript{25}

Remedial

Remedial is defined as a correction for faulty study habits, the improvement of skills imperfectly learned [or taught] and the raising of a pupil's general competence.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{25} Student Information Bulletin, 11.

\textsuperscript{26} "Remedial," Webster's Third New International Dictionary.
Roueche and Wheeler defined "remedial" to imply the remediation of student deficiencies in order that a student may enter a program in which previously ineligible.\textsuperscript{27} Cross defined "remedial" as a goal-oriented or purposive program of overcoming academic deficiencies.\textsuperscript{28}

**Remedial and Developmental Student**

A remedial and developmental student is "[a]ny student, who, as a result of holistic assessment, has been placed in one or more remedial/developmental course(s)."\textsuperscript{29}

**Remedial and Developmental Studies Programs**

Remedial and developmental programs in Tennessee are defined as follows: "The Remedial and developmental program, a generic name describing the holistic remediation programs offered by Tennessee Board of Regents institutions as part of the AAPP. They include assessment, instruction, counseling, and other support services aimed at enhancing student preparation in the Basic Academic Competencies at the pre-college level."\textsuperscript{30}


\textsuperscript{30} Tennessee [State] Board of Regents, *Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment*, 4.
Remedial Studies Courses

Remedial studies courses defined by the 1984 White Paper are a program of instruction that leads to proficiency in the Basic Skills Competencies defined by the Tennessee State Department of Educational as its objectives for the Tennessee Proficiency Test. These fifty competencies address mathematics, language, spelling, and reading. These courses, now known as Basic Studies Courses, help students achieve proficiency in the most rudimentary Basic Skills Competencies.31

Southern Regional Educational Board

The Southern Regional Educational Board or SREB, headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia, consists of fifteen member states including Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.32

Tennessee's Academic Assessment and Placement Program

The assessment program, implemented Fall 1985, is designed for two purposes: to assess student readiness for college-level work and to indicate placement in appropriate college-level or college-preparatory courses. The AAPP is a battery of standardized tests used by all TBR institutions

31 Student Information Bulletin, 10.
as the primary measure of proficiency in the Basic Academic Competencies, a description of the knowledge and skills needed by an entering college student which were established by The College Board in Academic Preparation for College. The battery, based on the Educational Testing Service's Multiple Assessment Programs and Services, includes tests in writing, reading comprehension, and mathematics.\textsuperscript{33}

**Tennessee Board of Regents**

The creation on July 1, 1972, of the State University and Community College System by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee marked the establishment of the Tennessee Board of Regents. The stated purpose of this new governing body was to enhance the effectiveness of higher education institutions.\textsuperscript{34} The Tennessee Board of Regents, formerly the State Board of Regents until June 1989, is the governing body for the state's six regional universities, twelve community colleges, two technical institutes, and 26 vocational-technical schools. Tri-Cities State Technical Institute (now Northeast State Technical Community College), became Tennessee's twelfth community college in July 1990. Northeast State is excluded from the study as the institute


participated in the pilot study in April 1990 before conversion to a community college.

**Tennessee Board of Regents' Assessment Policy**

Students twenty years old or younger, must take the AAPP if scores on the ACT are below certain cut-off scores. If enhanced ACT composite score is 18 or lower, student must take all of the AAPP tests. If enhanced ACT score is 19 or higher, but English sub-score is 18 or lower, student must take the AAPP writing sample. If enhanced ACT score is 19 or higher, but math sub-score is 18 or lower, student must take the AAPP arithmetic test and an algebra test that covers the last algebra course taken in high school. If twenty-one years old or older, student must take the full battery of the AAPP test.35

**Tennessee's Community Colleges**

Tennessee's eleven community colleges, as of 04/01/90, are: (1) Chattanooga State Technical Community College; (2) Cleveland State Community College; (3) Columbia State Community College; (4) Dyersburg State Community College; (5) Jackson State Community College; (6) Motlow State Community College; (7) Pellissippi Community College; (8) Roane State Community College; (9) Shelby State Community College; (10 Volunteer State Community College; and (11) Walters State Community College (Appendix A).

---

35 *Student Information Bulletin*, 3.
A White Paper, developed by the Tennessee [State] Board of Regents in July 1984 and revised in November 1984, outlined the plan to develop a program to address the underprepared post-secondary student. A system-wide approach for providing a comprehensive program of educational services for the underprepared and educationally disadvantaged was implemented in the fall of 1985. Basic philosophies of this plan recognized that underpreparedness results from various socio-economic changes over which schools and students have no control, but these students should have a right to a second chance. This plan assumes that right lies with the state to provide "second chances" for the educationally disadvantaged.36

Procedures

The following procedures were followed in conducting the study:

1. A review of the related literature was conducted.
2. Permission for approval of the project was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University.
3. Written permission was obtained from Chancellor Thomas J. Garland of the Tennessee Board of Regents of the State University and Community College System of Tennessee

36 State Board of Regents, White paper, 2.
(Appendix B).

4. Correspondence and telephone calls were made to Linda Doran and Bene Cox, Office of Academic Affairs, Tennessee Board of Regents, for a listing of directors and addresses and student enrollment information for Fall of 1989 and Fall of 1990 (Appendix C).

5. Approval was obtained from the directors and other administrative personnel of the eleven community colleges and one technical institute to conduct the study at their institutions (Appendix D).

6. Appropriate instruments were developed for the measurement of the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors and courses and copyrighted (Appendix N).

7. A pilot study was conducted at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute in April 1990.

8. Reliability tests, validity procedures, and assessment analysis were conducted based on pilot test information. After completion of process, study instruments were professionally printed.

9. Written correspondence was mailed in early September 1990 to the directors explaining the purpose of the study and asking for their assistance, and follow-up telephone calls were made to obtain the number of full-time instructors and students who met the criteria for the study.

10. Telephone calls were made in mid-to-late September
1990 to the directors at the eleven community colleges and dates were scheduled for visitation to the campuses in October and November 1990.

12. The instruments were delivered in person on planned visits to the college sites beginning October 9, 1990, and ending November 26, 1990. During these visits, classes surveyed were selected and the process explained to the director and staff. The procedures were handled by telephone and mailed to three of the community colleges—Columbia State Community College, Motlow State Community College and Shelby State Community College.

13. Instructors surveyed the classes selected. Attempts were made to balance the number of remedial and developmental classes being surveyed.

14. Completed survey forms were either picked up or shipped to East Tennessee State University in November and December 1990.

15. The data were interpreted and analyzed at East Tennessee State University using the SPSS/PC+ Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

16. After collection and analysis of data, summaries, conclusions and recommendations were presented.

**Organization of the Study**

The study was organized into five chapters.

Chapter I, *Introduction*, includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance
of the study, research questions, hypotheses, assumptions, limitations of the study, definitions of terms, procedures, and organization of the study.

Chapter II, Review of Relevant Literature, provides a review of literature and research relevant to the problem statement.

Chapter III, Methodology, presents the methodology and procedures used in the study to obtain the research data. This section includes the description of the study, instrumentation, population parameters, pilot study, reliability and validity procedures, sampling sizes and data collection procedures.

Chapter IV, Presentation and Analysis of Data, contains the presentation, analyses, and interpretation of the data.

Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations, concludes with a summary, summary of the findings, discussion of the findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Related Literature

Introduction

A search of the literature yielded information which was relevant to this study in the following seven major areas. Readings deemed most significant were categorized accordingly and are reported in this chapter.

Historical Background and Philosophy

Section one of the literature review addresses the historical and philosophical background surrounding the implementation of remedial and developmental programs in higher education with a focus on community colleges.

Expansion of Programs at the National Level

Section two chronicles the expansion of remedial and developmental programs in higher education and events that contributed to the expansion.

Expansion of Programs in Tennessee

Section three outlines the development and implementation of remedial and developmental programs in Tennessee.

The Remedial Issue

Section four addresses the controversial placement of remedial courses in postsecondary institutions from opposing viewpoints.
Significant Studies

Section five relates to national and regional studies outlining the degree of underpreparedness of college-age students entering postsecondary institutions and problems faced by institutions ill-prepared for this influx.

Profile of the Remedial and Developmental Student

Section six identifies and outlines characteristics of the remedial or developmental student.

Instructor Attitudes and Student Ratings

Section seven focuses on the relationship of instructors' attitudes and how attitudes affect student ratings.

Historical and Philosophical Background

Preparatory or pre-college instruction was provided by the universities themselves in the mid-to-late nineteenth century and in the early years of the twentieth century. Since secondary schools were few, curricular upgrading and arrangements with preparatory schools or high schools were not possible for most colleges. Colleges were forced to reduce entrance requirements to a common elementary level or introduce their own preparatory divisions. Levine reported that "in 1870, there were only five states in the country, where none of the colleges were engaged in preparatory work. . . . As late as 1894, preparatory students still comprised over forty percent of entering students in American
colleges." These findings were substantiated by Cross, Accent on Learning, and Brier whose historical review of academic preparation chronicled the development of preparatory instruction at the college level in America since the nineteenth century.

Brier's review indicated that "few institutions of higher education during the nineteenth century were not faced in some way with the issue of underprepared students." Even though Brier emphasized that entry requirements were raised, the pressure to keep classrooms full often forced colleges to accept students lacking basic skills. Brier commented that "efforts to bridge the academic preparation gap are part of the traditional, if not formal, mission of higher education. . . . developmental education has a traditional place in American higher education. It is by no means a new arrival."

The proliferation of high schools in the early twentieth century gradually reduced the need for preparatory divisions at major colleges. At the turn of the twentieth century, two-year institutions were considered to be the most appropriate location for post-secondary preparation of


39 Brier, 5.
underprepared high school graduates. This was the modus operandi until the late 1950s and early 1960s, and it was only during the Sixties that the educational climate demanded that all of public higher education be accessible to students regardless of race or sex.\textsuperscript{40}

During the 1950s and 1960's, the federal government played an important role by enforcing decisions on desegregation of public schools to insure equal opportunities for all. A landmark decision, \textit{Brown v. Board of Education}, 347 U.S. 483, rendered by the United State Supreme Court in 1954, and the subsequent decision, \textit{Brown v. Board of Education}, 349 U.S. 294, 1955, ruled that "racially segregated schools are inherently unequal."\textsuperscript{41} The \textit{Brown} ruling struck down "state laws fostering desegregation... and ordered states... to eliminate segregated schools with all deliberate speed."\textsuperscript{42} This decision highlighted the importance of equality of opportunity of education and gave legal recognition to the concept as major racial barriers were eliminated by increased enforcement pressures from the federal government.

National educational priorities throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, concentrated on "access models--the

\textsuperscript{40} Abraham, \textit{1987 SREB Report}, 6.


\textsuperscript{42} Hazard, 133.
removal of obstacles to bring about equality of educational opportunity." Cross, Accent on Learning, 7.

44 Cross, Accent on Learning, 8.


46 Gordon, 17.
traditional college curricula became widespread during this rapid period of growth. In the first national study of remedial education in America in 1968, Salvage, Redirection, or Custody, Roueche found that most community colleges had developed courses for students with academic deficiencies. The courses most offered were remedial English, remedial reading, and remedial mathematics. Roueche further documented the widespread failure of these programs due largely to lack of institutional commitment.47

An important social movement that impacted heavily on college admissions was the civil rights movement of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Doorways to higher education that had been previously closed were opened by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Act included the proviso "that all federal programs supported by federal funds—including those allocated to public education—must be administered and operated without discrimination."48 As a result of this legislation, one of the major barriers, racial discrimination, was legally removed and further opened the doors of access of higher education.

Roueche and Snow pointed out that "historically, community colleges, with their open-door policies have been


the champions of egalitarianism." Findings in a national 1977 study by Roueche and Snow, revealed that only 1.4 percent of community colleges claimed not to have an open-door admissions policy. The statistics were not surprising since the egalitarian philosophy is at the heart of the community college movement. A question raised by this national study was whether the "open-door movement was a sign of a change in philosophy followed by a change in policy or a change in policy to ameliorate an enrollment difficulty of new students." 50

Additional findings from this national study unveiled a relationship between high-risk student success and institutions providing students with a written statement of their developmental and remedial philosophy. Data revealed that colleges which distributed philosophical or vision statements had greater student success and greatly reduced attrition. 51

Cohen and Brawer, The Collegiate Function, reaffirmed the American ideal that "supports the notion of an open society and equal opportunities for all, one in which every person should be given to chance to move between class

---

49 Roueche and Snow, 20.
50 Roueche and Snow, 20-21.
51 Roueche and Snow, 20-21.
strata, regardless of condition at birth."\textsuperscript{52} Cohen and Brawer acknowledged that the American community college was founded "to serve as a link between the lower schools and establishments of higher learning. Despite the many additional roles . . . that original function remains an essential component of their mission."\textsuperscript{53} The community college of today remains a cornerstone for students seeking admission to institutions of higher education.

Moore, \textit{Against the Odds}, wrote of the plight of high-risk students in 1970 and their lack of an adequate education at community colleges which proclaimed to meet the needs of such students. Moore argued that 'open door' meant more that the notion that every student could go to college. Moore interpreted 'open door' to mean "every student regardless of his level of achievement, will receive the best education possible in the college commensurate with his needs, efforts, motivation, and abilities."\textsuperscript{54} Moore wrote that the high-risk student was subjected to professional neglect, humiliation, and an attitude from the majority of his instructors that he could not learn. Moore argued that community colleges were still steeped in traditional

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Cohen and Brawer, \textit{Collegiate Function}, xi.
\item \textsuperscript{54} William Moore, Jr., \textit{Against the Odds} (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970), 5.
\end{itemize}
programs and did not utilize the same priorities in developing programs for the marginal student, and had made little or no efforts to meet the needs of these students.\textsuperscript{55}

From the social, legislative, and educational outlined above, conditions resulted in channeling many underprepared students into the traditional four-year college. As a result of this rapid influx, and the reluctance of traditional four-year institutions to accept underprepared students, community colleges sprang up during the late 1960s and early 1970s to meet this ever-increasing demand.

**Expansion of Remedial and Developmental Programs**

The review of literature indicated a number of explanations to explain the increase in remedial and developmental programs. Experts in the field of remedial and developmental studies could not state with assurance which social or educational condition was prime in leading to the decline in student abilities which led to large number of underprepared students entering postsecondary institutions. Efforts to trace the beginnings of remedial and developmental education are evidenced as far back as 1947 and major movements are excerpted from Levine's chronological history of undergraduate education:

**1947 - The President's Commission on Higher Education for Democracy**

\textsuperscript{55} Moore, 1.
President Truman's Commission on Higher Education ushered in the modern era of undergraduate curriculum. Among its recommendations of curricular improvement were proposals for the development and expansion of community colleges; the end of curricular, economic, religious, and racial barriers to higher education; mass access to college, the availability of a minimum of two years of college for all capable Americans and the mixing of general education with education for work.56

1958 National Defense Education Act

This act provided for undergraduate loans, graduate fellowships, and broad support for education in the sciences, mathematics and foreign languages.57

1963 Decline in National Achievement Scores

The College Board reported a national trend in the decline in College Board Scores which continued to decline during the decade of the 1960's and 1970s.58

1965 Upward Bound

Upward Bound, a program to prepare students with academic potential but lacking in motivation or academic skills for college was developed by the Carnegie Corporation and the Office of Economic

---

56 Levine, 608.
57 Levine, 511.
58 Levine, 511.
Opportunity.  

1965 The Higher Education Act of 1965

This act provided institutional aid to private and public colleges as well as individual students. Included were monies for research, libraries, recruitment of disadvantaged students, development of community colleges, and student aid programs for those with low income, guaranteed student loans, work-study programs and grants.  

1968 Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

This program, created by the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, included remedial instruction, counseling and support services for disadvantaged students.  

1970 City University of New York Admissions Policies

The City University of New York abandoned selective admissions in favor of open-door admissions. All high school graduates were guaranteed admission to some branch of the university no matter what their previous academic performance may have been.  

The rapid and traumatic experiences of the City University of New York were the most controversial and

59 Levine, 511.
60 Levine, 511.
61 Levine, 512.
62 Levine, 513.
heavily documented accounts of the impact of open-door admissions policies. Open-door admissions students traumatized both faculty members and students as faculty members found the massive numbers unmanageable. The initial year after implementation proved to be a dismal failure for both faculty and students. Follow-up studies of freshmen who entered during the first year revealed that there was no evidence that large-scale admissions of low-achieving students had produced any significant changes in retention or success rates that would not have been predicted from high school records.63

The incidents cited above, although not inclusive, were forerunners of the philosophy of equal educational opportunities as open-door admissions standards for students during the 1960s and 1970s continued. As a result, either directly or indirectly, access to higher education became more than just a dream for many Americans and students flocked to take advantage of these new opportunities.

Abraham, in his 1987 report on remedial and developmental programs in SREB states, offered these possible reasons:

1. One explanation frequently identified was the increase in the proportion of the population enrolled in

---

college. In 1970, 23 percent of the nation's 18 to 21 year old population was enrolled; by 1984, 36 percent, and in 1980, 46 percent of high school graduates attended college.

2. Another explanation often cited for the increase was the shift in admission standards. This shift resulted in restricted open admissions at four-year institutions while community colleges were adhering to 'open admissions' and less rigorous enforcement of admission standards.

3. Coinciding with these changes at the college level were changes at the secondary level. Standards for high school curricula were lowered and a decrease in achievement levels of high school graduates resulted in the late 1960s and 1970s with a steady decline in national ACT and SAT scores from 1971 to 1984.6

Other factors identified by Wirtz in a 1977 paper released by the College Entrance Examination Board included:

- a reduction in required high school courses, watered-down curricula, social promotion, grade inflation,
- increased absenteeism, less homework, fewer quality teachers, changing family structures, overuse of television watching, and declining student motivation.65

An explanation rendered by Cohen and Brawer is the notion that the idealist goal of mass schooling and


educational equality for all has been pursued more vigorously in the United States than in any other country. As outlined previously, federal and state governments made efforts at all levels of public education to accommodate an increasingly more diverse student body.\textsuperscript{66}

Colleges and universities contributed to the rapid increase in enrollment by aggressive recruitment campaigns during this period of time. Recruitment of high-risk students since 1971 continued to increase. Davis and others in a 1971 study, revealed that sixty-six percent of all the colleges studied were involved in some kind of recruitment.\textsuperscript{67} These massive recruitment initiatives resulted in more and more underprepared students enrolling in postsecondary institutions.

Cross, \textit{Accent on Learning}, found that sixty-four percent of the community colleges were recruiting nontraditional students in 1970, as compared to eighty-two percent in 1974.\textsuperscript{68} In 1977, Roueche and Snow pointed out that over eighty-nine percent of the community colleges were recruiting nontraditional students through local newspapers and that sixty percent of the senior colleges were

\textsuperscript{66} Cohen and Brawer, \textit{Collegiate Function}, 1-2.

\textsuperscript{67} Junius A. Davis et al., \textit{The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for "Disadvantaged" Students} (ERIC, ED 112 790, June 1975).

\textsuperscript{68} Cross, \textit{Accent on Learning}, 29.
recruiting through blanket mailouts to high school seniors.  

In a recent 1989 poll, conducted by University of California at Los Angeles Higher Education Research Center and the American Council on Education, revealed that the proportion of college freshmen who needed remedial work in mathematics had reached a record high. The survey, completed by 295,966 freshmen entering 587 two- and four-year colleges, found that "some 26.5 percent of freshmen polled in 1989 said they needed more work in the subject . . . far more than the 21.4 percent who said they needed such help in 1981."  

As the last legal religious, racial, financial, and sexist barriers to schooling were broken in the mid-1960s, community colleges sprang up across the nation and underwent tremendous growth. These colleges, aptly labeled "Democracy's College," found their classrooms filled with new faces foreign to the academic arena and provided access for people who might otherwise not attend. Cohen and Brawer summarized the growth and appeal of the community college: 

the diverse population was admitted, occupational programs were organized for students seeking job entry skills, courses were offered at the students'  

---

69 Roueche and Snow, 22.

convenience, day and night, on campus and off, past academic sins were forgiven, course registration was simplified and massive remedial programs were installed for students who could not read.71

Expansion of Programs in Tennessee

The development of community colleges in Tennessee occurred, as it did across the nation, due largely to elimination of major social, political, and legislative movements. Nicks, former chancellor of the State University and Community College System of Tennessee during the 1970s, authored The Tennessee Series. This series documented significant aspects of Tennessee's heritage and culture and chronicled the origins of community colleges in Tennessee. Nicks wrote, "In purpose and practice, Tennessee's community colleges have developed to fulfill the state's commitment to insuring student access to a comprehensive range of one-year and two-year quality post-secondary education programs and to lifelong learning.72 The historical review chronicled the founding and development of community colleges in Tennessee from the mid-1960s through the close of the 1970s. Nicks remarked that this "period of activities and impact will never again be experienced in Tennessee higher education,

71 Cohen and Brawer, Collegiate Function, 2.

nor will the colleges themselves ever repeat such adventures and growth in their institutional life cycles.\textsuperscript{73}

In September 1984, the Tennessee [State] Board of Regents reviewed the original July 1984 draft of the White Paper and moved toward solutions to the ever increasing number of underprepared students enrolling in postsecondary schools in Tennessee.\textsuperscript{74} Tennessee, as did a number of other states, undertook the serious search for a long-range solution. In seeking to define what that level of commitment should be and what role the Tennessee Board of Regents should play, three nationally known consultants in developmental education were engaged. These consultants were Dr. William Moore, Jr., Ohio State University, Dr. John E. Roueche, University of Texas at Austin, and Dr. Milton G. Spann, Jr., Appalachian State University.\textsuperscript{75} These three nationally-renowned experts provided vital assistance in the drafting of the White Paper in July 1984 which provided the rationale for the implementation of remedial and developmental programs in Tennessee in 1985.

According to the revised White Paper, The Better Schools Program, will neither reduce underpreparedness in the immediate future nor will it ever altogether eliminate it. In this regard, it should also be recognized that:

\textsuperscript{73} Nicks, xii.

\textsuperscript{74} State Board of Regents, White Paper, 1.

\textsuperscript{75} State Board of Regents, White Paper, 4.
1. underpreparedness does not equate with being incapable or ineducable;
2. the causes of underpreparedness are multiple and complex;
3. some underpreparedness results from changing social and economic conditions—factors over which schools and students have no control;
4. everyone has a right to a "second chance" and, indeed, it is cost-effective for the state to provide "second chances" for the educationally disadvantaged whatever the causes.⁷⁶

Tougher admission standards at Tennessee universities in 1989 translated to full classrooms at Tennessee's community colleges. Bach, Academic Vice Chancellor at Tennessee Board of Regents announced, "We had projected there would be some enrollment increases in community colleges with respect to the 1989 requirements . . . the increase has been significantly more than anybody could have projected."⁷⁷ Students who lacked required freshmen courses or were deficient in other areas were now taking these courses in community colleges. Eight of the state's

⁷⁶ State Board of Regents, White Paper, 2.
eleven community colleges reported increases over last year's (1988) enrollment figures.\textsuperscript{78}

Tennessee's Higher Education Commission Director, Arliss Roaden, revealed that records showed that one out of three freshmen enrolled in Tennessee colleges or universities was forced to catch up on high school math or English. Over 24,000 students are taking catch-up courses in state colleges or universities, 15,536 of them at two-year schools.\textsuperscript{79}

Roaden reiterated that if high school graduates couldn't keep up in college the options were limited to either tutoring them or flunking them out. Statistics from Board of Regents' universities indicated that thirty-one percent are unprepared, but forty-five percent of freshmen in community colleges needed help and that thirty-four percent of all incoming freshmen were required to take make-up work in math, English or both.\textsuperscript{80}

Roaden endorsed the effort to help unprepared students learn material needed to earn a college degree. Roaden disclosed, through a study completed in 1987 by the Tennessee Board of Regents, that the programs were working and found that students who completed makeup courses were


\textsuperscript{80} Rawlins, \textit{Sun}, sec. A: 1, col. 4.
more likely to stay in school another year than students who did not.81

In a January 1990 speech, Thomas Garland, then Chancellor of the Tennessee Board of Regents, discussed the challenges that lie ahead for the continuing, growing problem of providing remedial and developmental education for college freshmen. Garland stated that "60 percent of entering freshmen in the fall of 1989 needed remedial and developmental work; usually in mathematics or English--up from 50 percent who needed that help last year."82 Garland believed that the time and money devoted to these programs is productive and that students who go through these programs are performing "better than kids who just come in straight. . . . It is an extremely important program going on in Tennessee."83

The 1989 Fall term marks the beginning of the fifth year of the remedial and developmental program operation in Tennessee. The percentage of the 1989 fall students placed in at least one remedial or developmental course is greater than the percentage of Fall 1988 students placement numbers. This increase may be attributed to several factors:

81 Rawlins, Sun, sec. A: 1, col. 5.


1. Enrollments of students age twenty-one or older in R/D programs increased by 25.4 percent;
2. Institutions are complying closely with assessment guidelines for students twenty-one or older;
3. More accurate identification of students who can benefit from R/D programming;
4. Use of the SIS software program to identify students who need assessment.\textsuperscript{64}

In addition to addressing the problem of remedial and developmental education in Tennessee, the spotlight was focused clearly on then Governor (1981-1987) Lamar Alexander, appointed U. S. Secretary of Education in December 1990. Alexander was the originator of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 which looked to the future and to diminishing levels of underpreparedness by improving the quality of primary and secondary education. Alexander received national attention for his educational reforms in elementary and secondary education. A major shift of focus for now Governor, Ned McWherter, is to place priority on higher education reforms centering on the state's community colleges and regional institutions. Rather than pushing for improvements in the major research universities, McWherter has made a commitment to reform in

\textsuperscript{64} Thomas J. Garland, Memorandum to Members of the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs, 5 Dec. 1989, (Nashville: Tennessee [State] Board of Regents), 1.
higher education to further expand educational opportunities for all students.\textsuperscript{85}

\textbf{The Remedial Issue}

Should colleges and universities offer remedial and developmental instruction for students who are not ready to do "college-level" work? This issue continues to challenge educators and policymakers, who seek answers to the problem from a variety of solutions suggested by different historical, political, educational and philosophical perspectives. There is universal agreement on one issue. Today there are too many students who lack the skills and knowledge to adequately perform college-level work.

Reconciling the conflict between maintaining standards and allowing all students to enter programs remains a dilemma for higher education. Nevertheless, programs for the disadvantaged, nontraditional or high risk student have dramatically increased in both community colleges and senior colleges. As previously cited statistics indicate, there are now more colleges providing special programs than not. The overriding issue is whether community colleges can maintain their credibility as institutions of higher educational while they enrolling the increasingly less-prepared student.

In a February 1991 article in *Educational Leadership*, O’Neil addressed the issue of establishing national standards and the momentum behind the movement. Some prominent groups, National Assessment of Educational Progress, National Assessment Governing Board, and the National Governors' Association, view the establishment of national standards as beneficial, but others warn the move will cause more harm than good by threatening local and state controls. With colleges opening their doors and coffers to the marginally prepared student, Tomlinson, a senior research associate with the U. S. Department of Education stated that students "can do almost as little as they choose [in high school] without doing harm to their prospects."86

The idea of setting standards and making progress to higher education and top jobs dependent on test scores, which is common practice in other nations, runs counter to United States educational philosophies. Smith, education dean at Stanford University, remarked, "We pride ourselves, as a nation, on giving second, third, and fourth chances."87 Critics argue that the movement to set national standards, and exclude those who do not meet them, would eradicate over

---


87 O'Neil, 7-8.
fifty years of struggle to make education available to anyone who so desired.

A view often expressed in the literature from critics of the remedial movement is that the community college has diluted its potential by promising to be all things to all people. In 1973 Roueche and Kirk quoted critics as stating the functions of the community college are "so diverse, its pupils so scattered, and its efforts to be all things to all students that it escapes identification. . . . it has been looked down upon by holders of B.A. degrees as a refuge for the stupid . . . and . . . avoided as a place to teach by most serious scholars."88

In 1968, Jencks and Riesman, critics of the community college movement, labeled community colleges and the general education movement as "anti-university colleges" which displayed visible symptoms of dissidence from true academia.89 The movement was not viewed as helpful to the majority of high school students whose records were an all-too-accurate indication of academic incompetence or indifference, and for these students, the 'open door' usually became the 'revolving door'. The authors attributed part of the grown in popularity of the community college


89 Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City: Doubleday, 1968), 480.
movement to the fact that the movement attracted "flounderes" and the popular feeling that "everyone ought to have a chance to prove himself." Jencks and Riesman viewed this movement not as an alternative path for individuals, but "a safety value releasing pressures that might otherwise disrupt the dominant system. . . . and "allows the universities to go their own way without facing the full consequences of excluding the dull-witted or uninterested majority." 

Cohen and Brawer reviewed extensive studies conducted by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC). In a 1977 release, "Report of the ASCCC Conference on Academic Standards," ASCCC deplored pressures to lower standards, students entering college with inadequate basic skills, but with expectations of passing the courses, virtual elimination of D and F grades, and the cult of growth afflicting community colleges as evidenced by aggressive student recruitment. This influential body recommended that standards should be maintained through academic prerequisites for courses and proficiency testing before awarding academic degrees.

---

90 Jencks and Riesman, 490-91.
91 Jencks and Riesman, 492.
Devall referred to the expanding functions of the community college as the "bugaboo in American education." Devall viewed the community college movement as far from being a blessing, but distorting and diluting post-high school education in America. Devall argued that the institution failed to solve the problems for which it was intended and "community colleges were organizations of the past; and it is a false hope to expect them to fill the gaps in higher education in this country."  

In a rebuttal of Devall's views, Masiko argued that the community junior college had found a unique place in the total hierarchy of higher education and performed a much needed service for hundreds of thousands of men and women. Masiko refuted Devall's recommendations that businesses and military enterprises could do all that community colleges were doing and cheaper and better. Masiko contended that only through the failure of other institutions to do the job had the community-centered institution been organized to fill the void and that facts clearly demonstrated they were organizations of the future and not the past.

---


94 Devall, 169.

Jennings, a critic of Cohen and the theory that community colleges can meet the instructional needs of all people, argued that "not all students need to go the distance to the baccalaureate in one sixteen-year pull . . . no student who drops out along the way should have his academic credit card lifted." Jennings further characterized the community college:

Professor Cohen, like more other explorers or visitors to education's twilight zone, has a love-hate relationship with his subject. It is a democracy's college. It is an upgraded high school. It is a halfway house between the draft or marriage, and job or family. It is a second-chance emporium rigged in the consumer's favor. It is a decompression chamber guaranteeing safe passage from the depths of high schools to the upper reaches of college. It is the domain of change-agents who will restructure the whole of society. Or it is a glittering midway where the rubes are kept amused until its time to go home.

Jennings stressed that the task of educating everyone through compulsory education hadn't worked for the poor, the black, the Indian, or the Spanish-speaking families, nor was it working very well in secondary education. So, with


97 Jennings, 22.
"educationist's boosterism that is uniquely American . . . the junior college will do what the junior or senior high school did not do . . . the junior college will become a universal problem-solver for adolescent ills."\textsuperscript{98} Jennings reiterated that the only "viable mission for the community junior college is to match pretensions with performance and with a creative generosity that is not notably present in the groves of academe."\textsuperscript{99}

Kelley, Dean of Students at Kendall College in Illinois, openly expressed an opinion in the Chronicle of Higher Education that is shared by many in higher education. Higher education made a dreadful mistake in thinking that the institution has the capacity to be all things to all people. Kelly reiterated that in a pluralistic nation, a broad umbrella was necessary, but is against squandering skills, resources, and energies into students who have no use for the knowledge. Kelly stated that students with low entrance scores should be denied admission and whose need for remediation is so severe that the hope of succeeding in college is nil. Kelly declared that "experience not only indicates an overwhelming likelihood that they will not succeed academically; it also shows that they are the students who take the greatest amount of the instructors' \footnote{Jennings, 19} \footnote{Jennings, 24.}
time... time could be far more profitably devoted to students who do have a chance of succeeding."\(^{100}\)

In a review of Moore's *Against the Odds*, which advocated that open-door admissions policies could work in community colleges, Banks urged taxpayers to read the book to develop an understanding of the "sorry state of affairs at community colleges."\(^{101}\) Banks feared that the public might be "hoodwinked" into supporting educational steps backward. Banks contended that once the public became aware that the problem was the students rather than the schools, steps would be taken for the students to adjust to the schools rather than vice versa. Banks hoped that this awareness would demand changes in the educational establishment that reflected twentieth-century America.\(^{102}\)

In a nationwide survey conducted in 1989 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, more than two-thirds, or sixty-eight percent of 5,000 faculty members surveyed, stated "their institutions spend too much time and money teaching students what they should have

---


\(^{101}\) William M. Banks, review of *Against the Odds*, by William Moore Jr., *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 49, no. 6 (Feb. 1971), 503.

\(^{102}\) Banks, 503.
learned in high school." Other findings from this report revealed that three-fourths of those surveyed felt that the undergraduates in their courses were seriously underprepared in basic skills, and sixty-seven percent felt there has been a widespread lowering of standards in American higher education.

This survey, the fourth in a series undertaken by Carnegie, and the first since the 1984 education-reform movement, disclosed that faculty members were as dissatisfied today (1989) as they were in 1984 regarding the issue of whether colleges spend too much time teaching students what they should have already learned.\(^1\)

In a 1987 article, Cohen summarized six of the objections most often heard:

1. The community college is the wrong place to do developmental education;
2. Developmental education costs too much;
3. Developmental education should be the responsibility of a separate instructional division, not the responsibility of instructors in the collegiate curricula;
4. There is insufficient articulation with secondary

\(^1\) Mark Walsh, "In Poll, College Faculty Say Students are Underprepared in the Basic Skills," *Education Week*, 8 Nov. 1989: 5, col. 1.

\(^2\) Walsh, *Education Week*, col. 2.
schools;
5. Faculty members do not know how to teach literacy;
6. Placement and diagnostic tests are not valid.\textsuperscript{105}

Other controversial issues surrounding remedial and developmental studies focus on the problem of funding and granting of credit for these courses. Many states fund remedial classes at a lower level than the academic credit classes, because remedial studies are presumed to cost less. The issue of granting credit for remedial studies is tied to the question of mandatory competency examinations at entry. Cohen and Brawer foresaw a trend in the direction of such testing and of requiring students to complete all remedial work before enrolling in classes of their choice. This decision would be meet with various political forces arguing vigorously against this type of student segregation.\textsuperscript{106}

Another obstacle that compounds this dilemma is the notion of "college-level" work. In public two-year and four-year institutions in the SREB region, the criterion depended on the test selected. Entry-level placement was based on scores that varied from as low as one percentile to as high as the ninety-four percentile. The implications


\textsuperscript{106} Cohen and Brawer, \textit{Collegiate Function}, 22.
were obvious—it is difficult to discuss such issues as standards, quality, or improving undergraduate education when the notion of "college-level work" varies so widely.  

Staunch advocates, such as Cross, Roueche, Cohen, and Moore clearly recognize the need for remedial and developmental programs in higher education. These proponents view developmental education as the logical outgrowth of the focus on access that characterized the growth of American higher education. Cross argued that substantial changes in school forms were needed so that anyone may learn anything at any time. Students should be viewed as humanistic knowledge seekers rather than lethargic illiterates. Proponents believe that colleges should be open to anyone seeking knowledge and that the institution should be a resource tool used for an indefinite variety of purposes.

A 1987 article by Roueche, Baker, and Roueche addressed the issue of the "open door" or "revolving door" dilemma. These proponents of open door policies cited evidence that community colleges can keep their doors wide open without compromising academic standards by adopting and implementing


108 K. Patricia Cross in Cohen and Brawer, American Community College, 239.
policies and standards that require college students to "demonstrate college-level competencies before being admitted to college-level programs."\(^{109}\)

A concept paper presented to the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in April 1987 outlined the challenges faced by educators and students in developmental education. Among recommendations to insure student success were a comprehensive, ongoing program of assessment, support programs, and intentional efforts to increase the effectiveness of developmental education. An open-door community college is not fulfilling its stated mission if void of these services and is making a mockery of the open-door concept.\(^{110}\)

Research articles in the last few years continued to stress the importance of proper assessment and placement to insure student success and to halt the "revolving door" phenomenon. Many students see community colleges as their last chance for opportunity, and in spite of the recent national and state focuses on educational reform, the reforms are too late for "people in the pipeline" and

---


developmental education will still be needed for traditional and nontraditional students well into the future.

**Significant Studies**

Two early significant studies of remedial and developmental programs were conducted by Roueche and Moore. Roueche in 1968 conducted the first national study of remedial reeducation in American community colleges and documented the results in *Salvage, Redirection or Custody?* The study disclosed the failure of programs to be of any real assistance, and evidence indicated that most remedial programs developed during the 1960s consisted mainly of watered-down versions of regular college-level courses. The programs were poorly planned and even more poorly implemented.\(^\text{111}\)

Moore, *Against the Odds*, 1970, confirmed the findings of Roueche and revealed the unwillingness of community colleges to provide effective programs for the high-risk student. Evidence was strong from these early writings and studies that the programs had done little to eradicate the problems of nontraditional students.\(^\text{112}\)

In 1972, Roueche and Kirk conducted a study that examined developmental studies programs at five selected community colleges from a list of more than forty colleges nominated for their innovative approaches to the problem of

\(^{111}\) Roueche, *Salvage, Redirection or Custody?* 11.

\(^{112}\) Moore, ix.
remediation. Data were collected by written materials, such as, college catalogs, student, faculty and policy handbooks, program evaluations, course descriptions, and interviews of program directors, counselors, and faculty members.\footnote{113} Conclusions drawn from the study were that community colleges could design and implement successful programs for nontraditional students, and that other programs are enhanced and enriched as a result of successful remedial efforts.\footnote{114}

Snow and Roueche in 1977 reported the findings of a comprehensive national study of collegiate remedial offerings from 300 two- and four-year (150 public two- and 150 public four-year colleges) that were selected for participation in the study.\footnote{115} The purpose of the study was to identify characteristics of highly successful programs. The authors concluded that several important elements were instrumental in successful programs, and that programs were making positive impacts on heretofore unsuccessful students. The first conclusion was that the teacher was the key, secondly, supportive services


\footnote{114}{Roueche and Kirk, 81-82.}

\footnote{115}{Roueche and Snow, 131.}
were vital for success, and thirdly, proper organizational support was essential for effective programs. Roueche and Snow acknowledged that students could learn and succeed if those responsible for their education wanted them to, but redemption, in the final analysis depended upon faculty and staff commitment to student success.\footnote{Roueche and Snow, 114-30.}

In the 1980s, two national studies documented similar results. The Instructional Resource Center at City University of New York found that about thirty percent of first-time college students were "academically deficient" and required additional academic support. The National Center for Education Statistics found that about one of every five college freshmen took at least one remedial course.\footnote{Abraham, "College-level study," \textit{Issues in Higher Education}, 1.}

In a 1986 study conducted by the Southern Regional Education Board, data were supplied by 404 two-year and four-year public institutions of higher education in its fifteen-member states. SREB found that in almost thirty percent of the institutions, at least half of the first-time freshmen were in need of remedial instruction. The SREB study clearly indicated the number of entering college students who are not prepared for college-level study far
exceeds any reasonable estimate of those students who may be "falling through the cracks of secondary education."\footnote{118}

An ad hoc Committee on Assessment and Evaluation was assembled in 1988 to assess the effectiveness of Tennessee's Academic Assessment, Placement and Remediation Program implemented by the Tennessee [State] Board of Regents in 1985. The committee's goals were to determine what degree, if any, the program had been effective. Data, which is systemically supplied to Tennessee Board of Regents staff, were limited to only three quarters or two semesters (Fall 1986 to Spring 1987). Formative conclusions from the study revealed that the effect, thus far, had been positive. The committee emphasized that conclusions on long-term effectiveness would have to wait the compilation of equally long-term data.\footnote{119}

A study which received public attention in Tennessee was undertaken by Riggs, Davis, and Wilson of Memphis State University. This study focused on placement, retention and academic progress of minority students in Tennessee's ten [at that time] public community colleges. Enrollment records of 5,139 first-time freshmen enrolled in 1986 in were examined and students tracked through three successive

\footnote{118 Abraham A. Ansley, Jr., "Remedial Education in College: How Widespread is it?" Issues in Higher Education, no. 24 (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1988), 1.}

\footnote{119 Tennessee [State] Board of Regents, Ad hoc Committee on Assessment, 7-8.}
academic quarters.\textsuperscript{120} Of the 5,139 first time freshmen, only 56 black students were enrolled in college level courses, and of these, only 26 remained enrolled in Regents' institutions after three quarters. This study challenged public officials to reassess mandatory labeling and placement for marginal students which may be falling well short of the primary goal of helping students, especially blacks, stay in school and to help the most poorly prepared compete at the college level.\textsuperscript{121}

\textbf{Profile of the Remedial Student}

The increased expansion of higher educational opportunities has created a population explosion of non-traditional students in community colleges. These students not only lack basic skills, but also doubt their ability to survive, let alone succeed, in college. The literature review confirmed that diversity is a term used frequently in describing kinds of students not from mainstream America. Terminology for these students included ethnic minority students, immigrant students, older students, white-working class students, new students, nontraditional students, underprepared students, basic skills students, remedial students, high-risk students, developmental students,


\textsuperscript{121} Riggs, et al., 7, 10.
disadvantaged students, marginal, low-achieving, first generation and even problem students.

Moore, who coined the term 'high-risk' in 1970 in *Against the Odds*, wrote poignantly of underprepared students and the inadequate education they were receiving.

No other student is subjected to deliberate professional neglect that is shown the remedial student. . . . No books are written about him and virtually no research. . . . This student is an afterthought. . . . One of the academic squatters. . . . treated as a villain rather than the victim. . . . attitude of majority of his instructors is that he cannot learn. . . . he knows he is not wanted. . . . hundreds of his questions go unasked. Thousands go unanswered. . . . Poor teaching for him is legitimate.122

Moore wrote that the odds were stacked against the high risk student and further characterized the student as no stranger to failure. Moore defined high risk, educationally disadvantaged, academically unsuccessful, and the like as "students whose erratic high school records, economic plight, unimpressive standardized test scores, and race/cultural/class distinctions succeed in placing them at

---

122 Moore, 1-2.
a disadvantage in contention with the vast majority of students.  

Mink, president of Organization and Human Resource Development Associates of Austin, Texas, and an early developer of individualized learning strategies, defined high risk students as "students who enter a college program with an array of deficiencies developed through years of failure or partial failure and who don't try because they don't believe they can."  

Roueche and Roueche defined 'new students' as appearing from all levels of socio-economic backgrounds and with varying levels of abilities. Students demonstrated the obvious deficiencies in reading, writing, and arithmetic, but a new "failure identity" characteristic was present. Students had experienced little success in school previously and demonstrated little expectation of success for the future.  

In Cross's 1971 book, Beyond the Open Door, students whose scores on traditional academic tests were below average or in the lowest one-third were defined as "new

---

123 Moore, 5-6.


Cross defined low academic ability as the distinguishing characteristic of "new students" and outlined other characteristics that fit these students:

1. Young people who had not considered college before the decade of the 1970s are now entering college;
2. Most are Caucasians whose fathers work at blue-collar jobs;
3. A substantial number are members of minority ethnic groups;
4. Most of the parents have never attended college, and view education as the way to a better job and a better life than that of their parents;
5. The expectation of college is new to the family;
6. Traditional college students have mostly made A's and B's in high school, "new students" have mostly made C's;
7. Traditional students are attracted to four-year universities and colleges; "new students" plan to enter public community colleges or vocational schools;
8. "New students" are swept into college by the rising educational aspirations of the citizenry;
9. New students rate themselves "below average" on

126 K. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971), 12.
almost any characteristic related to school work;

10. Twice as likely as top-third students to say they feel tense, nervous or shy in class.\textsuperscript{127}

In a 1983 article, Cross used the term 'basic skills' to suggest that these students are severely limited in life choices because they lack the basic skills essential for lifelong learning. In an earlier era, they might not have graduated from high school and almost certainly would not have gone on to college.\textsuperscript{128} Basic skills students have not been especially happy or successful in school, and often have been identified as early as the fourth or fifth grade, and this gap continued to widen as these students progressed through the upper grades.\textsuperscript{129}

Willett, President of Muskingum Area Technical College of Zanesville, Ohio, defined a first generation student as "one whose parents have not achieved a college degree."\textsuperscript{130} In a study conducted by Willett in 1989, drawing from a sample of four mid-western two-year colleges, the findings revealed "the typical two-year college student is from a first-generation family . . . eighty percent of these two-

\textsuperscript{127} Cross, Beyond the Open Door, 14-15.


\textsuperscript{129} Cross, Beyond the Open Door, 31.

\textsuperscript{130} Lynn H. Willett, "Are Two-Year College Students First-Generation Students?" Community College Review 17, no. 2 (Fall 1989): 48.
year college students attending college came from parental backgrounds where college degrees had not been achieved.\textsuperscript{131}

Rose, of the University of California at Los Angeles, and author of the 1989 book, \textit{Lives on the Boundary: The Struggles and Achievements of America's Underprepared}, believes that non-traditional students have many benefits to offer institutions and "there is ample evidence that well-designed instruction can help non-traditional students excel."\textsuperscript{132} Rose stated that research universities have a longstanding bias against certain kinds of applied work and when that work involves introductory or remedial work, the bias was even stronger. The author felt that this attitude was unfortunate, because over the past ten years, working with underprepared college students has "contributed in important ways to scholars' thinking about topics including the socio-cultural foundations of literacy, the characteristics of 'higher-order' literacy and in the interaction of writing and reading."\textsuperscript{133} Rose has experienced that non-traditional students provide fresh, often illuminating

\textsuperscript{131} Willett, 51.


\textsuperscript{133} Rose, \textit{Chronicle}, sec. 2: B2, col. 3.
perspectives on academic material and that "diversity can and should serve everyone's best interests."\textsuperscript{134}

Maxwell defined underprepared students as "those whose skills, knowledge, and academic ability are significantly below those of the 'typical' student."\textsuperscript{135} Underpreparedness was relative to individual institutional entrance requirements. Maxwell defined underprepared and underachieving to encompass "students who are labeled 'misprepared,' meaning that although they earned high grades in high school, either they did not take college preparatory courses . . . or their courses were academically weak."\textsuperscript{136}

The problem of underprepared students affects almost every institution of higher education and is often viewed as a national crisis. Newspapers, journals, and television report on the crisis in the three R's, the illiteracy of today's high school seniors, and the problems of providing the necessary tax base for remedial instruction to so many. In spite of all efforts of recent educational reforms, underprepared students of today share many of the same characteristics and pose the same problems for higher education as underprepared students from a decade past.


\textsuperscript{135} Maxwell, 2-3.

\textsuperscript{136} Maxwell, 3.
Attitudes of Instructors
and Student Ratings

The literature dealing with student ratings of college instruction and relationships among relevant variables is voluminous. One of the most critical questions raised is the validity of such measures and if similarity or dissimilarity in attitudes or personalities influence the ratings. Studies, which are occurring more often in the literature, reflect the validity of the ratings and more clearly define that relationships among variables do exist.

Critics oppose use of student ratings because of biasing factors inherent in the ratings, and argue that ratings relate more to the characteristics of the rater than the instructor. Goldman was highly critical of student evaluations of faculty and felt the evaluations should be eliminated entirely. Goldman stated that student evaluations are contingent upon and influenced by such variables as students' interests and needs, good grades, teaching style of the instructor, level of course, and whether the course was required or taken as an elective.\footnote{137 Louis Goldham, "Student Evaluations of Their Professors Rarely Provide a Fair Measure of Teaching Ability," opinion, Chronicle of Higher Education, 8 Aug. 1990, sec. 2: B2, cols. 1-4.}

Goldman believed that "student evaluations tell us much more about the students than about the instructors or courses they are evaluating."\footnote{138 Goldman, Chronicle, 8 Aug. 1990, sec. 2: B2, col. 2.}
The usefulness of student evaluations was clearly iterated by criticisms of Goldman's approach. Roustom, Academic Relations of the Canadian Embassy in Washington, stated "evaluations can be useful to students in that they can reflect certain problems students have encountered with a particular professor . . . whether the approach of one professor . . . is more or less suitable to him or her compared with the approach of another professor." 139

According to a statement by Erdle, Murray, and Rushton, "student ratings are currently the most widely used measure of teaching effectiveness in North American Colleges and universities." 140 These authors stated that a reasonably consistent pattern of personality characteristics associated with student ratings of college teaching has emerged from research. Erdle, Murray, and Rushton confirmed, "The highly rated teacher is perceived by faculty peers and by students as showing leadership, objectivity, and high intellect on the one hand and supportiveness, extraversion, and emotional stability on the other." 141 Student ratings of teacher personality have been shown to relate to student evaluations


141 Erdle, Murray, and Rushton, 394-95.
of teaching, with the "effective teacher perceived as showing ascendancy, responsibility, emotional stability, sociability, original thinking, personal relations, and vigor."142

In a five-year study conducted by Erdle, Murray, and Rushton, results revealed that approximately fifty percent of the relations between personality and teaching effectiveness was mediated by classroom behavior. The highly rated teacher was found to exhibit two types of personality traits: achievement orientation (dominance, intelligence, and leadership) and interpersonal orientation (supportiveness, nonauthoritarianism, nondefensiveness). This study suggested that instructor personality is reflected in specific classroom teaching behaviors, which in turn are validly rated by students.143

As a result of a meta-analysis study conducted by Cohen in 1981 to synthesize research on the relationship between student ratings of instruction and student achievement, additional findings disclosed that provided strong support for the validity of student ratings as measures of teaching effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is generally thought to reflect student achievement and can be further

142 Frank Costin and Joseph E. Grush, "Personality Correlates of Teacher-Student Behavior in the College Classroom," Journal of Educational Psychology 65 (1973) in Erdle, Murray, and Rushton, 394.

143 Erdle et al., 404, 406.
operationalized as the amount students learn. Cohen stated that if student ratings are to have utility in evaluating effectiveness, a moderately strong relationship would need to be shown to this index. Based on the findings of the meta-analysis, student ratings are a valid index and students do a good job distinguishing among teachers on the basis of how much they have learned.

In a study conducted by Abrami and Mizener, the relationship between attitude similarity and teacher evaluation was explored. The results revealed that students do not appear to let their own attitudes or the attitude similarity with their teachers substantially affect their evaluations of those teachers. Students do discriminate among teachers in terms of perceived teacher attitudes, particularly so for attitudes relevant to the context of instruction.

Good and Good, Middle Tennessee State University, undertook a study in 1974 in which it was hypothesized that a hypothetical job supervisor who is attitudinally similar to oneself will be evaluated more positively than an

---
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attitudinally dissimilar. It was further hypothesized that attraction to a supervisor (instructor) can be positively influenced by attitude similarity. The results of the study suggested that attitude similarity can influence evaluative responses toward a stranger even when that stranger is identified as being purely hypothetical or imaginary.¹⁴⁷

Levenson and LeUnes, Texas A & M University, replicated the study conducted by Good and Good using a real-life teaching situation. These authors concluded that while it appeared that students' personal feelings toward an instructor are influenced by similarity or dissimilarity of attitudes, this variable did not interfere with judgments of teaching ability.¹⁴⁸

In a similar study conducted at Middle Tennessee State University in the Summer and Fall of 1985, sixty-six college students were given a Likert type rating scale to rate their own behaviors in an instructional setting and to evaluate faculty performance. Findings from the study disclosed that students' evaluations of faculty performances are highly related to students' liking of the instructor as a person, liking of the instructor as a teacher, and their interests


in the course (or the subject matter) at the time of the evaluation.\footnote{Thomas Li-Ping Tang and Theresa Li-Na Tang, "A Correlation Study of Students' Evaluations of Faculty Performance and Their Self-Ratings in an Instructional Setting," \textit{College Student Journal} 21, no. 1 (Spring 1987): 91-92.}

Hofman and Kremer confirmed research findings that "course ratings were a function of both students' own attitudes and even more, of interactions between students' and instructors' attitudes. . . . attitudes are to be added to the list of personal variables in explaining evaluative variance."\footnote{John E. Hofman and Liya Kremer, "Attitudes Toward Higher Education and Course Evaluation," \textit{Journal of Educational Psychology} 72, no. 5 (1980): 616.} The attribution to instructors of attitude items preferred by students was associated with positive course evaluations. Regressive analysis showed that attitudes accounted for close to fifty percent of evaluative variance.\footnote{Hofman and Kremer, 610.}

Grush, Clore, and Costin reported findings that students are attracted to instructors who possess more of certain traits and values than the students posses because of the belief that learning is facilitated by instructors who know more or have more desireable traits than students. These authors stated that it is not the similarity of students and teachers that is reinforcing but certain complementary instructor characters that are reinforcing.
Variance, rather than being a function of assumed similarity, may be explained by student perceptions of instructor attitudes.\textsuperscript{152}

Nancy G. Spann, Director, Learning Assistance Program, Appalachian State University conducted an interview with Vincent Tinto, Professor of Sociology and Education at Syracuse. Tinto, a prominent author on retention of postsecondary students, surmised that the more students made contact with faculty, especially outside the classroom, and the more educationally satisfying those contacts were, the more likely at-risk students would remain in college. Tinto maintains that "faculty contact is, therefore, the fabric of the college community and is an independent predicator or force in learning."\textsuperscript{153}

Tinto theorized that developmental education programs are at the very core of successful institutional efforts to educate and retain students, and these programs are central to the missions of community colleges in helping students to grown and learn. Student contact and full integration into the mainstream are part of the


responsibilities of faculty members who must become more proactive in reaching out to students.\textsuperscript{154}

Research into what contributes to or predicts faculty job satisfaction at the community college level is important. The center of teaching and learning of any community college is the faculty and the job of the faculty member is clearly that of a teacher. Few, if any, community colleges require research or publication. In a study conducted by the Opinion Research Corporation using data obtained from a 1984 survey done by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, revealed variables which best explained job satisfaction at the community college level. A total of 703 full-time two-year college faculty members from thirty-five institutions were sampled in the survey. Respondents completed a questionnaire regarding their backgrounds, interests, professional activities, perceptions of students, and the institution. The findings of the study indicated that community college faculty, are, on the average, satisfied with their jobs.\textsuperscript{155}

The most significant variable of this study, the perceptions of and relationships with students, indicated that faculty were more satisfied if students were well-prepared, appreciative, interested and having good prospects

\textsuperscript{154} Spann, 22.

\textsuperscript{155} Ellen Milosheff, "Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction at the Community College," \textit{Community College Review} 18, no. 1 (Summer 1990): 12.
for the future. Milosheff stated in a previous study conducted by M. D. Hill in 1983 that the "level of education was found to be significant when predicting career satisfaction of community college faculty. As the degree level of the faculty member increased, so, too, did the level of job satisfaction."\textsuperscript{156}

Roueche and Snow in their 1977 national studied further emphasized the importance of instructor relationships with students and successful programs. Successful developmental education programs "build on content that students see as useful and interesting, employ instructional techniques that truly accommodate individual student differences and take place in learning environments where teachers are endeavoring to help students grow and develop as worthwhile human beings."\textsuperscript{157} Other findings revealed:

1. The same amount of effort was devoted to improving students' self-concepts as was made in improving reading and writing skills;

2. English, reading and math courses were taught so as to reinforce the students' verbal and quantitative abilities in other courses;

3. Teachers believed that students had talents and could learn with proper instruction;

\textsuperscript{156} Milosheff, 13.

4. Teachers were open to their own growth and development and looked for better ways to assist students.\textsuperscript{158}

As the number of students needing remediation has continued to grow during the decade of the eighties, instructors need to focus on individual growth and improvement of teaching strategies to enhance job satisfaction. Milosheff reiterated that faculty members "need to look beyond the remedial aspect and recognize them as contributing members in other aspects."\textsuperscript{159} The researcher firmly believed that poor academic quality is something than can be remediated. Faculty members should see remediation of students as a means of opening the doors for potential, productive members of society who are well worth the time, effort, and expense.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{158} John E. Roueche, "Increasing Basic Skills," 94.
\textsuperscript{159} Milosheff, 21.
\textsuperscript{160} Milosheff, 21.
CHAPTER 3
Methods and Procedures

This chapter contains the research design, instrumentation development, description of the pilot study, refinement of instruments, population parameters and sample selections. Reliability and validity assessments for the instruments and data analysis procedures are contained in this chapter.

The techniques of descriptive research were used in gathering data for the correlational study. Relationship or correlational studies examine the association between measures of different variables at approximately the same time. The process involves collecting data to determine the existence of a relationship between two or more variables and to estimate the relationship's magnitude. Long, Convey and Chwalek stated that "in addition to investigating relationships between variables of interest, these studies often try to obtain a better understanding of factors that make up a complex construct such as intelligence, self-concept, or school ability."\(^{161}\)

No effort was undertaken to manipulate the variables or influence the findings through intervention. Directors

and instructors completed a survey instrument that measured various components of accommodation—philosophy (relating to institutional accommodation), instruction—(relating to classroom accommodation) and personal accommodation—(relating to specific programs and procedures at their own institutions). Students completed an instrument that rated developmental instructors and courses.

Instrumentation Review and Development

A number of instruments currently in print were examined in efforts to select the most appropriate instruments for the purposes of this study. Instruments detailed below, although not inclusive, represented many that were examined.

Pace developed the College and University Environment Scale in 1962; however, this scale was restricted to a four-year college setting. The American College Testing Service developed a related Student Reaction to College instrument for use at the community college level. The instrument assesses the effectiveness of planning and decision making in terms of the institutions's contribution to these goals of enhancing the environment for student development.

---

162 Roueche and Roueche, Developmental Education: A Primer, 73.

Western Psychological Services publish an instrument that focuses on identifying potential college dropouts by assessing overall adjustment to college and well as adjustment in the areas of academic, social personal-emotional adjustment and attachment to the institution. This test is used routinely for freshman screening in detecting problems early in a student's college career.\textsuperscript{164}

An "Evaluative Design for Developmental Education" instrument was developed by Roueche and Roueche in 1977. The instrument focused on self-assessment of efforts by comparing the present state of an institution's programs against the ideal, and to identify the shapes and forms by which successful learning climates were characterized.\textsuperscript{165}

The importance of an appropriate evaluative instrument was reiterated by Roueche who stated, "Current research indicates that if a student is allowed to assess the college environment, he will provide valuable information useful in reducing the undesirable and increasing the desirable aspect of that environment."\textsuperscript{166}

None of the instruments examined met the specific needs of assessing the attitudes of directors and instructors and

\textsuperscript{164} Robert W. Baker and Bohdan Siryk, \textit{Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACO} \textit{(Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1989.}

\textsuperscript{165} Roueche and Roueche, \textit{Developmental Education: A Primer}, 75-89.

\textsuperscript{166} Roueche and Roueche, \textit{Developmental Education: A Primer}, 73.
their relationship to student ratings. As a result of no test currently in print to measure the attitudes of both instructors and students, two questionnaires were developed. One to assess the attitudes of directors and instructors and one for student ratings of instructors and courses.

Criteria for Pilot Instrument Development

The following section describes initial development of the pilot instruments. Included are criteria for conducting the pilot study and the administration of the pilot instruments.

Several criteria were established to guide the construction of the items and administration of the pilot instruments:

1. Theoretical formulations from the literature on evaluations of college students toward teacher performance and teacher self-evaluation instruments were examined.

2. Efforts were made to construct as homogeneous a test as possible based on propositions regarding the nature of student evaluations of instructors and courses.

3. A sufficient number of items were written initially to provide for elimination of unsatisfactory items through item analysis procedures based on frequency distributions and reliability coefficients.

4. An attempt was made to structure items describing specific attitudes and behaviors rather than general attributes in order to reduce bias resulting from ambiguous,
confusing, or meaningless items.

5. Items for student completion were written in clear, simple language and were capable of being understood by freshmen and sophomore remedial and developmental students.

6. The student instrument was structured for either group or individual administration.

7. Responses were arranged for both instruments on a five-point Likert-type scale that provided for optimum reliability without creating a cumbersome number of response options. This format was designed to facilitate scoring and render more dependability.

8. Different subjects were used in the pilot study from those used in the actual study.

9. Instruments were administered under conditions that closely resembled those under which the actual study took pace.

Pilot Instrument for Directors and Instructors

A forty-six item pilot questionnaire was developed for measuring the attitudes of directors and instructors (Appendix E). The pilot instrument contained six demographic items and forty items measuring attitudes. Responses were scored on Scantron Answer Form No. 3200 (Appendix F) using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from Agree Strongly (A) to Disagree Strongly (D), and No Opinion (E).
Pilot Instrument for Students

A forty-item student pilot questionnaire was developed for student ratings of instructors and courses (Appendix G). Students responded to five demographic items and thirty-five items for evaluation of instructor and course using a five-point Likert-type scale.

Rationale for Selection of Tri-Cities State Technical Institute

Tri-Cities State Technical Institute (now Northeast State Technical Community College, effective July 1, 1990) was not included in the actual study as the research project
was limited to community colleges and excluded the three technical institutes in Tennessee. Tri-Cities State Technical Institute participated in the pilot project, but was excluded from the actual study which was limited to Tennessee's community colleges. Tri-Cities was not converted to a community college until July 1, 1990.

Faculty and students at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute were selected for the pilot study. The program for remedial and developmental students at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute represents and more closely parallels the programs offered at community colleges as compared to programs at four-year universities. Since the actual study was limited to community colleges, further legitimacy was provided by restricting the pilot study to Tri-Cities State Technical Institute.

**Pilot Project for Directors and Instructors**

The purposes for administering the pilot study were as follows:

1. To ascertain that the wording of the items was clear and understandable,

2. To evaluate the overall format for ease of use, readability and clarity,

3. To approximate the amount of time required to complete the instrument,

4. To obtain an index of the extent to which the pilot instrument was internally consistent or reliable,
5. To validate the instrument, and
6. To eliminate unsatisfactory items prior to undertaking the actual study.

Appropriate administrative personnel at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute were contacted and permission was received the conduct the pilot study (Appendix H). Tri-Cities State Technical Institute has one full-time director and at least one full-time instructor in the six areas of remedial and developmental studies. Selection of classes that represented the six major areas was completed with the assistance of the guidance counselor in remedial and developmental studies and this researcher following established criteria. Selections portrayed the six major areas of remedial and developmental studies—remedial mathematics, developmental mathematics, remedial English (writing), developmental English (writing), remedial reading, and developmental reading.

Administration of Pilot Instruments to Director and Instructors

The full-time director and eight instructors in the Remedial and Developmental Department at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute, Blountville, Tennessee, completed the instrument for the pilot study during April 1990. After selection of classes and coordinating a time schedule to physically be present during the classes selected, this
researcher met the instructors at the beginning of the class period selected.

The instructors were aware of the project and permission had previously been granted through the director to participate in the project. This researcher read the instructions aloud, distributed forms and pencils, and gathered the materials when the students and the instructor completed the instruments. Responses were marked on Scantron Form No. 3200 that corresponded with the survey form. The instructors completed the questions for assessment of the instruments (Appendix I). Students completed the "Student Evaluation of Remedial and Developmental Instructor or Course" simultaneously with the instructor. This researcher was present throughout the administration of the instruments to monitor the time and answer questions that arose. Time frames ranged from twelve to twenty minutes for the instructors.

Pilot Project for Remedial and Developmental Students

The purposes for administering a pilot instrument were as follows:

1. Identify additional improvements needed in the format and directions for completion of the instrument,

2. Determine the internal consistency or reliability of the instrument with a sample representative of the total population,

3. Establish validation of the instrument,
4. Develop time framework for administering the instruments, and

5. Revise or delete items according to the results of SPSS/PC+ statistical procedures for reliability.

The instrument was administered to 106 students at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute in April 1990. Students were surveyed from the following classes: (a) one class of remedial math, (b) one class of developmental math, (c) one class of remedial English (writing), (d) one class of developmental English (writing), (e) one class of remedial reading, and (f) one class of developmental reading.

Administration of Pilot Instrument to Students

This researcher was present and administered the pilot study instruments to the instructors and the students. A form was developed (Appendix I) for student assessment of the instrument and feedback on improvement of the form. Students responded to a forty-item instrument, "Student Evaluation of Remedial and Developmental Instructor or Course," according to a five-point Likert-type scale. Students were provided with No. 2 pencils and directions were given orally. Responses were recorded on Scantron Answer Form 3200 that corresponded to the instrument scale. Students were timed with time frames ranging from twelve to fifteen minutes.
Validity of Pilot Instruments

Shaw and Wright stated that "effective measurement of attitudes demands that the scales be valid, but this is one of the most difficult characteristics to establish and probably represents the greatest deficiency of the scales."\(^{167}\) Most authors in the volume of works by Shaw and Wright use content validity in the construction of the scales. "All scales . . . may be said to have some degree of content validity, in the sense that the items are drawn from the attitude content domain."\(^{168}\)

Best defined content validity as "the degree to which the test actually measures, or is specifically related to, the traits for which it was designed."\(^{169}\) This type of validation is often determined by careful examination of objectives, item analysis, and the judgments of subject matter specialists.

Validation processes for this study consisted of the following procedures:

1. The pilot instruments were administered to the director, eight instructors, and 106 students at Tri-Cities State Technical Institute in April 1990.

2. A form was developed and attached to the pilot

\(^{167}\) Shaw and Wright, *Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes*, 562.

\(^{168}\) Shaw and Wright, *Scales*, 562.

instruments for use by the directors, instructors, and students in assessing the pilot instruments.

3. Following the administration of the pilot study, conferences were held with individual instructors for suggestions and recommendations on administering and improving the instrument.

4. Comments were compiled from the assessment sheets attached to the pilot instruments. These comments and suggestions were carefully analyzed. Changes were made in format and word structure of individual items to eliminate confusing, ambiguous statements.

5. A frequency chart procedure was conducted by using SPSS/PC+ to determine frequencies of responses. Items that contained little or no variance were examined for possible elimination since the responses were apparently too obvious or contained no variance.

6. Item analysis was extracted from the reliability procedures conducted with SPSS/PC+. Items that displayed little or negative correlations with other items on the test were examined for possible elimination.

7. The director and instructor instrument was refined from a forty-six item questionnaire to a thirty-eight item instrument. For the pilot study, directors and instructors responded to six items of classification and forty-items for measurement of attitudes.

8. The final number of items for the actual study
instrument for directors and instructors contained nine items of demographics. Data collected for demographic information included sex of respondent, age range, current position, number of years experience, primary area of assignment, classification of remedial or developmental, content area for remedial, content area for developmental, and highest level of education and thirty-six items for measurement of institutional, classroom and personal accommodation.

9. The total number of items for the actual study instrument for directors and instructors was forty-five. Nine items related to classification and thirty-six items for measurement of attitudes (Appendix J).

10. After conclusion of the item analyses using established criteria for refinement, the student pilot instrument was narrowed from a forty-item instrument to a thirty-four item questionnaire. The pilot study instrument contained five classification items and thirty-five questions for evaluation of instructor or course. For the actual study instrument, the first six items were demographic—sex, age range, current standing, classification of course as remedial or developmental, content area for remedial courses, and content area for developmental courses. The remaining twenty-eight items measured student responses for evaluation of instructor or course.
11. The total number of items for the actual study instrument for student evaluation of instructors and courses was thirty-four. Six of the items related to demographics and twenty-eight items focused on instructor and course ratings (Appendix K).

12. Content and face validity analysis was conducted through a face-to-face interview with Dr. Milton G. Spann, current Director of the National Center for Developmental Education at Appalachian State University. The interview was held on April 25, 1990, in Boone, North Carolina. Dr. Spann, a nationally-known expert and author in the field of developmental education, reviewed the instruments for validity, layout, readability and ease of use. Each item was carefully analyzed and changes and suggestions for improvement annotated on the instrument itself. Face validity comments were given by Dr. Spann regarding overall instrument appearance and suggestions were made on administering the instrument.

Reliability of Instruments

The usefulness of an attitude scale depends upon its properties. At minimum a useful scale must be reliable or yield consistent results and valid to the extent it measures what is supposed to be measured. Cronbach's Alpha is one of the most commonly used procedures to establish reliability coefficients to determine internal consistency or reliability. According to the SPSS/PC+ Advanced Statistics
Guide:

Alpha is based on the "internal consistency" of a test. That is, it is based on the average correlations of items within a test, if the items are standardized to a standard deviation of 1; or on the average covariance among items on a scale if the items are not standardized. We assume that the items on a scale are positively correlated with each other because they are measuring, to a certain extent, a common entity.  

Reliability of Student Pilot Instrument

The following procedures were conducted regarding reliability of the pilot instruments:

1. Using the SPSS/PC+ Statistical Software Package to determine the relationship of individual items with other items on the scales, two reliability procedures were conducted at the end of the pilot study. This procedure yielded the correlations between items on the test.

2. Inspection of the item reliability analysis indicated that several items should be deleted. Criteria for deletion of items were determined and consisted of the following: (a) items on the total scale which, when deleted, would increase the coefficient alpha of the total scale beyond the obtained value for the total scale, and (b) items on the total scale having an initial item-total score

---

correlation of less than .20. Criteria were selected because items with the above characteristics displayed a low reliability coefficient with other items and added little to the overall instrument.

3. Cronbach's alpha procedure and split-half reliability tests were conducted on the student pilot instrument. The reliability coefficient provided by Cronbach's alpha procedure (raw score) for the total scale was .8759 and standardized item alpha was .8818 on the revised 28 item scale.


Reliability of Student Actual Study Instrument

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the twenty-eight item student instrument, excluding demographics, was .8639 with a standardized alpha of .8779 for the entire scale. Items that were negatively worded were reverse coded to be compatible with the positive-scoring scale. Item numbers 8, 10, 12 and 28 were recoded to be in agreement with the scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Split-half reliability procedures revealed the
following reliability coefficients: alpha for part 1 of .8207, alpha for part 2 of .6961, correlation between forms .7291, equal length Spearman-Brown .8433, Gutman Split-half .8031, and unequal-length Spearman-Brown of .8433.

After examination of the item-total correlations, question no. 28 displayed a total correlation of .0300 with other items on the scale and question no. 33 revealed a negative -.1605 correlation with other items on the scale. Cronbach's alpha was rerun with the elimination of item numbers 28 and 33. Data revealed alpha of .8862 on the twenty-six item scale with 2,879 cases. A split-half reliability procedure was completed with elimination of items number 28 and 33. The following reliability coefficients were displayed: correlation between forms .7568, equal length Spearman-Brown .8615, Gutman split-half .8615, unequal-length Spearman-Brown .8615, alpha for part 1 .8074, alpha for part 2 .7966. Total number of cases considered was 2,887 out of 3,269 students surveyed on the twenty-six item questionnaire. The difference reflects at least one missing response to an item on the scale.

Reliability of Director and Instructor Pilot Instrument

Due to the size of the sample during the pilot study, neither test could be considered reliable or suitable to estimate reliability coefficients. Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability procedures were conducted after the actual collection of data.
Reliability of Directors and Instructors Actual Study

Instrument

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the thirty-six item director and instructor instrument, excluding demographics, was .5891 with a standardized item alpha of .6534 for the entire scale. Examination of item-total correlation coefficients revealed item numbers 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 34, and 39 had either a negative correlation or a correlation of less than .0515. These items were negatively written on a positive measuring scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. Item numbers 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 34, and 39 were recoded to match the scale. After recoding, Cronbach's reliability coefficients for the thirty-six item instrument displayed an alpha of .7163 and a standardized item alpha of .7596.

Split-half reliability procedures revealed the following reliability coefficients: alpha for part 1 of .6167 and alpha for part 2 of .6883. Split-half reliability coefficients revealed correlation between forms of .4320, equal length Spearman-Brown .6033, Gutman Split-half .6030, and unequal-length Spearman-Brown of .6035. Total number of cases for Cronbach's and Split-half reliability tests was 163. The difference reflects omission of at least one item on the thirty-six item scale.

Population of Remedial and Developmental Students

The population consisted of students enrolled in
remedial and developmental courses in Tennessee's eleven community colleges. The geographical locations of the institutions encompassed both urban and rural settings across the state of Tennessee. The enrollment size of participating institutions clustered into three distinct geographical locations. Those located in the East included Walters State Community College, Pellissippi State Technical Community College, Roane State Community College, Cleveland State Community College, and Chattanooga State Technical Community College. Colleges situated in middle Tennessee included Motlow State Community College, Volunteer State Community College, and Columbia State Community College. West Tennessee included Jackson State Community College, Shelby State Community College, and Dyersburg State Community College. By surveying all eleven of Tennessee's community colleges, the classes selected were representative of remedial and developmental students throughout the state of Tennessee.

Excluded from the population for the pilot study and the actual study were students enrolled in courses related to study skills. These courses are often taught by other instructors in various departments or by an outside adjunct faculty member. If study skills were taught within the department by a full-time instructor, that instructor was surveyed in one of the six basic content areas. Remedial and developmental students are frequently enrolled in these
classes, but not exclusively.

**Enrollment Data for Fall 1989**

Enrollment data from the Tennessee Board of Regents was obtained for Fall 1989. The total number of first-time freshmen, including non-remedial and developmental students in community colleges and technical institutions totaled 11,134. Non-remedial students accounted for 2,926 of the total while 8,208 students were enrolled in at least one remedial and developmental course. The total population of remedial and developmental students for this study totaled 6,454.\(^1\) The 6,454 statistic excluded the three technical institutions in the Fall of 1989—Nashville State Technical Institute, Tri-Cities State Technical Institute and State Technical Institute at Memphis.

The 6,454 number represents the actual headcount so some duplication could occur if a student was placed in three differing content areas. The numbers below include students 21 years of age or older and students less than 21 years of age who were placed in remedial and developmental courses in the six major domains. Remedial data and developmental data are combined within the content areas of reading, writing, and math. These statistics are an actual

\(^1\) Thomas J. Garland, Memorandum to Members of the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs, *Enrollment Data for TBR Remedial/Developmental Program: Fall 1989*, (Nashville: Tennessee Board of Regents, 5 Dec. 1989), Table 1, 5.
headcount of content area, but it is highly unlikely that a student would be placed in both remedial reading and developmental reading simultaneously within the same semester.

Statistics for the fall semester 1989 disclosed the following numbers of students placed in the three major content areas of remedial and developmental studies.

Table 1
Remedial and Developmental Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Date for Fall 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment Date for Fall 1990

Of 11,848 first-time freshmen enrolled in TBR institutions, 2,876 were non-remedial while 8,972 were enrolled in one more remedial or developmental course. Of the 8,972 enrolled, 6,900 were enrolled in community

\(^{172}\) Garland, Enrollment Data, Table 2C, 9.
colleges that were included in the total population for the study. Data displayed show actual headcount enrollment. Excluded from the population were the two technical institutions and Northeast State Technical Community College.

Statistics for the Fall semester 1990 revealed the numbers of students were enrolled. The headcount for students enrolled in remedial and developmental writing was 3,548, 5,762 in math, and 2,894 in remedial and developmental reading. Data are displayed in Table 1.

Table 2
Remedial and Developmental Students
Enrollment Date for Fall 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>5,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2,894\textsuperscript{173}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{173} Otis L. Floyd, Memorandum to Members of the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs, \textit{TBR Remedial and Developmental Studies Program: Fall 1990 Enrollments} (Nashville: Tennessee Board of Regents, 11 Nov. 1990), Table 2.
Population for Directors and Instructors

The population for directors and instructors included the eleven current directors, acting, or interim directors of remedial and developmental studies. The instructor population included full-time instructors, adjunct or temporary instructors who taught twelve or more hours or full-time faculty members from the math, reading, English, or other department who taught at least one section of remedial and developmental studies. Based on personal telephone calls with directors and departmental secretaries on March 19, 1990, the number was approximately 200.

The addition of adjunct, temporary, and full-time faculty from other departments, teaching at least one remedial or developmental course, increased the population of instructors. The population of directors and instructors who met the criteria for the actual study was 242. A total of 230 directors and instructors responded to the questionnaire for a percentage rate of return of 95%.

Sampling Size for Directors and Instructors

There was no sampling size for the directors and instructors as the entire population was surveyed.

Student Sampling Size

A stratified random sample was selected from the remedial and developmental population which depicted the six areas of remedial and developmental studies. All students
within the classes selected were surveyed. Classes were
designated by the criteria set forth for selection.
Attempts were made to select an equal number of classes from
the six major domains. Directors provided student
enrollment figures for course offerings during the Fall of
1990. The director, departmental secretary or this
researcher randomly selected the classes to be included.

The sample was based on the following limitations a) classes selected at each institution represented the six major areas of remedial and developmental studies; b) an equal number of remedial classes were selected along with an equal number of developmental classes. With remedial classes fewer in number and classes sizes smaller, this was not always possible.

Attempts were made to balance the number of students in each class. Large classes of over twenty-five were selected as well as classes with ten or less. The total number of remedial students surveyed was 1,006; total number of developmental students was 2,263 for a total of 3,269. Table 3 contains the number of students surveyed in the Fall of 1990 and the percentage of the total sampling size and total population according to content area. Students sampled in the content area of reading, 669 students, represented 21% of the total sampling size, writing, 790 students, represented 24%, and mathematics, 1, 805 students, represented 55%. Percentages of total population surveyed
were writing 22.2%, math 31.3% and reading for 23.1%.

Table 3
Number and Percentage of Students Surveyed
in the Fall of 1990 by Content Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Percentage Total Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,264*</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five cases listed as missing from 3,269

Data Collection Procedures

Instructors surveyed the class that had been selected and indicated on the materials provided. Materials provided included:

1. One director/instructor evaluation form with Scantron answer form enclosed,
2. 20 student evaluation forms or the actual number of students enrolled in the class according to class roles,
3. An equal number of student Scantron answer forms,
4. Instruction sheet for administering the instruments to that class (Appendix L),
5. A collection procedure coordinated by the
directors, departmental secretaries secretary, and this researcher.

Students enrolled in remedial and developmental classes were administered the "Student Evaluation of Remedial and Developmental Instructor or course." All students in that class were surveyed. The average remedial and developmental class consisted of twenty students. Attempts were made to keep these classes smaller than the average freshmen classes because of the need for individual attention and the nature of the class itself.

Visits were made to the community colleges to meet with the directors and deliver the survey instruments personally. Visits began on October 9, 1990 and concluded on November 9, 1991. Personal visits were made to Walters State Community College, Pellissippi State Technical Community College, Roane State Community College, Chattanooga State Technical Community College, Cleveland State Community College, Jackson State Community College, Dyersburg Community College and Volunteer State Community College. Materials were mailed to Motlow State Community College, Columbia State Community College and Shelby State Community College. Instructions were provided by telephoned and also included with the materials. Materials were collected on return visits or shipped via UPS to the Department of Educational Leadership at East Tennessee State University. Gathering of data was completed by December 7, 1990.
Data Analysis Procedures

The data collected from the actual study were initially subjected to factor analysis. One of the basic assumptions of factor analysis is that underlying dimensions, or factors, can be used to explain complex phenomena, and that such underlying factors, which are smaller in number than the number of observed variables, are responsible for the covariation among the observed variables. The responses to the items on the two instruments constituted observed variables. Factor analysis identifies those underlying, not directly observable, constructs.

Kim and Mueller described factor analysis as a "variety of statistical techniques whose common objective is to represent a set of variables in terms of a smaller number of hypothetical variables." Factor analysis can be used according to Kim and Mueller as an "expedient way of ascertaining the minimum number of hypothetical factors that can account for the observed covariation and as a means of exploring the data for possible data reduction." Rummel depicted factor analysis as "a means by which the regularity

---


and order in phenomena can be discerned."\(^{176}\)

The SPSS/PC+ Advanced Statistics Guide outlines factor analysis as "a statistical technique used to identify a relatively small number of factors than can be used to represent relationships among sets of many interrelated variables."\(^{177}\) Steps utilized in performing factor analysis included the following:

1. Data collection and preparation of the correlation matrix for all variables;
2. Initial factor extraction or the number of factors necessary to represent the data and the method was determined;
3. Various rotations were conducted to make the factors more interpretable;
4. Factor scores were constructed for each instructor. These scores were used for further analysis.\(^{178}\)

In order to identify factors underlying the variability of items, the first step in factor analysis consists of developing a matrix of item correlations. From this matrix, several approaches are then available for extracting the underlying factors. The principal components method for initial extraction of factors was chosen for data analysis.


In the present study because each principal components factor maximizes the variance explained from the correlation matrix.

The SPSS/PC+ Statistical Package was employed for data analysis. After completion of the data collection process, the responses from the survey instruments were scanned from the Scantron Answer Form 3200 by using a Scantron 5200S machine. The data resulting from the scanning process were downloaded onto micro-disks into an ASCII file for use with the SPSS/PC+ package.

After identification and labeling of factors from the student instrument and the directors and instructors instrument, factor scores were calculated from the students ratings and entered into the instructor's data files. The average instructor factor scores, derived from the four student factors, were correlated with the instructor factor scores to determine the measure of association by using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient or, simply Pearson's $r$ or the correlation coefficient between the average instructor factor scores and the six instructor factors.

The Pearson $r$ was used to determine measures of correlation for H1, H2, H3, and H4. The value of $r$, ranges from -1.00 to +1.00, with -1.00 indicating a perfect negative agreement, 1.00 indicating perfect positive agreement, and a coefficient near zero reflecting little or
no relationship. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to perform the Pearson $r$. The program computed the correlation coefficients for $H_0^1$, $H_0^2$, $H_0^3$ and $H_0^4$.

The $t$-test for independent means was used for testing $H_0^5$, $H_0^6$, and $H_0^7$ at the .05 level of significance. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to compute differences between the means. The program computed the mean, standard deviation, $t$ value, degrees of freedom and the two-tailed probability. The program identified differences at the .01 and .001 levels of significance.

The process of identifying and labeling factors for the student instrument and the instructor instrument are contained in Chapter 4. The results of the analyses as they apply to Hypotheses testing of 1-7 are presented in Chapter 4. Demographic data for both the student analyses and the directors and instructors analyses. The research hypotheses are presented in the null format below for statistical analyses.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses were tested in the null form as indicated below:

$H_0^1$. There will be no relationship in attitudes of directors and instructors of remedial and developmental courses and student ratings of instructors or courses.
H_02. There will be no relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental English (writing) courses and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H_03. There will be no relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental Mathematics courses (Basic Arithmetic, Elementary Algebra, and Intermediate Algebra) and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H_04. There will be no relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental reading courses (Basic Reading and Fundamental Reading) and student ratings of instructors or courses.

H_05. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of directors and instructors who hold strong beliefs in open door, egalitarian philosophies and directors and instructors who hold weak beliefs in open door, egalitarian philosophies.

H_06. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of younger (24 and under) traditional students and the attitudes of older (over 24) non-traditional students toward remedial and developmental studies.

H_07. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of remedial and developmental students toward regular full-time remedial and developmental instructors and instructors from integrated or other disciplines.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Data

The problem of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings. Further analysis was to determine if differences existed between the attitudes of traditional students and non-traditional students according to age, integrated faculty and non-integrated faculty, and if a difference existed between instructors who held strong egalitarian beliefs and those who held weak beliefs.

Pre-Analysis Preparation of Data

Data were obtained from two questionnaires completed by the two groups. Directors and instructors completed a questionnaire measuring attitudes toward institutional, classroom, and personal accommodation and students completed a questionnaire rating instructors and courses.

Two hundred thirty responses were received from the directors and instructors prior to the deadline of December 15, 1990. This accounted for a 95% return rate. Responses were received from 3,269 remedial and development students. The return rate of student responses was dependent upon the instructor administering the survey. Data are presented in Table 4 according to the eleven community colleges surveyed.
Table 4

Number of Respondents Surveyed Per Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Directors/Instructors</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chattanooga State *(CSTCC)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleveland State *(CLSCC)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Columbia State *(CoSCC)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dyersburg State *(DSCC)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jackson State *(JSCC)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Motlow State *(MSCC)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pellissippi State *(PSTCC)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Roane State *(RSCC)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shelby State *(SSCC)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Volunteer State *(VSCC)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Walters State *(WSCC)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>3269</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* accepted abbreviations
Responses were coded on Scantron Form 3200 for both populations surveyed. The answer forms were initially checked for pencil markings outside the coded areas that would be detected by the scanning machine. After this clean-up phase was completed, responses were checked for correct coding of the demographic data for the instructor according to area taught and type of course. A crosscheck was performed to determine if the student had correctly coded the course as either remedial or developmental, and to verify that the content area of writing, mathematics or reading was in alignment with the instructor coding. Identification numbers were coded on both response forms for the directors and instructors identifying the school, instructor or director identification number, and whether integrated or non-integrated. Student responses were coded identifying the school, student identification number which was an actual numerical count, integrated or non-integrated faculty member, and instructor identification number. The instructor identification number was entered on the student response form to correlate student responses to an individual instructor.

The answer forms were transported to the computer services center at East Tennessee State University to be scanned and downloaded onto micro-disks. This process was completed in two weeks. Data were converted into an ASCII file for later conversion and analysis.
After completion of the scanning process, a verification check was made with the actual hardcopy to the scanned data to verify omissions and to correct coding that had been incorrectly scanned. Data were now ready for the transformation processes which included recoding the alpha responses to numeric responses for analysis with SPSS.

Responses initially coded as A were recoded as 5 for strongly agree; B responses were recoded as 4 for agree; C responses were recoded as 3 for disagree; D responses were recoded as 2 for strongly disagree; and E responses were recoded as 1 for no opinion.

After completion of the initial recoding process, another recoding process was conducted to place the 'no opinion' responses in a neutral or middle position on the scale. Recoding transformations were as follows: A responses remained coded at a value of 5 for strongly agree; B responses remained at 4 for agree; E responses recoded to a value of 3 for 'no opinion'; C responses recoded to a value of 2 for disagree; and D responses recoded as 1 for strongly disagree.

After examination of reliability coefficients and frequency responses, several items were reverse coded to match the scale of 5 to 1 ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree if the item had previously been negatively worded. Items recoded on the student instrument were item numbers 8, 10, 12, and 28. Items recoded on the director
and instructor instrument included item numbers 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 34, and 39. The pre-analysis process of data preparation was completed and data were ready for analysis.

Demographic Data for Directors and Instructors

Demographic data were obtained from nine items on the director and instructor instrument plus one additional item coded in the identification numbers. Data were obtained regarding sex, age, classification of current position, number of years experience in current position, primary area of assignment, classification of course, remedial content area, developmental content area, highest level of education, and integrated or non-integrated faculty.

Item 1 on the data sheet asked the respondents to indicate their sex. Of the 230 directors and instructors who responded, 151 were female for 65.7% and 78 were male for 33.9%. Valid cases consisted of 229 with one case missing. Data depicting the frequency and percentage distributions for gender of respondents are presented in Table 5.

Item 2 on the data sheet asked respondents to indicate their age according to four age ranges. The majority of respondents, 95 or 41.3%, fell within the 41-50 range followed closely by age range 31-40 for 75 respondents or 32.6% of the respondents. Data are presented in Table 6.
Table 5

Frequency Distribution for Sex of Directors and Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Frequency Distribution for Age of Directors and Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 3 on the data sheet asked respondents to identify their current position according to three options. Responses were obtained from 230 cases with no cases missing. The majority of respondents were instructors, 191 or 83% of the respondents surveyed. Combinations of directors and instructors accounted for 29 positions or 12.6% of respondents while full-time directors accounted for 10 or 4.3% of respondents. Data are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution for Current Position Held
By Directors and Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Instructor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Director</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 4 on the data sheet asked the respondents for the number of years of experience in the position currently held. Five options were provided. The majority of respondents fell within the 0-5 years range or 53.9% of the total number of respondents. Instructors who had held their current position for 6-10 years accounted for the next
largest percentage of 46 respondents for 20.0% percent. The lowest frequency and percentage of 11 or 4.8% represented instructors or directors with over 21 years of experience. Date are presented in Table 8 which represents this distribution.

Table 8
Frequency Distribution for Number of Years
Experience In Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 5 on the director and instructor data sheet represented the primary area of assignment for the instructors and teaching directors. Data were classified according to the three major content areas of writing, mathematics or reading. The majority of instructors, 119 or 51.7% taught mathematics, 59 or 25.7% taught in the area of writing, and 43 or 18.7% percent of the instructors taught
reading. There were 221 valid cases with 9 missing cases which accounted for 3.9% of the population. Table 9 displays this data with the nine missing cases representing directors or department chairs who were full time administrators.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 6 asked for classification of the course currently being surveyed into one of two major categories. Courses being evaluated were classified as either remedial or developmental. Of the courses surveyed 153 or 66.5% were developmental as opposed to 68 or 29.6% classified as remedial. There were 221 valid cases with 9 missing cases representing full-time administrators. Data are presented in Table 10.
Item 7 provided a breakout of Item 5 and 6 for content area in remedial courses. Thirteen instructors taught remedial reading or 5.7%; thirty-five instructors taught remedial math or 15.2%; and 19 instructors taught remedial writing for 8.6% of the total population of directors and instructors surveyed. The sum of the percentages equals 29.5% approximating the total number surveyed as depicted in Table 10. Data for the breakout are presented in Table 11.

Item 8 is a duplicate of item 7 with a breakout of developmental courses according to the three major content areas. There were 153 instructors and teaching directors or 66.5% surveyed in developmental courses. Twenty-eight instructors taught developmental reading or 12.2%, 87 or 37.8% of instructors taught developmental math or elementary or intermediate algebra, 37 or 16.1% taught developmental writing, and one instructor taught a course not classified as developmental writing, reading, or math. Data are presented in Table 12.

The last of the demographic items, item 9, asked for the highest level of education obtained. Twenty-three or 10% of the directors and instructors held a doctorate degree, twenty or 8.7% held a specialists degree, 138 held a masters degree, 15 held a bachelor's degree plus 30 or 45 hours, 32 held only a bachelors's degree and two cases were missing. Data are displayed in Table 13.
Table 10  
Frequency Distribution for Instructor Classification of Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11  
Frequency Distribution for Content Area in Remedial Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67*</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 case missing
Table 12
Frequency Distribution for Content Area
in Developmental Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Frequency Distribution for
Highest Level of Education Attained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors + 30 or 45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Data for Students

Demographic data were obtained from six items on the student instrument. Data were obtained regarding sex, age, current college standing, classification of course, remedial content area, and developmental content area.

Demographic data of the sex and age range distributions were found in item 1 and item 2 of the instrument. Of the 3,269 students sampled, 1,966 or 60.1% of the sample were female and 1,295 or 39.6% were male. Seven missing cases accounted for .2% of the sample. The age range of the students varied from 18-24 to over 50. The vast majority, 2,480 or 75.9% of students sampled were age 18-24. Only .7% or 22 students were over 50. Data are displayed in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Frequency Distribution for Age of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 3 of the student instrument sought the class standing of the respondent. Students responded to four options of first-time freshmen, freshmen transfer, sophomore, and sophomore transfer. The overwhelming majority, 2,605 or 79.7% were first-time freshmen and an additional 4.3% or 139 students were freshmen transfers. Sophomore standing accounted for 12.5% or 407 students with an additional 62 or 1.9% classified as sophomore transfers. Data are presented in Table 16.
Table 16

Frequency Distribution for Student Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-time freshmen</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen Transfers</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Transfers</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 4 on the student instrument and item 6 on the directors' and instructors' instrument were duplicate items in relation to the classification of the course currently being evaluated. Courses evaluated by students were classified as either remedial or developmental. Of the instructors and courses rated by the students, 2,263 students evaluated instructors in developmental courses and 1,006 rated instructors in remedial courses. Student ratings for developmental courses accounted for 69.2% and ratings for remedial courses accounted for 30.8% of the total sampling size of 3,269 as depicted in Table 17.

Item 5 provided a breakout of Item 4 for content area in remedial courses. Two hundred and sixty instructors or 7.9% were rated in the content area of remedial reading,
509 or 15.0% were rated in remedial mathematics, and 237 or 7.1% were rated in remedial writing. The sum of the percentages approximates 30% as depicted on Table 18. Data for the breakout of remedial course content are presented in Table 18.

Item 6 was a breakout of Table 17 of developmental courses and instructors rated by students in the three major content areas. The majority of instructors were rated in developmental math with 1,294 or 39.6% falling within the content area of math, 551 instructors were rated in developmental writing or 16.9%, and 409 were rated in developmental reading or 12.5%. The category of 'other' accounted for 3 student ratings of a course not classified as developmental writing, reading, or math and 6 missing cases accounting for a total of .2%. Data are presented in Table 19.

Table 17
Frequency Distribution for Student Classification of Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Course</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18  
Frequency Distribution for Student Classification of Content Area in Remedial Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19  
Frequency Distribution for Student Classification of Content Area in Developmental Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Analysis Procedures  
Data from the study were initially subjected to factor
analysis in order to investigate the number and kinds of factors that could be derived from the data. This analysis included four steps: (a) condensation of factors through principal components analysis to provide a starting point for rotation, (b) rotation of factors to achieve a more interpretable factor solution, (c) labeling of factors, and (d) computing factor scores.

The principal components method for initial extraction of factor analysis was used. The factors were rotated using either uncorrelated (varimax) or correlated (oblique) depending upon the convergence of the factors. Only those principal components factors having an eigenvalue of 1 or more were subject to selection and rotation. Four criteria guided the selection of a factor solution. The solution (a) would account for as much of the total variance as possible, (b) factor loadings of .40 or higher were considered, (c) resulting factors would be interpretable, and (d) factors would share communality.

**Student Factor Analysis**

Student data were initially factored using the SPSS/PC+ Statistical Software Package without a specified number of factors sought. The program extracted 5 factors with the varimax rotation converging in 9 iterations and the oblique rotation converging in 16 iterations. The five-factor solution accounted for 46.6% of the variance. An additional factor analysis procedure was conducted specifying a four-
The four-factor solution accounted for 45.7% of the variance with an oblique rotation converging in 8 iterations. Since six eigenvalues were greater than 1 and any additional variance would be less than 45.7%, it was not necessary to extract factors of less than four.

The four-factor solution was selected as the optimal factor structure to explain the data because this solution provided for 45.7% of the variance, all four factors were interpretable to some extent, and aspects of the five-factor solution could be identified within the four-factor solution. Table 20 contains the eigenvalues and percentages of explained variance for the principal components analysis for the four-factor solution of the student instrument.

### Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.731</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student factors 1 through 4 contain the following number of items: 1=12, 2=7, 3=4, and 4=4. Table 21 depicts the pattern matrix for the 4-factor solution. The left-hand side contains the item numbers from the student instrument. Items 13, 14, 27, 34, 16, 17, 29, 30, 18, 9, 26, and 19 loaded on Factor 1. Items 15, 25, 24, 7, 23, 20, and 21 loaded on Factor 2. Factor 3 contained items 8, 10, 12, and 28, and Factor 4 contained items 32, 22, 11, and 31.

Table 21
Student Factor Analysis
Oblique Rotated Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.82329</td>
<td>-0.06859</td>
<td>0.03739</td>
<td>-0.16512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.79944</td>
<td>0.02153</td>
<td>0.00415</td>
<td>-0.04212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.74775</td>
<td>-0.07796</td>
<td>0.03930</td>
<td>-0.03284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.74750</td>
<td>0.00395</td>
<td>0.00360</td>
<td>-0.08349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.71303</td>
<td>0.01160</td>
<td>0.03284</td>
<td>-0.07991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.68106</td>
<td>0.15076</td>
<td>-0.01127</td>
<td>-0.04931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.64320</td>
<td>0.06360</td>
<td>-0.03391</td>
<td>0.08034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.58038</td>
<td>0.00485</td>
<td>-0.00806</td>
<td>0.11102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.56767</td>
<td>0.08310</td>
<td>-0.01283</td>
<td>0.18460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.52446</td>
<td>0.05940</td>
<td>-0.04244</td>
<td>0.10747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.48182</td>
<td>0.09972</td>
<td>-0.05863</td>
<td>0.29029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.28843*</td>
<td>0.06223</td>
<td>0.05771</td>
<td>0.18443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 (Continued)

Student Factor Analysis

Oblique Rotated Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.11928</td>
<td>.71636</td>
<td>.06838</td>
<td>-.10687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.04686</td>
<td>.70962</td>
<td>-.01369</td>
<td>.06819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.00642</td>
<td>.70161</td>
<td>.15780</td>
<td>.02872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.11441</td>
<td>.69870</td>
<td>.05640</td>
<td>-.14167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.03299</td>
<td>.64650</td>
<td>-.00874</td>
<td>.14536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.04230</td>
<td>.63411</td>
<td>.01058</td>
<td>.12503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.10325</td>
<td>.30805**</td>
<td>-.03836</td>
<td>.18254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.00657</td>
<td>.00387</td>
<td>.67172</td>
<td>-.05359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.06641</td>
<td>.16612</td>
<td>.65842</td>
<td>.00401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.08055</td>
<td>.24339</td>
<td>.61876</td>
<td>-.15909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.05062</td>
<td>-.33934</td>
<td>.54297</td>
<td>.22899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-.10142</td>
<td>.00516</td>
<td>-.06637</td>
<td>.67622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.01248</td>
<td>.19589</td>
<td>.07119</td>
<td>.54626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.26168</td>
<td>.12551</td>
<td>-.08749</td>
<td>.47027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.08736</td>
<td>-.02314</td>
<td>.04451</td>
<td>.35409****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

* loading of <.40 on Factor 1

** loading of <.40 on Factor 2

*** loading of <.40 on Factor 3

**** loading of <.40 on Factor 4
Characteristics of Student Factor 1 - Instructor Concern

Factor 1 contained 11 items loading at least .40 and accounted for 28.6% of the variance. None of the items were reverse items. Table 22 presents the items in an abbreviated form similar to input into the statistical analysis program. Factor 1 was Instructor Concern.

Characteristics of Student Factor 2 - Socialization

Factor 2 contained 6 items loading at least .40 on and accounted for 6.8% of the variance. None of the items were reverse items. Table 23 presents the items in an even more abbreviated form than input for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 2 was labeled Socialization.

Characteristics of Student Factor 3 - Value of Course

Factor 3 contained 4 items loading at least .40 and accounted for 5.9% of the variance. All of the items were reverse items. Table 24 presents the items in a format similar to the abbreviated form for statistical analysis purposes; not as they appeared in their entire length in the student instrument. Factor 3 was labeled Value of Course.

Characteristics of Student Factor 4 - Flexibility of Grading

Factor 4 contained 3 items loading at least .40 and accounted for 4.4% of the variance. None were reverse items. Table 25 presents the items in abbreviated form. Factor 4 was labeled Flexibility of Grading.
Table 22

Characteristics of Student Factor 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Instructor Concern</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Instructor Treats Students Well</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Instructor Cares if I Pass Course</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dir/insturc Door Open to See Them</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Instruc Wants me to do my Very Best</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Instruc Helps Dur Classtime with Work</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Instruc Teaches so I Understand Lesson</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Instruc Covers Mater Until I Understand</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Instruc Helps Outside Classtime</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Instruc Tells me Often Doing Good Job</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Can Talk with Instr About Problems</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Instruc Encourages to Stay in School</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Instruc Encour to Part in Col Life</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.288*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* loading of <.40

Note.

N = No
Y = Yes
Table 23
Characteristics of Student Factor 2

Socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Course Makes Feel Like I Belong in Coll N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Course Helps Conduct Myself as Student N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Material Covered is Interesting N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Course has Taught me a Great Deal N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Course Helps me Understand Prob I Face N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Course Helps with Other Course Work N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Grades are Better in R/D than Oth Dpts N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.308*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

N = No
Y = Yes

* loading of <.40

Table 24
Characteristics of Student Factor 3

Value of Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Course Makes Feel Don't Belong in Coll Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Material Covered is Boring Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Course is a Waste of Time Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Grading is the Same in Course as Others Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 25
**Characteristics of Student Factor 4**

**Flexibility of Grading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Grades are Curved if Poor Performance on Tst</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Instruc Allows Xtr Cred to Improve Grade</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instruc Provides Study Guides for Tests</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Can Move on if Mat Learned Quickly</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.354*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

N = No  
Y = Yes

* loading of <.40

**Directors and Instructors Factor Analysis**

Director and instructor data were initially factored without a specified number of factors sought. The SPSS/PC+ program extracted 13 factors with the varimax rotation converging in 14 iterations. The oblique rotation failed to converge in 25 iterations due to a smaller population and the instrument containing 36 items for analysis. The thirteen-factor solution contained 13 eigenvalues of greater than 1 and accounted for 64.8% of the variance. After factor 1 with an eigenvalue of 5.151 accounting for 14.3% percent of the variance, the remaining factors accounted from 5.9% to 2.8% of the total variance. Factors 2 to 13 accounted for little more than individual variables. The
The 13-factor solution was not considered as a possibility.

Additional factor analysis procedures were conducted specifying a three-factor solution, a four-factor solution, and a six-factor solution. Data were examined for consideration of a seven- and eight-factor solution. The six-factor solution was selected which accounted for 40.4% of the variance with a varimax rotation converging in 23 iterations. Attempts to converge an oblique rotation were unsuccessful. Using less than six factors resulted in item loadings that were not easily interpretable or identifiable.

The six-factor solution was selected as the optimal factor structure to explain the data because this solution provided for 40.4% of the variance, all six factors were interpretable to some extent, and aspects of the seven-and eight-factor solution could be identified within the six-factor solution. Table 26 contains the eigenvalues and percentages of explained variance for the principal components analysis for the six-factor solution of the director and instructor instrument.

Factor 1 contained 7 items, Factor 2 contained 10 items, Factor 3 contained 4 items, and Factor 4 contained 6 items, Factor 5 contained 5 items, and Factor 6 contained 4 items. Table 27 depicts the pattern matrix for the six-factor solution. The left-hand side of the table contains the item numbers or questions from the director and instructor instrument. Items 45, 28, 42, 44, 43, 31, and 41
Table 26

Eigenvalues and Percentages of Explained Variance Six-Factor Solution Director and Instructor Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.117</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

loaded on Factor 1. Items 11, 12, 35, 13, 33, 10, 14, 38, 24, and 30 loaded on Factor 2. Factor 3 contained items 18, 19, 16, and 28. Factor 4 contained items 29, 27, 26, 40, 15, and 25. Items 34, 37, 36, 23, and 22 loaded on Factor 5 and items 21, 17, 39, and 32 loaded on Factor 6.

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 1

Factor 1 contained 7 items loading at least .40 and accounted for 14.2% of the variance. None of the items were reverse items. Table 28 presents the items in an abbreviated form. Factor 1 was labeled Special Recognition and Attentiveness.
Table 27
Director and Instructor Factor Analysis
Varimax Rotated Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.65775</td>
<td>.06575</td>
<td>.16577</td>
<td>-.12332</td>
<td>.29850</td>
<td>-.11171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.63384</td>
<td>.19665</td>
<td>.12020</td>
<td>.16961</td>
<td>-.09315</td>
<td>.09569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.60170</td>
<td>.07178</td>
<td>-.08409</td>
<td>.03660</td>
<td>-.12607</td>
<td>.03650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.57323</td>
<td>.13694</td>
<td>.24941</td>
<td>.24470</td>
<td>.21172</td>
<td>.00054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.52642</td>
<td>.31267</td>
<td>.26275</td>
<td>.02783</td>
<td>.27611</td>
<td>-.16554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.48157</td>
<td>-.08231</td>
<td>-.23588</td>
<td>.09743</td>
<td>-.08412</td>
<td>.02250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.45143</td>
<td>-.04246</td>
<td>.29593</td>
<td>.28072</td>
<td>.13776</td>
<td>-.29311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.01649</td>
<td>.68261</td>
<td>.11471</td>
<td>.04114</td>
<td>-.03826</td>
<td>-.02416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.24433</td>
<td>.52741</td>
<td>.24754</td>
<td>-.14036</td>
<td>-.14036</td>
<td>.14606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.09895</td>
<td>.49075</td>
<td>-.02518</td>
<td>.19602</td>
<td>-.02716</td>
<td>-.17624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.02105</td>
<td>.47358</td>
<td>-.04538</td>
<td>.04635</td>
<td>.13763</td>
<td>.15047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.18298</td>
<td>.45117</td>
<td>.08552</td>
<td>-.28299</td>
<td>-.02533</td>
<td>.05858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.13911</td>
<td>.41116</td>
<td>.08173</td>
<td>.11553</td>
<td>-.16861</td>
<td>.09697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.13579</td>
<td>.40166</td>
<td>.00477</td>
<td>.16514</td>
<td>-.0388</td>
<td>-.02143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.34376</td>
<td>.38368</td>
<td>.00154</td>
<td>.02224</td>
<td>-.27483</td>
<td>-.03637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 (Continued)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.12348</td>
<td>.29429</td>
<td>.07650</td>
<td>.12693</td>
<td>-.00441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.03744</td>
<td>-.27933</td>
<td>.14365</td>
<td>.08176</td>
<td>-.15287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.04156</td>
<td>.12788</td>
<td>.76817</td>
<td>.07561</td>
<td>-.03178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.01894</td>
<td>.17807</td>
<td>.68269</td>
<td>.14690</td>
<td>-.08206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.15218</td>
<td>.15525</td>
<td>.56155</td>
<td>.42281</td>
<td>.13702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.00808</td>
<td>.17419</td>
<td>-.43091</td>
<td>.20051</td>
<td>.16520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.23199</td>
<td>.03404</td>
<td>.16607</td>
<td>.60963</td>
<td>-.03103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.16407</td>
<td>.09357</td>
<td>.05964</td>
<td>.60123</td>
<td>-.03137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.15262</td>
<td>.00533</td>
<td>.15671</td>
<td>.59373</td>
<td>-.14662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.26109</td>
<td>.22677</td>
<td>.07871</td>
<td>.49201</td>
<td>.09584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.15617</td>
<td>.05082</td>
<td>-.17567</td>
<td>.38867</td>
<td>.15053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.12583</td>
<td>.10609</td>
<td>-.10747</td>
<td>.25730</td>
<td>.12114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.18611</td>
<td>-.06200</td>
<td>-.04724</td>
<td>-.28809</td>
<td>.56780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.19807</td>
<td>.13417</td>
<td>.07444</td>
<td>-.10515</td>
<td>-.55849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.18007</td>
<td>.24182</td>
<td>.38558</td>
<td>.07800</td>
<td>.51858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.03654</td>
<td>-.14893</td>
<td>-.24704</td>
<td>.09636</td>
<td>.48723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.02122</td>
<td>.36066</td>
<td>.32230</td>
<td>.29658</td>
<td>.45224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.15417</td>
<td>.09432</td>
<td>-.03957</td>
<td>-.03593</td>
<td>.16429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.00334</td>
<td>.13455</td>
<td>.02776</td>
<td>.00925</td>
<td>.10386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.04506</td>
<td>-.12747</td>
<td>.14983</td>
<td>.02629</td>
<td>-.06207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.37770</td>
<td>.25391</td>
<td>-.15484</td>
<td>.07943</td>
<td>-.23360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28
Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Enjoyment of Students Factor Job Satis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Students Rec Wkly Feedbk on Progress</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Instru Avail Aft Reg Hrs to Counsel</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Dir and Instruc Door Open to Students</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Std success responsibility of instru</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>R/D Classes should be 15 or Less</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Instructor Offers Further Help</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

N = No
Y = Yes

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 2

Factor 2 contained 10 items with 7 loading at .40 or higher and accounted for 5.9% of the variance. Item 10 was a reverse item. Table 29 presents the items in an abbreviated form, somewhat similar, but more abbreviated, than that used for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 2 was labeled Egalitarianism.
Table 29
Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 2

Egalitarianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Open Door Policies Should Expand</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>90% of Stdts can Lrn Gvn Time and Help</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Instr Shd Clarify Q's drng Tst Taking</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Value of Educ is Knowledg for Future</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Students Provded Revw Sheet Tst Taking</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Open Door Polcs Weaknd Purpose of Educ</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Educ Insts Mst Chng to Mt Society Need</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Instr Outlines Ttxbk Material</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.384*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Waivers for Plcment on Indiv Basis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.294*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>R/D Stds Wrk Independently of Instr</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.279*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
* loadings of <.40

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 3

Factor 3 contained 4 items with at .40 or higher and accounted for 5.7% of the variance. Items 17 and 18 were reverse items. Table 30 presents the items in an abbreviated form, somewhat similar, but more abbreviated, than that used for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 3 was labeled Involvement in College Life.
Table 30

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 3

Involvement in College Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Extra curr Activs take away Study Time</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sprts &amp; Xtra Curr Activs for Av or Abv</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Stds Should be Involved in College Life</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cut-off Sccrs for Placement Enforced</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.431*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* negative factor loading

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 4

Factor 4 contained 6 items with 4 items loading .40 or higher and accounted for 5.1% of the variance. None of the items were reversed. Table 31 presents the items in an abbreviated form, somewhat similar, but more abbreviated, than that used for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 4 was labeled Allowance for Success.

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 5

Factor 5 contained 6 items with 5 items loading .40 or higher and 1 item loading -.558 accounting for 4.9% of the variance. Items 23 and 34 were reverse items. Table 32 presents the items in an abbreviated form. Factor 5 was labeled Classroom Adaptations.
Table 31
Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 4
Allowance for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Supplemental Learning Provided</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Difficult Materl Retaugt for Understdng</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Stdts can Acelrte thru Requiremts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Important to Chat with Students</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Backbone of R/D is Subject Matter</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.389*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Chpt Rdgs Asng H/W with Q's at End</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.257*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
* loadings of < .40

Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 6
Factor 6 contained 4 items with 3 items loading .40 or higher accounted for 4.5% of the variance. Items 17 and 39 were reverse items. Table 33 presents the items in an abbreviated form, somewhat similar, but more abbreviated, than that used for statistical analysis purposes. Factor 6 was labeled Integrativeness.
Table 32  
Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 5  
Classroom Adaptations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tst Q's Drw fr Matri nt Cvered in Class</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Students use Notes During Test Taking</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Peer Teachng Bneficial to Slwer Stdt</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>R/D Course nt Graded as Tough as N-R/D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sprts &amp; Xtra Curr Ativi Prvid Incentves</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33  
Characteristics of Director and Instructor Factor 6  
Integrativeness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reverse Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>R/D Classes Should be Integral Part</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>R/D Clses Shld be Housed Apt frm N-R/D</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Students need Appoint to see Instru</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Can Improve Grade by Extra Assignmnts</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.308*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
* loading of <.40
Factor Scores

Factor scores were computed from the student data file and the director and instructor data file using SPSS/PC+ to compute the scores. After initial factor scores had been extracted, an average student rating score was computed by the statistical program by averaging student factor scores for each instructor on the four student factors.

The average student rating scores were entered by instructor identification number into the instructor data file. The average student rating scores based on the four student factors were correlated with the factor scores derived from the factor analysis process for the instructors. Average factor scores could not be determined for the full-time directors and administrators and the instructors at Motlow State Community College. For directors who were full-time administrators, no class was taught to correlate the average student rating score with the director factor scores. When materials were returned from Motlow State Community College, the instructor answer forms were separated from the student ratings and no means were available to correlate the students with the instructors. All responses, including full-time directors and instructors, were utilized in the factor analysis procedures.

Four factors were previously identified from the student factor analysis process. Six factors were identified from
the instructor factor analysis process. Student Factor 1 was labeled Instructor Concern, Factor 2 was labeled Socialization, Factor 3 was labeled Value of Course, and Factor 4 was labeled Flexibility of Grading. Instructor Factor 1 was labeled Special Recognition and Attentiveness, Factor 2 was labeled Egalitarianism, Factor 3 was labeled Involvement in College Life, Factor 4 was labeled Allowance for Success, Factor 5 was labeled Classroom Adaptations, and Factor 6 was labeled Integrativeness. Factor labels are depicted in Tables 34 and 35.

Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Factor Labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Value of Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flexibility of Grading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyses and Interpretation of Findings

Seven null hypotheses were tested in the study. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were tested using the Pearson $r$ to determine correlation coefficients significant at the .05 level using a one-tailed test. Hypotheses 5, 6 and 7 were
Table 35
Director and Instructor Factor Labels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Factor Labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Special Attention and Attentiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Involvement in College Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allowance for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Classroom Adaptations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Integrativeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

tested using the t-test for independent means. The pooled variance estimate was used because F-Values had a probability of >.05, indicating that the variances were statistically equal. Hypotheses 5, 6 and 7 were tested at the .05 level of significance using a two-tailed test.

H$_0$. There will be no overall relationship in attitudes of directors and instructors of remedial and developmental studies and student ratings of instructors or courses.

For analytical purposes, the correlations were analyzed separately by the four student factors and the six instructor factors. There was a possibility of 24 correlations for each test. A correlation was found between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor
5, Classroom Adaptations, of .2458. Student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, was negatively correlated, -.2130 with instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness. A relationship was found between student Factor 2, Socialization, and instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness of .2324. This correlation indicates that attitudes toward the involvement of remedial and developmental students into all aspects of college life and integration within the regular curriculum is important to both students and instructors.

All three correlations were significant at the .01 level of significance. Even though three relationships or 12.5% of a possible 24 relationships were found, these relationships are not significant enough to warrant rejecting the null. The preponderance of evidence supports retaining the null. H01 failed to be rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Data are presented in Table 36. The four student factors are labeled horizontally on the table and the six instructor and director factors are labeled vertically.

H02. There will be no relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental English (writing) courses and student ratings of instructors or courses.

A relationship was found between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 1, Special Recognition and Attentiveness, with a correlation coefficient of .3062, significant at the .05 level. Student
Table 36
Correlation Between Student Rating Scores and Instructor Factor Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0465</td>
<td>.0952</td>
<td>-.0613</td>
<td>.1096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0454</td>
<td>-.0197</td>
<td>.0851</td>
<td>.1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0986</td>
<td>-.0024</td>
<td>-.0462</td>
<td>.0511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0637</td>
<td>-.0938</td>
<td>.0706</td>
<td>-.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2458**</td>
<td>-.1406</td>
<td>-.0247</td>
<td>-.1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.2130**</td>
<td>.2324**</td>
<td>.1594</td>
<td>.0755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Two-tailed test.

N = 140
*p < .05
**p < .01

Factor 1, Instructor Concern, focused on providing extra assistance to students, willingness to meet with the students outside of regular classtime, encouraging students to remain in school and demonstrating an overall caring nature. Instructor Factor 1, Special Recognition and Attentiveness, addressed these same issues including instructor responsibility for success of students and enjoyment of students listed as a component of job satisfaction.
A correlation of .4060, significant at the .01 and 
.05 level, was present between student Factor 1, Instructor 
Concern, and instructor Factor 3, Involvement in College 
Life. Instructor Factor 3, Involvement in College Life, 
focused on student involvement in all aspects of the college 
curriculum to include sports and extra curricular 
activities. Student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, 
correlated to instructor Factor 5, Classroom Adaptations of 
.4414 at the .01 and .05 level. Instructor Factor 5 
included using peer teaching to assist slower learners, 
allowing use of notes during test taking, and covering 
material in class that will be tested.

Another relationship, although negatively correlated, 
was present between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, 
and instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness, of -.3703 which was 
significant at the .01 level. Student Factor 1, Instructor 
Concern, was negatively correlated with the instructor 
Factor 6, Integrativeness, which stated remedial and 
developmental courses should be housed together with non-
remedial and developmental courses. Since negatively 
correlated, instructors feel it is important to physically 
integrate remedial and developmental courses within the 
regular departments.

Out of a possible 24 correlations, a relationship was 
found in four of the correlations or 16.7% of the total 
number possible. Even though a relationship was found to be
significant between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 1, 3, 5 and 6, Special Recognition and Attentiveness, Involvement in College Life, Allowance for Success, and Classroom Adaptations, respectively, and significant at the .01 and .05 level, four relationships from a possible 24 relationships are not significant enough to warrant rejecting the null. The preponderance of evidence supports retaining $H_0^2$ as statistical data failed to reject $H_0^2$.

The content area of writing held the highest correlation coefficient of .4414, significant at the .01 level. Student factor 1, Instructor Concern, was correlated with Instructor factor 3, Involvement in College Life, with a .4060 coefficient, significant at the .01 level. The four correlations were between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and Instructor Factor 1, Special Recognition and Attentiveness, Involvement in College Life, Classroom Adaptations, and Integrativeness. Student factor 1 was negatively correlated with instructor factor 5 due to reversal of coding. This factor focuses on adjusting classroom teaching and strategies to provide as much assistance as possible. The correlations confirm the factors that students and instructors identified as important—'caringness' and a sense of 'belongingness.' Data indicated these factors were prominent in writing. Table 37 depicts the correlations.
H₀₃. There will be no relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental Mathematics courses (Basic Arithmetic, Elementary Algebra, and Intermediate Algebra) and student ratings of instructors or courses.

Statistical analysis revealed only one relationship for H₀₃ between student Factor 3, Value of Course, and instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness, of .3294, significant at the .01 level. Student Factor 3, Value of Course, indicates that the course is a waste of time, material is boring and the course makes the students feel as if they don't belong in college. Coding for the 4 items contained in Factor 3, Value of Course, was reversed since negatively worded. Instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness, contained two negatively worded items, classes should be housed apart and students need an appointment to see the instructor, and were reversed recoded. The reverse coding accounts for the correlation between the two factors as students indicated mathematics courses were valuable and should be an integral part of the regular curriculum.

A relationship was found to be significant at the .01 and .05 level of significance on these two factors. Since only one relationship or 4% was found to be significant at the .05 level from a possible 24 correlations, the preponderance of evidence supports retaining the null. Statistical analysis failed to reject H₀₃. Data are
presented in Table 38.

H₄. There will be no relationship in attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental reading courses (Basic Reading and Fundamental Reading) and student ratings of instructors or courses.

Data analysis revealed four relationships for H₄. A relationship was found between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 4, Allowance for Success, with a correlation of .3297 significant at the .05 level; between student Factor 2, Socialization, and instructor factor 6, Integrativeness, with a correlation of .3430, significant at the .05 level. Student Factor 4, Flexibility of Grades, was related to instructor Factor 3, Involvement in College Life, with a coefficient .4282, significant at the .01 level, and instructor Factor 1, Special Recognition and Attentiveness at .3571.

Four relationships from a possible 24 or 16.7% were statistically significant at the .05 level or less. The preponderance of evidence supports retaining the null. Analysis failed to reject the null. Data are presented in Table 39.

H₅. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of directors and instructors who hold strong beliefs in egalitarian philosophies and directors and instructors who hold weak beliefs in egalitarian philosophies.
Table 37
Correlation Between Average Student Rating Scores
Instructor Factor Scores in Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3062*</td>
<td>-.1093</td>
<td>-.2246</td>
<td>.0495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0881</td>
<td>-.0076</td>
<td>.0527</td>
<td>.1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4060**</td>
<td>-.1917</td>
<td>-.2240</td>
<td>-.0199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0933</td>
<td>-.0017</td>
<td>.2466</td>
<td>.1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4414**</td>
<td>-.1122</td>
<td>-.3131</td>
<td>-.0836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.3703**</td>
<td>.1867</td>
<td>.0200</td>
<td>-.2067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 40 Two-tailed test.

*P < .05  
**P < .01

The t-test for independent samples was used to test if a significant difference existed in the attitudes of directors and instructors who hold strong beliefs and directors and instructors who hold weak beliefs in open, door egalitarian philosophies at the .05 level of significance. Item numbers 10 and 11 on the directors and instructors instrument addressed this hypothesis.
Table 38

Correlation Between Average Student Rating Scores and Instructor Factor Scores in Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0617</td>
<td>.0255</td>
<td>.1677</td>
<td>-.0221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0310</td>
<td>.1078</td>
<td>.1906</td>
<td>.1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0216</td>
<td>.0195</td>
<td>-.0023</td>
<td>-.1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.0721</td>
<td>-.1427</td>
<td>.1402</td>
<td>-.0441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.0087</td>
<td>.0311</td>
<td>.0656</td>
<td>-.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.1307</td>
<td>.2232</td>
<td>.3294**</td>
<td>.1233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 67

Two-tailed test.

*p < .05

**p < .01
Table 39
Correlation Between Average Student Rating Scores and Instructor Factor Scores in Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.2288</td>
<td>.2550</td>
<td>-.0273</td>
<td>.3571*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0517</td>
<td>-.2773</td>
<td>.1596</td>
<td>-.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.2956</td>
<td>.1571</td>
<td>.2668</td>
<td>.4282**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3297*</td>
<td>-.1091</td>
<td>-.2328</td>
<td>-.1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.2156</td>
<td>-.2870</td>
<td>.0368</td>
<td>-.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.2320</td>
<td>.3430*</td>
<td>.0429</td>
<td>.3118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 33
Two-tailed test.

*p < .05
**p < .01

Item No. 10: "Open door" policies have weakened the true purpose of higher education.

Item No. 11: "Open door" policies should continue to expand to allow anyone the opportunity to attend college.

Analysis involved summing the instructors' score on these two items (Item No. 10 + Item No. 11). The maximum
plus a strongly agree code of 5 on Item No. 11. The coding scheme for Item No. 10, worded negatively, had previously been recoded to accurately reflect the responses.

A value label was determined to measure strong beliefs as opposed to weak beliefs. Scores ranging from 10 to 7 indicated strong beliefs; scores from 6 to 2 reflected weak beliefs. Instructor scores totaling 10 to 7 were placed in group 1, and scores totaling 6 through 2 were placed in group 2.

Of the six factors tested for instructors who held strong beliefs in open door policies and those who held weak beliefs in open door policies, only one factor, Factor 2, Egalitarianism, revealed a significant difference between Group 1 and Group 2. Statistical analysis indicated a $t$-value for Factor 2 of 8.53 with a probability of <.001 which was significant at the .001, .01 and .05 levels. Data revealed that a significant difference existed in instructors and directors who held strong beliefs and those who held weak beliefs in egalitarianism. Since a significant difference was found, the null hypotheses was rejected for Factor 2.

Data analysis for Factor 1 revealed a $t$ value of -.30 with a two-tailed probability of .762, Factor 3 revealed a $t$ value of .38 with a two-tailed probability of .708, Factor 4 presented a $t$ value of .38 with a two-tailed probability of .708, Factor 5 revealed a $t$ value of -1.63 with a two-tailed
probability of .106 and Factor 6 revealed a t value of .15 with a two-tailed probability of .881. In summarizing the data analysis for H₀ ², the null hypotheses was rejected for Factor 2 and retained for Factor ¹, ³, ⁴, ⁵ and ⁶. The data for analysis of H₀ ⁵ are presented in Table 40.

H₀ ⁶. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of younger (24 and under) traditional students and the attitudes of older (over 24) non-traditional students toward remedial and developmental studies.

The age range was coded on the student instrument as (A) = ages 18-24, (B) = ages 25-39, (C) = ages 40-49 and (D) = age 50 or over. The alpha codes were converted to numeric codes with A=5, B=4, C=3 and D=2. For statistical analysis of H₀ ⁶, the age variable was recoded into groups 1 and 2 as follows: Group 1 contained the age ranges from codes 4, 3, and 2 or students over age 24 who were classified as non-traditional students. Group 2 contained the students who ages fell within the 18-24 range (code A=5) or the traditional students. Group 1 contained 659 responses and Group 2 contained 2,213 responses for a total sampling size of 2,872.

The t-test for independent means was used to determine if a difference existed at the .05 level of significance between the means of traditional and non-traditional student according to the four student factors identified. The four factors were analyzed separately. Data analysis revealed a
significant difference in three out of four factors tested. A significant difference was found between the attitudes of younger students and the attitudes of older students on Factors 2, 3, and 4.

Data analysis revealed a two-tailed probability of .647 with a $t$ value of .46 for Group 1 and Group 2 on Factor 1, Instructor Concern with a level of significance at .05 with the null hypothesis being retained for Factor 1. A significant difference was found on Factor 2, Socialization, between Group 1 and Group 2 at a significance level of <.001. The null hypothesis was rejected for Factor 2 and the research hypothesis accepted. Significant differences were found between Group 1 and 2 on Factor 3, Value of Course and Factor 4, Flexibility of Grades. Factor 3 revealed a two-tailed probability of <.001 with a $t$ value of 7.00 and Factor 4 revealed a two-tailed probability of .009 with a $t$ value of -2.60. In summarization, the null hypothesis was accepted for Factor 1 and rejected for Factors 2, 3, and 4. Data are presented in Table 41.

$H_07$. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of remedial and developmental students toward regular full-time remedial and developmental instructors and instructors from integrated or other disciplines.
Table 40

Differences in the Mean Scores of Instructors Who Held Strong Beliefs and Instructors Who Held Weak Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-.0150</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.0381</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.887</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  d.f = 161  *p < .05  **p < .01  ***p < .001

Group 1 - strong beliefs  Group 2 - weak beliefs
Table 41

Differences in the Mean Scores of the Attitudes of Younger, Traditional Students and the Mean Scores of Older, Non-Traditional Students By Student Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>-.0045</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>1.164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>&lt;.001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>2213</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 2,872

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

Group 1 = Older, non-traditional students

Group 2 = Younger, traditional students
Regular full-time faculty were instructors who taught remedial and developmental courses only. Integrated instructors were those who had split appointments and taught both remedial and developmental classes. Integrated faculty also referred to programs completely integrated within the regular academic schedule. In completely integrated faculty, no labels identified instructors as remedial or developmental, as courses for remedial and developmental writing, reading, and math were taught within the writing, reading, and math departments.

Instructors and student instruments were coded to reflect this fact. A variable was labeled 'non-integrated' and coded '0' if non-integrated and coded '1' if integrated.

The t-test for independent means was used to determine if a difference existed between the means of student ratings of integrated faculty and full-time remedial and developmental faculty according to the four student factors identified.

Data analysis revealed no significant differences in courses taught by remedial and developmental faculty only and courses taught by integrated faculty at the .05 level of significance.

Factor 1 revealed a two-tailed probability of .979 and a t value of .50, Factor 2 had a two-tailed probability of .113 with a t value of -1.94, Factor 3 displayed a two-tailed probability of .874 with a t value of -.91 and Factor 4 revealed a two-tailed probability of .012 and a t value of
.53. Since no significant differences were found at the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was retained for Factors 1, 2, 3 and 4. Statistical results are displayed in Table 42.

Table 43 contains a summary of the correlations evident in Hypotheses H01, H02, H03, and H04. The results of the testings for H05, H06 and H07 and summaries are found within the text. Summaries, discussion of findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations based on the analysis of data and the review of the literature are found in Chapter 5.
Table 42
Differences in the Mean Scores of Student Ratings of Integrated Faculty and Full-time Remedial Developmental Faculty by Student Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>2-tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2202</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 2,825

*p < .05

Group 1 = non-integrated
Group 2 = integrated
### Table 43
Summary of Correlations Evident in Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Student Factor No.</th>
<th>Instructor Factor No.</th>
<th>Positive or Negative</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.2458*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.2130*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.4060*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.4414*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.3703*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3294*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.4282*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.3571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** + = positive  - = negative  
*P < .05*  
**P < .01**

**Student Factor 1** - Instructor Concern  
**Student Factor 2** - Socialization  
**Student Factor 3** - Value of Course  
**Student Factor 4** - Flexibility of Grading  
**Instructor Factor 1** - Special Recognition and Attentiveness  
**Instructor Factor 3** - Involvement in College Life  
**Instructor Factor 4** - Allowance for Success  
**Instructor Factor 5** - Classroom Adaptations  
**Instructor Factor 6** - Integrativeness
CHAPTER 5
Summaries, Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications

This chapter contains a summary, summary of findings, discussion of findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications based on the review of the literature and analysis of data.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors and courses in remedial and developmental studies. Further analyses were to determine if differences existed between the attitudes of traditional students and non-traditional students according to age, between integrated faculty and non-integrated faculty, and between instructors who held strong 'open door' beliefs policies versus weak beliefs. Seven null hypotheses were formulated to determine the degree of relationship and if significant differences existed at the .05 level of significance.

The entire population of 230 directors and full-time, adjunct or temporary instructors, teaching at least 12 hours or more in Tennessee's community colleges, was surveyed in the Fall of 1990. Two instruments were developed—one
to determine directors' and instructors' attitudes toward institutional, classroom and personal accommodation, and one for student ratings of instructors and courses. A stratified random sample of 3,269 remedial and developmental students in Tennessee's community colleges were surveyed in the Fall of 1990.

Eleven of Tennessee's community colleges, participated in the project. The twelfth community college, Northeast State Technical Community College, participated in the pilot study in April 1990, and converted to a community college effective July 1, 1990.

Community colleges that participated in the study in East Tennessee were Walters State Community College, Pellissippi State Technical Community College, Roane State Community College, Chattanooga State Technical Community College, and Cleveland State Community College. Middle Tennessee included Columbia State Community College, Motlow State Community College, and Volunteer State Community College. Dyersburg State Community College, Jackson State Community College and Shelby State Community College represented West Tennessee.

Summary of Findings

From the results of the data analysis and interpretation, the following findings are presented:

1. Factor analysis from student data resulted in identification of four student factors. These factors were
labeled Instructor Concern, Socialization, Value of Course, and Flexibility of Grading.

2. Director and instructor factor analysis resulted in identification of six director and instructor factors. These factors were labeled Special Recognition and Attentiveness, Egalitarianism, Involvement in College Life, Allowance for Success, Classroom Adaptations, and Integritiveness.

3. The results indicated no overall relationship existed between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors.

There were two positive correlations from a total of 24 possible correlations (four student factors times six instructor factors). A relationship was found between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 5, Classroom Adaptations, and student Factor 2, Socialization, and instructor Factor 6, Integritiveness.

4. Overall results indicated no relationship existed between the attitudes of instructors of remedial and developmental English (writing) and student ratings.

Three positive relationships were found from a possible 24 in writing between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 1, Special Recognition and Attentiveness; between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 3, Involvement with College Life; and between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern and instructor
Factor 5, Classroom Adaptations. A negative correlation was found between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness. The highest coefficient of .4414 was found in writing with two correlations significant at the .01 level.

5. Overall results indicated no relationship existed between the attitudes of instructors of mathematics and student ratings of instructors and courses.

Analysis revealed only one relationship from a possible 24 between student Factor 3, Value of Course, and instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness.

6. Overall results indicated no relationship existed between the attitudes of instructors of reading and student ratings of instructors and courses.

Data analysis revealed four positive relationships from a possible 24. A relationship was found between student Factor 1, Instructor Concern, and instructor Factor 4, Allowance for Success; between student factor 2, Socialization, and instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness; between student Factor 4, Flexibility of Grading, and Instructor Factor 6, Integrativeness; and between student Factor 4, Flexibility of Grading, and instructor Factor 1, Special Recognition and Attentiveness.

7. The results indicated a significant difference existed in instructors and directors who held strong egalitarian beliefs and those who held weak beliefs.
Directors and instructors who held strong egalitarian philosophies believed in 'open door' policies.

Even though there was no relationship in five out of the six tested hypotheses, a significant difference was found on the instructor factor, Egalitarianism. This factor stated that 'open door' policies should expand and that these policies have not weakened the true purpose of higher education. Since the null hypotheses were testing for this one particular factor, it was significant on this factor even though the t tests on the remaining five factors revealed no difference.

8. The results indicated a significant difference existed in the attitudes of young, traditional students, and the attitudes of older, non-traditional students. Older students, over age 24, identified the 'caring' nature of the instructor, the value of the course, and a sense that they belonged in college, more than did younger, age 24 or less, students.

9. The results indicated no significant difference existed between the attitudes of students toward integrated and non-integrated faculty.

Discussion of Findings

Roueche wrote in 1973 that the success of the community college as a social institution will depend, "in large measure, upon the success of its educational endeavors with
nontraditional students."179 This prominent author addressed the issue of the egalitarian open door policies of the two-year college. Roueche reiterated that this policy has meaning, "if, and only if, these new students are educationally accommodated. Educational accommodation implies responsibility that goes beyond 'custody' and 'cooling out' functions. . . . the community college has value to the extent it provides successful and meaningful experiences for all of its students."180

Two issues were paramount in this article regarding accommodating individual differences. The first issue is the simple notion that students can learn and the second issue has to do with teacher attitudes and expectations. Roueche remarked in this same article that the "crucial ingredient to becoming an effective instructor . . . is one who accommodates individual differences in a four-letter word: Care!"181

In reviewing the relationships that were significant, the majority of correlations were present between the student factor of Instructor Concern and the instructor factors of Special Recognition and Attentiveness, and Integrativeness. These factors focused heavily on the

'caring' and 'belongingness' notions. Instructor Concern included the following items: instructor 'cares' if student passes, wants student to do their best, helps outside classtime, tells students often they're doing a good job, encourages students to stay in school, teaches so lesson is understood, feels it is important to simply chat with students, and the instructor talks with students about other problems.

The instructor factor, Special Recognition and Attentiveness included items, such as, enjoyment of students a factor in job satisfaction, availability of instructor after work hours to counsel with students, instructors' doors being open to students, offering additional help during and after scheduled class hours, and instructors feeling responsibility for student success.

The content area of writing revealed three positive correlations on the student factor of caringness with the highest coefficient found in the content area of writing regarding instructor's showing concern, adjusting to student needs, and providing extra time and assistance. The area of reading contained the most correlations with four.

Directors, instructors, and students viewed a sense of 'belongingness' as important. The integrativeness factor stated that remedial and developmental classes should be an integral part of the college scene and not isolated. The relationship between feeling a part of the college scene and
being integrated within the whole of the institution surfaced on several factors. This factor supplements relationships that were found regarding the effect of total involvement of remedial and developmental students in extra curricular activities.

These relationships clearly demonstrate that the 'caring' factor was important to students and instructors, as well as, a feeling of 'belongingness' to the college scene. It is important to point out that a relationship between instructor concern and classroom adaptations on the part of the instructors was significant. Instructor's adaptations were noted in drawing test questions from material covered in class, allowing for student use of notes during test taking, and using peer teaching to benefit slower students. Students related this characteristic to the helpfulness and caring notions.

Students did not differentiate in their feelings toward an instructor who taught only remedial and developmental and an instructor who was from another department. The same relationships of instructor caring and concern were evident. The fact that an instructor taught only remedial or developmental course or an instructor in an integrated did not influence student ratings. It is interesting to note that students rated both types of instructors on how well they demonstrated a caring nature toward their students and the other items related to that factor.
Older, over age 24, remedial and developmental students rated instructors higher in the areas of instructor concern, value of the course, and involvement in the college scene than did their younger, age 24 and under, counterparts. This difference could probably be explained in the maturity level of older students who recognize the importance and value of getting an education, and the potential benefits. Older students would have more of an understanding of the problems they would face and the importance and impact of an understanding, supportive instructor.

The situations noted above confirm that remedial and developmental students view helpful, supportive, caring instructors, who understand their special needs, as an important element in their college experiences and successes. There is a strong tie between directors and instructors who believe in 'open door' policies and the 'second-chance' theory of giving that individual the special help to make that 'second-chance' successful.

Apart from the formal purpose statement, one of the major purposes of this study was to measure the degree of accommodation by examining attitudes of the directors and instructors and receiving feedback from the students themselves. The degree to which instructors make accommodations reflects willingness to adjust to student diversities and expectations.

The statements noted previously by Roueche and a
reflective summary of the review of literature provide the theoretical formulations for the study. Community college students, and in particular, remedial and developmental students learn in different ways and at varying rates of speed. Roueche recognized the importance of 'caring' about the students and accommodating individual needs as essential to the success of remedial and developmental programs.

**Conclusions**

As a result of the findings, the following conclusions were drawn concerning the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors and courses.

1. Students value helpfulness and the 'caring' notion of instructors as important characteristics.

2. The attitudes of directors and instructors has some effect on student ratings.

3. Student's view instructors of writing as showing more concern and helpfulness than other content areas in 'going the extra mile' to help insure their success.

4. Students view it important to have access to their instructors and directors.

5. Directors, instructors, and students feel it is important to have a sense of "belongingness" and to be an integral part of all activities of the college scene.

6. Instructors of remedial and developmental students feel responsible for student success.

7. The age of a student does have an affect on
student ratings of the instructor and the course.

8. Student ratings are not affected by whether the instructor is a full-time R/D instructor or an integrated faculty member.

9. Directors and instructors who hold strong egalitarianism philosophies believe in 'open door' policies, and that these policies have not weakened the purpose of higher education.

**Recommendations**

As a result of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Directors and other administrative personnel responsible for hiring should carefully screen potential faculty members to focus on individuals displaying a helpful, caring philosophy of teaching.

2. Instructor placement, including within-house assignments, be carefully monitored to match the qualities of helpfulness, flexibility, and empathy to meet the specific needs of remedial and developmental students.

3. Directors and instructors should closely analyze how well their programs are integrated into the regular college scene.

4. Directors should devise a plan for the maximum amount of integration, not only into regular academic curriculum, but involvement in extra curricular activities as well.
5. Remedial and developmental departments should provide in-service and counseling for all instructors regarding the special needs of remedial and developmental students.

6. Instructors of remedial and developmental students should keep abreast of current techniques and research in the area of remedial and developmental studies to aid in continuing to be successful and meeting the needs of this ever-increasing population.

7. Further research should be done to measure the importance of the affective domain in the learning environments of remedial and developmental students.

8. A state-wide study should be undertaken to determine the attitudes of remedial and developmental students toward counseling services and study skills courses, both excluded from this study.

9. A recommended study would be to replicate this project in the six regional universities under Tennessee Board of Regents' governance and compare the results with data from the community colleges.

10. Special programs should be designed and tailored for older non-traditional students to help form a cohesive unit of support.

11. There is a need to study the scoring of the two instruments to correlate with other measures of attitudinal scales.
12. While it may not be possible, or even desirable, for instructors to adjust all aspects of a course to student diversities and expectations, instructors ought to be at least aware of how they are interacting with different segments of students.

13. Instruction must be designed to permit continuous student progress and take into account the range of abilities found in remedial and developmental students.

Implications

1. As more and more older students enter community colleges and students enter with less skills, a study focusing on the attitudes of this group could influence programs in the future.

2. The results of this study can supplement and provide additional information to Tennessee Board of Regents' five-year study currently in process.

3. An inherent purpose of this study is to stimulate and aid further research on the affective domain of the remedial and developmental student.

4. Additional study of the two instruments and their underlying dimensions should be undertaken to develop further the subsidiary factors are strong enough to be isolated and used in future validation studies.

5. The instruments could be used in the traditional population to see if directors, instructors, and students respond similarly and to measure validation.
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APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN TENNESSEE AS OF 04/01/90
APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE WITH TENNESSEE BOARD OF REGENTS' CHANCELLOR
January 16, 1990

Mr. Thomas J. Garland, Chancellor
The State University and Community
College System of Tennessee
1415 Murfreesboro Road, Suite 350
Nashville, TN 37217

Dear Mr. Garland:

In the summer of 1989 I wrote to you requesting information about the successes of remedial and developmental programs in Tennessee Board of Regents' universities and community colleges. The report that was promptly forwarded, "The Effectiveness of the State Board of Regents' Academic Assessment, Placement and Remediation Program" was very useful in preparing my dissertation proposal through the Department of Educational Leadership.

The purpose of this letter is to acquaint you with the progress of the study and to request your written permission to proceed with the project. The dissertation topic focuses on "The Relationship of Instructors' and Administrators' Openness to Accommodation and Student Evaluations in Remedial and Developmental Studies at Community Colleges in Tennessee." Currently, I am in the process of developing instruments for pilot studies this spring.

Before proceeding with the study which will involve all community colleges in Tennessee and East Tennessee State University, information and cooperation will be needed from your office and the Office of Academic Affairs through Dr. Linda Doran and Dr. Bene Cox. I wish to thank you in advance for your assistance in this endeavor.

Respectfully yours,

Carolyn H. Brown
Doctoral Candidate

Charles W. Burkett, Chairman
Major Advisor
January 30, 1990

Ms. Carolyn H. Brown  
Doctoral Candidate  
East Tennessee State University  
Department of Educational Leadership  
and Policy Analysis  
Box 19000A  
Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

Dr. Charles W. Burkett, Chairman  
Department of Educational Leadership  
and Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University  
Box 19000A  
Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

Dear Ms. Brown and Dr. Burkett:

In response to your letter of January 16, I am pleased that the information which was provided you by our office with respect to TBR's remedial/developmental program proved to be helpful. I believe the dissertation topic which you describe identifies an essential assessment component, and we would certainly be happy to see copies of the developing instruments for the pilot study.

Also with respect to your request, I certainly would encourage you to discuss this matter with Dr. Doran or Dr. Cox (whom you identified in your letter). I should point out to you, however, that Dr. Peter Consacro of our Academic Affairs staff has major responsibility for assessment activities at the Tennessee Board of Regents.
Those activities include an evaluation of the effectiveness of the R/D program, and you may wish to consider whether he would be an appropriate person to discuss the matter with you.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Garland
Chancellor

cc: Dr. Linda D. Doran
    Dr. Bene’ S. Cox
    Dr. D. Peter Consacro
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO DIRECTOR SEEKING ASSISTANCE AND PERMISSION.
September 6, 1900

(Director's Name)
(Community College)
(Address of Community College)
(City, State, and Zip Code)

Dear (Name of Director):

Would you please assist me in conducting a survey in your department that would involve you as the director, full-time instructors (including adjunct or temporary teaching 12 or more hours) and one class of students taught by each of the full-time instructors.

The study focuses on the relationship between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of directors and instructors and courses. The findings of this study, conducted in community colleges across the state of Tennessee with approval of the Tennessee Board of Regents, should be important to you and your staff in providing effective programs and strategies for remedial and developmental students.

After obtaining your approval, I will be contacting you to schedule a time in October or early November to conduct the survey. I personally plan to visit each community college campus to be available in administering the survey and minimizing the amount of time required.

If you have any questions, please call me at 615-639-1036 (U) or leave a message at the numbers listed above.

Sincerely yours,

Carolyn H. Brown
Doctoral Candidate

Charles W. Burkett
Chairman
January 16, 1990

Dr. Dene Cox, Office of Academic Affairs
The State University and Community
College System of Tennessee
1415 Murfreesboro Road
Nashville, TN 37217

Dear Dr. Cox:

I am currently a doctoral candidate and an interim faculty member in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University. It is my understanding that during your fall visit to our campus, Dr. Nancy Garland spoke with you concerning my dissertation project.

The purpose of this letter is to acquaint you with the planned project and to request your assistance and cooperation in proceeding with the project. The dissertation focuses on "The Relationship of Instructors' and Administrators' Openness to Accommodation and Student Evaluations in Remedial and Developmental Studies at Community Colleges in Tennessee."

Before proceeding with the study which will involve all community colleges in Tennessee and East Tennessee State University, information is needed in the following areas to complete the proposal:

(a) Total number of remedial and developmental students enrolled either full or part-time during the fall of 1989* in Tennessee's eleven community colleges;

(b) If available, total number of R/D students enrolled either full or part-time in math, reading, writing, and study skills during fall 1989;

(c) Total number of full-time only R/D instructors (including temporary or adjunct if full-time);

(d) Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the eleven directors or acting directors at the community colleges.

*If data is not available for fall 1989, information for spring 1988 will suffice for items (a), (b), and (c) as this information is needed to estimate total population parameters and approximate sampling sizes.
I will be more than willing to answer any questions you may have about the project and to provide additional information to you. If I can be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call me at (615) 929-4430 or 929-4251 (ETSU) or 639-1036 (!!).

I look forward to working with you and your staff and wish to thank you in advance for your assistance in this endeavor.

Respectfully yours,

Carolyn H. Brown
Doctoral Candidate

Charles W. Burkett, Chairman
Major Advisor
February 27, 1990

Carolyn H. Brown
Doctoral Candidate
East Tennessee State University
Department of Educational Leadership
and Policy Analysis
Box 19000A
Johnson City, TN 37614-0002

Dear Ms. Brown:

In response to your recent letter, I am forwarding some of the information you requested. Specifically, I am enclosing information concerning:

(a) Total number of remedial and developmental students enrolled either full or part-time during the fall of 1989 in Tennessee’s eleven community colleges;

(b) The total number of Remedial/Developmental (R/D) students enrolled either full or part-time in math, reading, writing, and study skills during fall 1989; and

(c) Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the eleven directors or acting directors at the community colleges.

Other information you requested, i.e. the total number of full-time only R/D Instructors (including temporary or adjunct if full-time), is included in institutional site visit reports compiled annually for staff site visits in the fall. This information will be made available to you if you would like to visit our offices to review the site visit reports for your research.

I wish you success in your doctoral work.

Sincerely,

Dené S. Cox
Assistant Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs

enclosures
January 16, 1990

Dr. Linda Doran, Office of Academic Affairs
The State University and Community
College System of Tennessee
1415 Murfreesboro Road
Nashville, TN 37217

Dear Dr. Doran:

I am currently a doctoral candidate and an interim faculty member in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University. It is my understanding that during your fall visit to our campus, Dr. Nancy Garland spoke with you and Dr. Cox concerning my dissertation project.

The purpose of this letter is to acquaint you with the planned project and to request your assistance and cooperation in proceeding with the project. The dissertation focuses on "The Relationship of Instructors' and Administrators' Openness to Accommodation and Student Evaluations in Remedial and Developmental Studies at Community Colleges in Tennessee."

Before proceeding with the study which will involve all community colleges in Tennessee and East Tennessee State University, information is needed regarding (a) total number of remedial and developmental students enrolled either full or part-time during the fall of 1989 (if available or spring 1988) in Tennessee's eleven community colleges; (b) total number of R/D students enrolled either full or part-time in math, reading, writing, and study skills during fall 1989; (c) total number of full-time only R/D instructors (including temporary or adjunct if full-time); and (d) names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the eleven directors or acting directors at the community colleges. Information relevant to the first three items is needed to estimate total population parameters and approximate sampling sizes. Dr. Cox has been asked to provide assistance in this area.

I currently have a copy of the report, "The Effectiveness of the State Board of Regents' Academic Assessment, Placement and Remediation Program," completed for the period Fall 1986 to Spring 1987. Has a report or study been generated on R/D program effectiveness since that date? Are remedial and developmental programs working in Tennessee's community colleges? What does the latest statistics reveal?
I will be more than willing to answer any questions you may have about the project and to provide additional information to you. If I can be of any assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call me at (615) 929-4430 or 929-4251 (ETSU) or 639-1036 (II).

I look forward to working with you and your staff and wish to thank you in advance for your assistance in this endeavor.

Respectfully yours,

Carolyn H. Brown
Doctoral Candidate

Charles W. Burkett, Chairman
Major Advisor
APPENDIX E

PILOT STUDY INSTRUMENT FOR DIRECTORS AND INSTRUCTORS
DATA SHEET

DIRECTORS AND INSTRUCTORS

Please check ( ) the appropriate spaces below.

1. Sex:  ____ Male  ____ Female

2. Age Range:  ____ 20-30  ____ 31-40  ____ 41-50  ____ Over 50

3. Classification of your current position:
   ____ Administrator (Director)  ____ Instructor/Teacher
   If administrator or director checked, are you also a teaching professor?  ____ Yes  ____ No

4. How many years experience have you had as the following?
   ____ Administrator (Director)  ____ Instructor/Teacher
   ____ Number of years  ____ Number of years

5. Primary area of assignment: (Select only one)
   (a) English Composition
      ____ Basic Writing  ____ Fundamentals of Composition
   (b) Mathematics
      ____ Basic Arithmetic  ____ Elementary Algebra  ____ Intermediate Algebra
   (c) Reading
      ____ Basic Reading  ____ Fundamentals of Reading
   (d) Other
      ____ Other (please specify)

6. Highest level of education:
   ____ Bachelor's  ____ Master's  ____ Education Specialist
   ____ Doctorate
**DIRECTORS AND INSTRUCTORS EVALUATION**

**OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES**

**DIRECTIONS:** Below are 40 statements relating to your educational philosophies regarding remedial and developmental studies. Mark your responses on the answer form provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly [AS]</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree [A]</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree [DS]</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree strongly [DS]</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion [NO]</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**A. PHILOSOPHY:** (Both Directors and Instructors complete this section)

**Institutional Accommodation**

Mark your responses on the answer form provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The &quot;open door&quot; policies of community colleges have provided many opportunities for students otherwise denied admission.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot;Open door&quot; policies have weakened or undermined the true purpose of higher education.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;Open door&quot; policies should continue to expand to allow anyone the opportunity to attend college regardless of his abilities.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that 90% or more of all students can learn at a mastery level what has been taught, given sufficient time and appropriate help.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The goals of education should be dictated by students' interests and needs, as well as by the larger demands of society.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is my responsibility as a remedial and developmental director or instructor to help each student reach his maximum potential.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The true value of education is arranging learning so that the student can build up a store house of knowledge that he can use in the future.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS: (Teaching Directors and Instructors complete this section)

(Classroom Accommodation)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. The curriculum should consist of subject matter to be learned and skills to be acquired.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I assign readings a chapter at a time and ask students to complete the questions at the end of the chapter.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Provisions are made for a student to accelerate through program requirements.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. During class lecture I intermittently paraphrase difficult text material as students follow along in their textbooks.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Students receive ample feedback on their progress in the course.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Supplemental learning opportunities are provided (e.g., tutorial assistance, peer teaching, after-class hours for conferences, etc.).</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. College level students should be able to work independently of the instructor and peers.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Remedial and developmental classes should be held to 15 students or less.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Students who have trouble with coursework could improve their grade by completing homework even though they did not complete it accurately.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I provide the students with a review sheet to aid in test taking.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Test questions are drawn from reading assignments are not always discussed in class.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Accuracy is the most important element in any assignment.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am available during test taking to clarify any questions the students may have.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I believe in peer teaching and ask the more capable students to work in pairs with those having difficulty.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I ignore a student in class who has his head down on his desk.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I frequently allow students to use their notes during a test and offer assistance.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Institutional Accommodation Continued)

8. Education and educational institutions must be sources of new social ideas; education must be a social program undergoing continual reconstruction. A B C D E

9. The backbone of remedial and developmental studies is subject matter. A B C D E

10. It is my responsibility to do all within my power to see that a student is successful; if a student fails or drops out, I have failed. A B C D E

11. Students in remedial and developmental classes are involved in all aspects of community college life—sports, honors day, fraternities, etc. A B C D E

12. Remedial and developmental classes should be physically housed apart from the other students. A B C D E

13. Too many extra-curricular activities deprive remedial and developmental students of vital study time. A B C D E

14. Sports and other extra-curricular activities are normally for the average or above average student. A B C D E

15. Cut-off scores requiring students to enroll in remedial and developmental classes are strictly enforced. A B C D E

16. Remedial and developmental classes should be an integral part of the college curriculum (example: remedial math should be housed in the regular math department). A B C D E

17. Sports and other extra-curricular activities often provide the incentive for remedial and developmental students to remain in college. A B C D E

18. Students in remedial and developmental courses should not be graded as stringently as other students. A B C D E

19. Exceptions and waivers are granted exempting students from remedial and developmental classes on an individual basis. A B C D E
c. PERSONAL ACCOMMODATION: (Both Directors and Instructors complete this section)

36. Students must make an appointment to see me other than scheduled class time................. A  B  C  D  E

37. Instructors should frequently outline textbook chapters on the board or provide a written outline of material to aid poor readers........ A  B  C  D  E

38. I listen sympathetically to complaints and very often simply chat with the students................. A  B  C  D  E

39. If a student appears to be having difficulty in coursework or experiencing personal problems, I ask if I can be of help............... A  B  C  D  E

40. Alternatives and other courses of actions are discussed with students who are having difficulty early in the semester................. A  B  C  D  E

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F

SCANTRON ANSWER FORM 3200
APPENDIX G

PILOT STUDY INSTRUMENT FOR STUDENTS
Please mark the appropriate spaces below.

1. Sex:  ____ Male  ____ Female


3. Classification: (Check only one)

   ____ First-time freshman
   (No prior college)
   ____ Sophomore
   Transfer Student
   ____ Freshman
   ____ Sophomore

   Special Student
   ____ Visiting Student
   ____ Other (Please specify) _____________________________

4. Current Enrollment Status:

   ____ Full-time
   ____ Part-time

5. Are you currently enrolled in classes other than remedial
   or developmental studies courses?  ____ Yes  ____ No
STUDENT EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE

Name of College:_________________________________________

Course Name: ___________________________Course #:__________

Check one: _______ Remedial (Basic) or Developmental _______

------------------------------------------------------------------

Below is a list of statements to help you rate the instructor and course in which you receive this form. Answer each question in terms of how you feel about the instructor and the course.

DIRECTIONS:

MARK your responses from agree strongly (A) to disagree strongly (D). If you have no opinion, mark (E).

| Agree strongly | A |
| Agree          | B |
| Disagree       | C |
| Disagree strongly | D |
| No Opinion (NO) | E |

THIS IS NOT AN INTELLIGENCE TEST. THE CHOICES YOU MAKE WILL IN NO WAY AFFECT YOUR GRADE IN ANY COURSE.
MARK YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED FROM AGREE STRONGLY (A) TO DISAGREE STRONGLY (D). IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, MARK (E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Sometimes this course makes me doubt the value of a college education.</th>
<th>A B C D E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. I can do extra credit in this course to improve my grade.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. This course has helped me understand the problems I face in getting an education.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Most students do not enjoy this class.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The material covered by this course is interesting.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. This course helps me to learn proper conduct as a college student.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tests are given over if most of us do poorly.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The instructor encourages me to stay in school.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. This course teaches me to be a better person.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Grading is done strictly by the rules.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. This instructor goes over and over material until we understand it.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The instructor helps me with assignments outside of regular class time.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The things I have learned in this class are useful.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Not everyone does the same assignment during class time.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I can express my opinion in this class.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Grades are sometimes curved if everyone in the class did poorly on a test.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Most of the things I learn in this course are useless.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. This instructor makes me do my very best.</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARK YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED FROM AGREE STRONGLY (A) TO DISAGREE STRONGLY (D). IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, MARK (E).

1. This course has taught me a great deal. ............... A B C D E
2. Having to take this course makes me feel like I do not belong in college. ......................... A B C D E
3. I can talk with this instructor about other problems I'm having in school. ........................ A B C D E
4. The material covered is boring. ..................... A B C D E
5. The instructor provides study guides for tests. .... A B C D E
6. Most students don't like this course .............. A B C D E
7. The instructor treats the students well .......... A B C D E
8. I believe this instructor really cares about whether I pass or fail this course .......... A B C D E
9. This course helps me feel that I belong in college .................. A B C D E
10. This instructor helps me during classtime when I have trouble with my work .......... A B C D E
11. This course is not as good as most people say it is ....................... A B C D E
12. This instructor puts me down if I make a mistake .. A B C D E
13. The instructor teaches in such a way that I understand the lesson .................. A B C D E
14. This instructor tells me often that I am doing a good job .................. A B C D E
15. Most students enjoy this course .................. A B C D E
16. I use things I learn in this course to help me with my other course work .......... A B C D E
17. My grades are better in this class than my other classes .................. A B C D E
APPENDIX H

PERMISSION LETTER FOR PILOT STUDY
April 12, 1990

Ms. Carolyn H. Brown
Department of Educational Leadership
and Policy Analysis
P.O. Box 19000A
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN 37614-0002

Dear Ms. Brown:

This is to approve your request to work with our Developmental Studies Department in a pilot study or field test. This approval assumes that you are able to work out the details of administering these instruments with Mr. Chris Lefler. Please feel free to contact Mr. Lefler at 282-0000, extension 366.

Best wishes to you in your study and the completion of your degree.

Sincerely,

R. Wade Powers
President

cc: Chris Lefler

TRI-CITIES STATE TECHNICAL INSTITUTE IS AN INSTITUTION OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF TENNESSEE ACCREDITED BY THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGES OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS TO AWARD ASSOCIATE DEGREES
APPENDIX I

ASSESSMENT FORMS FOR PILOT STUDY INSTRUMENTS

OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES
STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

DIRECTIONS:
Please answer the following questions about the survey form you just completed:

(1) Would you have filled out this form if you had not been asked? Yes  ____ No ___  It got why not? ________________

(2) Were the directions clear? Yes  ____ No ___

(3) Are there questions on the form you didn't understand? Yes  ____ No  ____ List the number of the question(s) you didn't understand. ________________________

(4) Were there words on the form you didn't know? Yes  ____ No ____ Circle the words you didn't know on the survey form.

(5) Were there too many questions? Yes  ____ No  ____

(6) Do you feel it took too much time for you to fill it out? Yes  ____ No  ____

(7) List number(s) of question(s) you would take out. ________________________

(8) Is there a question you feel should be asked? If so, what other question(s) should be asked? ________________________

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY OTHER COMMENTS YOU MAY HAVE ON THE BACK OF THIS FORM. THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP.
DIRECTORS AND INSTRUCTORS

ASSESSMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. Comments concerning the effectiveness of the cover letter:
   (e.g., in your opinion did the cover letter motivate you to
   complete the form, if not, do you have suggestions to help
   stimulate a response).

2. Comments concerning the survey form:
   Format and layout_________________
   Understandability_________________
   Ease of use_________________
   Questions that should be eliminated (list number(s) __________
   Questions (areas of content relating to philosophy, instruction, or classroom techniques or strategies) that
   should be included)_________________

3. Length of time to complete the form: (Specify the
   approximate number of minutes) __________

PLEASE PROVIDE ANY OTHER COMMENTS YOU MAY HAVE ON THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE AND TIME.
APPENDIX J
DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION
OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES
DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION
OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

East Tennessee State University
College of Education
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
Box 19000A
Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002
Telephone: (615) 929-4415, 4430

Copyright Carolyn H. Brown 1991

Carolyn H. Brown
Doctoral Candidate
DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

The purpose of this study is to determine if a relationship exists between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors and courses. The findings of this study, conducted in community colleges across the state of Tennessee, should prove important to you as you continue to meet the needs of remedial and developmental students.

DIRECTIONS: MARK ALL RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED. MAKE DARK MARKS (■) AND SELECT EITHER A, B, C, D OR E. DO NOT WRITE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. USE A #2 PENCIL.

After completing the DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR DATA SHEET (statements No. 1-9), continue to the next page. The statements that follow are designed to determine your attitude toward institutional, classroom, and personal accommodation as it relates to remedial and developmental studies.

CONTINUE TO MARK YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED BEGINNING WITH STATEMENT NO. 10 THROUGH NO. 45.

MARK YOUR OPINIONS FROM AGREE STRONGLY (A) TO DISAGREE STRONGLY (D). IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, MARK (E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly (AS)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Disagree strongly (DS)</th>
<th>No opinion (NO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR DATA SHEET

NAME OF COLLEGE: ____________________________________________________________

PLEASE MARK YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED. LEAVE THE I.D. NUMBER
SECTION BLANK.

1. SEX: (A) Male (B) Female

2. AGE RANGE: (A) 20-30 (B) 31-40 (C) 41-50 (D) Over 50

3. CLASSIFICATION OF YOUR CURRENT POSITION:
   (A) Full-time Director (Administrator)   (B) Director/Instructor   (C) Professor/Instructor

4. NUMBER OF YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN YOUR CURRENT POSITION:
   (A) 0-5  (B) 6-10  (C) 11-15  (D) 16-20  (E) OVER 21
   Full-time directors or administrators, skip to Item No. 9.

5. PRIMARY AREA OF ASSIGNMENT: (Select only one)
   (A) English Composition (Writing)  (B) Mathematics  (C) Reading

6. CLASSIFICATION: (Select for the course currently being evaluated)
   (A) Remedial or (B) Developmental
   If remedial, complete Question 7; if developmental, complete Question 8.

7. CONTENT AREA: (Remedial)
   (A) Basic Writing (English)  (B) Basic Mathematics  (C) Basic Reading

8. CONTENT AREA: (Developmental)
   (A) Developmental English
   (B) Developmental Math (Elementary Algebra or Intermediate Algebra)
   (C) Developmental Reading or Fundamentals of Reading
   (D) Other (please specify)

9. HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION:
   (A) Bachelors  (B) Bachelors + 30/45  (C) Masters  (D) Specialist  (E) Doctorate
A. INSTITUTIONAL ACCOMMODATION
(Directors and instructors complete STATEMENTS NO. 10 - 24.)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>&quot;Open door&quot; policies have weakened the true purpose of higher education</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>&quot;Open door&quot; policies should continue to expand to allow anyone the opportunity to attend college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ninety percent (90%) or more of all students can learn at a mastery level given sufficient time and appropriate help</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The true value of education is arranging learning so that the student can acquire knowledge for future use</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Educational institutions must undergo continuous change to meet societal needs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The backbone of remedial and developmental studies (R/D) is subject matter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Students in (R/D) classes should be involved in all aspects of community college life (sports, honors day, fraternities, etc.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>(R/D) classes should be housed apart from non (R/D) classes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Extra-curricular activities deprive (R/D) students of vital study time</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Sports and extra-curricular activities are for the average or above-average student</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Cut-off scores for placement in (R/D) classes should be strictly enforced</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>(R/D) classes should be an integral part of the college curriculum (example: remedial math should be housed in the regular math department)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Sports and extra-curricular activities often provide the incentive for (R/D) students to remain in college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Students in (R/D) courses should not be graded as stringently as non-(R/D) students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Waivers are granted for placement in (R/D) on an individual basis</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. CLASSROOM ACCOMMODATION:
(Reporting Directors and Instructors complete STATEMENTS NO. 25 - 38).

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Chapter readings are assigned for homework with completion of the questions at the end of the chapter</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Provisions should be made for students to accelerate through program requirements</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Difficult material covered during lectures is retaught for student comprehension</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Students should receive ample (weekly) feedback on their progress in the course</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Supplemental learning opportunities are provided (tutorial assistance, computer instruction, and after-class conferences)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>(R/D) students should be capable of working independently of the instructor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>(R/D) classes should be held to 15 student or less</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Students who are having difficulty could improve their grade by completing extra assignments</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Students should be provided with a review sheet to aid in test taking</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Test questions could be drawn from material not discussed in class</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Instructors should be available during test taking to clarify questions that may arise</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Peer teaching by more capable students can be beneficial to slower students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Students should be allowed to use notes during test taking</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Instructors should outline textbook material to aid poor readers</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue to next Page→
C. PERSONAL ACCOMMODATION:
(Both Directors and Instructors complete STATEMENTS NO. 39 - 45).

39. Students must make an appointment to see me other than scheduled times.

40. It is important to simply chat with the students.

41. If a student appears to be having difficulty with coursework or personal problems, the instructor should offer further help.

42. Instructors should be available after regularly scheduled hours to counsel with students.

43. It is my responsibility to do all within my power to see that a student is successful.

44. Directors’ and instructors’ doors should be open to students.

45. Enjoyment derived from working with (R/D) students is a major factor in job satisfaction.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:


5
APPENDIX K

STUDENT EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL

INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE
STUDENT EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE
STUDENT EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE

DIRECTIONS: MARK ALL RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED. MAKE DARK MARKS (■■■) AND SELECT EITHER A, B, C, D, OR E. DO NOT WRITE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. USE A #2 PENCIL.

After completing the STUDENT DATA FORM, continue on to the next page. The statements that follow are designed to help you rate the instructor and course in which you receive this form. Please read each question carefully and respond in terms of how you FEEL about the instructor and the course.

CONTINUE TO MARK YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED. MARK YOUR OPINIONS FROM AGREE STRONGLY (A) TO DISAGREE STRONGLY (D). IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, MARK (E).

| Agree strongly (AS) .......... A |
| Agree (A) ..................... B |
| Disagree (D) ................. C |
| Disagree strongly (DS) ....... D |
| No Opinion (NO) .............. E |

NOTE: THIS IS NOT AN INTELLIGENCE TEST. THE CHOICES YOU MAKE WILL IN NO WAY AFFECT YOUR GRADE IN ANY COURSE. IT IS YOUR PERSONAL OPINION THAT IS BEING SOUGHT.
STUDENT DATA FORM

NAME OF COLLEGE: ____________________________________________________________

MARK YOUR RESPONSES ( ) ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED BEGINNING WITH ITEM
1. SELECT EITHER A, B, C, D, OR E. LEAVE THE I.D. NUMBER SECTION BLANK.

1. SEX: (A) Male  (B) Female

2. AGE RANGE: (A) 18-24  (B) 25-39  (C) 40-49  (D) Over 50

3. CURRENT STANDING: (Mark only one)
   (A) First-time freshman  (C) Freshman transfer
   (B) Sophomore  (D) Sophomore transfer

4. CLASSIFICATION: (Select for the course currently being evaluated)
   (A) REMEDIAL  OR  (B) DEVELOPMENTAL
   If remedial, complete Question 5; if developmental, complete Question 6.

5. CONTENT AREA: (Remedial)
   (A) Basic Writing (English)  (B) Basic Mathematics  (C) Basic Reading

6. CONTENT AREA: (Developmental)
   (A) Developmental English
   (B) Developmental Math (Elementary Algebra or Intermediate Algebra)
   (C) Developmental Reading or Fundamentals of Reading
   (D) Other (please specify)
MARK YOUR OPINIONS FROM AGREE STRONGLY (A) TO DISAGREE STRONGLY (D). IF YOU HAVE NO OPINION, MARK (E). MAKE DARK MARKS ( □ ). CONTINUE TO MARK YOUR RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED BEGINNING WITH ITEM #7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Agree (B)</th>
<th>Disagree (C)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>This course has taught me a great deal</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Having to take this course makes me feel like I don't belong in college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I can talk with this instructor about personal problems I'm having in school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The material covered is boring</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The instructor provides a study guide (review sheet) to help with tests</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>This course is a waste of time</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The instructor treats the students well</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I believe this instructor really cares about whether I pass or fail this course</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>This course helps me feel I can make it in college</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>This instructor helps me during class time when I have trouble with my work</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The instructor teaches in such a way that I understand the lessons</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>This instructor tells me often that I am doing a good job</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>This instructor encourages me to take part in college life (sports, talent shows, fraternities, other events)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I learn things in this course that help me with my other course work</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My grades are better in this class than classes outside this department</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARK YOUR OPINIONS FROM AGREE STRONGLY (A) TO DISAGREE STRONGLY (E). IF YOU
HAVE NO OPINION, MARK (E). MAKE DARK MARKS ( * ) AND CONTINUE TO MARK YOUR
RESPONSES ON THE ANSWER FORM PROVIDED BEGINNING WITH ITEM #22.

22. I can do extra credit in this course to improve
my grade .................................................................................

23. This course has helped me understand the problems I
face in getting an education ......................................................

24. The material covered by this course is interesting ..............

25. In this course I have learned how to conduct myself as
a successful college student ......................................................

26. The instructor encourages me to stay in school .........................

27. The director or instructor's door is open if I need to
talk to them ...............................................................................

28. Grading is no different in this course from courses
outside this department ............................................................

29. This instructor goes over and over material until
we understand it ........................................................................

30. The instructor helps with assignments outside of
regular class time ......................................................................

31. When I learn something quicker than the others, I can
move on ......................................................................................

32. Grades are sometimes curved if everyone in the class did
poorly on a test ........................................................................

33. Students should be allowed to use their class notes
during test taking ....................................................................

34. This instructor wants me to do my very best .........................

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: ______________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX L

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING SURVEY FORMS
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING SURVEY FORMS

Your assistance is sought in conducting a state-wide survey of the relationship between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors and courses.

WHO:
Directors (including coordinators and supervisors), full-time, adjunct, and part-time instructors teaching 12 or more hours in remedial or developmental studies.

WHAT:
Directors and instructors will complete the DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES. Instructors will administer the student form, STUDENT EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE to ONE of their classes. All students in that class will be surveyed.

AREAS:
Six major areas of remedial and developmental studies: (1) REMEDIAL math, (2) writing (English), (3) reading, and (4) DEVELOPMENTAL math, (5) reading, and (6) writing (English). Study skills courses are excluded.

TIME:
0-10 minutes for students; 10-12 minutes for instructors and directors with instructors completing the form simultaneously with the students.

ASSISTANCE:
The assistance of the director, department chairs, or supervisors will be needed to achieve a balance between the number of remedial classes surveyed and the number of developmental classes surveyed. Attempts should be made to balance the six areas.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:
The name of the college listed at the beginning of the DATA SHEETS (pg. 0 2) should be left blank. DO NOT WRITE ON THE BOOKLETS. Directors, instructors, and students are to leave the identification section on the ANSWER FORM blank. Individual social security numbers are not to be used.

COMPLETION:
Students and instructors should remove the answer forms (if inside) the booklets. The instructor should place their answer form on top. A collection procedure will be determined by supervisors or directors. If forms are to be mailed, return to Ms. Carolyn H. Brown at the address shown on the booklet cover. If you have any questions, call (w) 929-4430 or (h) 639-1036.

October 1990 THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING SURVEY FORMS

Your assistance is needed in conducting a state-wide survey of the relationship between the attitudes of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors and courses.

WHO:
Directors (including coordinators and supervisors), full-time, adjunct, and part-time instructors teaching 12 or more hours in R/D studies or full-time faculty members from the math, reading, English, or other department teaching at least one section of R/D. Instructors in the latter category will need to place an "I" for "integrated" on the Scantron answer form in the space marked "Subject" on the right-hand side.

WHAT:
Directors and instructors will complete the DIRECTOR AND INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES. Instructors will administer the student form, STUDENT EVALUATION OF REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL INSTRUCTOR OR COURSE to ONE of their classes. All students in that class will be surveyed.

AREAS:
Six major areas of remedial and developmental studies: (1) REMEDIAL math, (2) writing (English), (3) reading, and (4) DEVELOPMENTAL math, (5) reading, and (6) writing (English). STUDY SKILLS COURSES ARE EXCLUDED. Caution students to mark only one for Question # 4. If remedial, complete question # 5 and leave # 6 blank. If developmental, complete # 6 and leave # 5 blank.

TIME:
6-10 minutes for students; 10-12 minutes for instructors completing the form simultaneously with the students.

ASSISTANCE:
The assistance of the director or area coordinators will be needed to achieve a balance between the number of remedial classes surveyed versus developmental classes surveyed.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS
The name of the college listed at the beginning of the DATA SHEETS (pg. 2) should be left blank. DO NOT WRITE ON THE BOOKLETS. Directors, instructors, and students are to leave the identification section on the ANSWER FORM blank. Individual social security numbers are not to be used.

COMPLETION:
A collection procedure will be determined by the director or area coordinators. If forms are to be mailed, return to Ms. Carolyn H. Brown at the address shown on the booklet cover. If you have any questions, call (w) 615-929-4430 or (h) 615-639-1036.

November 1990   THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX M

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD INFORMED CONSENT

FORM NO. 106
PROJECT TITLE: The Relationship Between the Attitudes of Directors and Instructors of Remedial and Developmental Studies in Community Colleges in Tennessee and Student Ratings.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn Hawkins Brown

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed the above-titled project on (date) 4-18-90 with respect to the rights and safety of human subjects, including matters of informed consent and protection of subject confidentiality, and finds the project acceptable to the Board.
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn Hawkins Brown

TITLE OF PROJECT: The Relationship Between the Attitudes of Directors and Instructors of Remedial and Developmental Studies in Community Colleges in Tennessee and Student Ratings.

1. Indicated below are the (a) purposes of this study, (b) the procedures to be followed and (c) the approximate duration of this study.

The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between the attitude of directors and instructors and student ratings of instructors/courses. Directors and instructors will be asked to complete a survey form which should take no more than 30 minutes; students will be randomly surveyed and asked to complete a survey form which should take no more than 15-20 minutes. The approximate duration of the study is nine months.

2. Discomforts, inconveniences, and/or risks that can reasonably be expected are:

Expected inconveniences and/or risks are minimal. Information is being sought through a survey. The study is not an experiment; variables are not manipulated.

I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the possible related risks involved. If I have any further questions about this study, I understand that I can call CAROLYN H. BROWN at (615) 639-1036 or can be reached at home (615) 639-1036 who will try to answer any additional questions that I might have. I understand that I will receive a copy of this form to read at leisure.

I also understand that while my rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and the ETSU Institutional Review Board do have free access to any information obtained in this study should it become necessary and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that I may withdraw at any time without prejudice to me. I also understand that while East Tennessee State University does not provide compensation for medical treatment other than emergency first aid for any physical injury which may occur as a result of my participation in this study, claims arising against ETSU or any of its agents or employees may be submitted to the Tennessee Claims Commission for disposition to the extent allowable as provided under TCA Section 9-8-307. Further information concerning this may be obtained from the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board.

Date ____________________________ Signature of Volunteer

Date ____________________________ Signature of Parents or Guardian

Date ____________________________ Signature of Witness (if applicable)

Date ____________________________ Signature of Investigator
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