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Comparison of Student Responses in Columbus Technical Institute Follow-Up Study with Present Study.
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

For most of their history, American colleges and universities have educated ministers, doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, agriculturalists, and home economists for the professions. During the past sixty years, the public vocational schools have slowly taken on the training of workers who desire industry, farming, selling, homemaking, and other such occupations. But the advent of Sputnik and the ensuing avalanche of technological events and information which accumulated in the decade of the sixties have created a new and different demand: many highly skilled and technically educated people. These are people with technical knowledge and skills of a different nature from those needed by tradesman, engineers, scientists, or professional workers. As Roy Roberts defined it: "This area of work is known as technical, and workers in these occupations are termed technicians, laboratory assistants, production supervisors, and other similar titles."¹

Post-secondary two-year technical college programs offering associate degrees have been established throughout the United States in order to meet this need and challenge. However, the educational

theories and practices of the institutions in the United States, including the technical colleges, have been "put to the wall" by forces from without and within: The John Holt and Ivan Illich anti-school philosophy, race demands, the Viet Nam War, the narcotics program, student and civil unrest, and many more of which the loss of faith in technology is not the least. These issues have posed many questions and forced educators to take another look at themselves and their objectives. This, in turn, has placed special responsibilities upon the shoulders of general educators. One such responsibility was stated clearly by Dr. Grant Venn in Man, Education, and Work:

...The most significant aspect of the new technology is described by the word "change." It is not simply a case of new sets of social and economical relationships replacing older ones, but of the new ones themselves being replaced at a faster and faster rate, with only those adapted to change surviving. This concept of change is not new; what is new is the change in the rate of change.

...The traditional tools of the art have been vastly augmented by the development of data processing, linear programming, system analysis and simulation...The nation's task is to make certain that the human promise is not lost to the economic promise of technology.

Although the technical colleges have responded to meet the needs of the technological society, their faculties, especially general educators, must be sure that these colleges respond to meet the needs of the individual also. Most vocational and technical educators have defined general education as that education which all students

received as necessary to life, and vocational and technical education as that specific body of information and training needed to ply a trade or vocation. Countering this definition of liberal education, general educator Daniel Bell has said:

Liberal education, for me, is more than the cultivation of the humanities although it is certainly that. It is an emphasis on the grounds of knowledge. For this reason I reject the commonly made distinction between general education as dealing with broad relationships and specialized instruction as presenting detailed material within an organized discipline. The relevant distinction, I feel, lies in the way a subject is introduced. When a subject is presented as received doctrine or as fact, it becomes an aspect of specialization and technique. When it is introduced with an awareness of its contingency and of the conceptual frame that guides its organization, the student can then proceed with the necessary self-consciousness that keeps his mind open to possibility and to re-orientation. All knowledge, thus, is liberal (that is, it enlarges and liberates the mind) when it is committed to continuing inquiry.

By its very nature, this charge lay heaviest with the humanities of which language is chief. It is through language that education becomes liberating or enslaving. Though so trained and so charged, not to allow the language programs to become mere oil for the machinery of the technologies, the communication skills, language arts, speech or English instructors are confronted with an antithetical philosophy in the technical colleges: They meet with Dr. Ingram's definition of general education, especially of language arts, as a necessary "by-product". In an address to vocational educators,

---

3Roberts, Vocational and Practical Arts Education, p. 12.
Dr. Ingram stated:

The public's growing trend of expecting education to do all things for all people is responsible for the notion, expressed by some educators, that every vocational course should include units on grammar, penmanship, spelling, good manners, and the like. These are important areas of instruction and should not be neglected by our schools. However, in a vocational course, these competencies should remain by-products rather than incorporated as planned units of the instructional program. 5

Although many feel that the language arts program must be allowed to be the "blood" of human communication and subsequent behavior and a co-partner with technical studies in the technical colleges, many do not.

Because of this and because of the rapid growth of the two-year technical college, are the colleges' philosophies too varied, resulting in incongruent language arts programs; are these colleges and programs of varied types, resulting in a diverseness in quality of training of their student graduates? Further, is there a failure of the four-year institutions to provide properly trained language arts instructors? Is there an equally serious failure of publishers to provide necessary and appropriate texts? And is there a student and employer dissatisfaction with the language arts program in the two-year technical colleges? If the answer to all or a few of these questions is "yes", the language arts programs of the two-year technical colleges suffer the anguish of the vocational high school.

programs—no identity. It would mean that no one— the college teacher trainer, the administrator, the textbook writer, the individual instructor—possesses the objective guidelines necessary for teaching the communicative skills within the two-year technical colleges or the secondary vocational high schools.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The problem that this study attempted to answer can be stated thus: What is the identity of the language arts program in the Ohio two-year technical colleges and what will it be? As Donald Snepp has put it:

> The phenomenal growth of the two-year college in America may well be one of the most significant educational events of the twentieth century, and it is our unique privilege and responsibility to exert our influence upon these comparatively early, formative, and crucial years...Inherent in this situation lies what I feel to be the two-year college instructor’s main obligation—a willingness and desire to constantly interpret and react to change.7

Change is a fact of the times and it is especially true in the two-year colleges. However, before one could recommend change, the existing programs needed to be appraised. What is the identity and status of the communicative skills as perceived by the instructors, administrators, students, and employers? Is the language arts programs of the technical colleges in Ohio adequate. Does change need

---


to be made? If so, what kind? These were a few of the questions one needed to answer in examining the programs for evidence that they were fulfilling the demands for relevant and improved instruction for the students. Suggested courses of study, authoritative opinion, and textbooks attempted to provide direction. "However, there is another dimension which must not be overlooked: the perceptions of those persons involved. Instructional improvement is dependent upon the personal growth and development of the individual teacher." Instructors teach what they are and as they perceive themselves to be interacting with reality. Thus, "in order to help the teacher improve his program, one must first know his perceptions, then work in terms of changing his perceptions by helping him develop professional skills, knowledge, and understanding. Not only was teacher perception crucial, but administrative perceptions became important also in determining expectations." Recent research suggested that educational innovation is enhanced or inhibited by attitudes and behaviors of those in leadership positions. Equally crucial were the perceptions of the student

---


10Schoen, Perceptions, p. 8.

and employer. Technical students can see little value in an academic subject like English unless it is specifically related to their career area. Yet research on employers indicated that the technicians were severely handicapped by the lack of ability to communicate. But no matter what the convictions of the instructors and administrators, it was the perceptions of the students and employers that the instructors and administrators had to satisfy by a positive fulfillment or a convinced changing. For example, if the communicative skills training in the technical colleges was perceived merely as acquiring basic skills needed for employment, the program reflected a different orientation than when it was viewed as instruction in the total human communicative process needed for a harmonious and democratic society of happy and enlightened citizens.

Attitudes, perceptions, and values often become difficult to identify. However, by studying the objective situation of the language arts education in the technical colleges of Ohio, it was assumed that perceptual variables may be inferred. Regardless of what instructors, administrators, students, and employers verbalized, how they actually perceived language should be revealed by the types of programs one finds in operation. This should relate the present

---


identity of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges and the reasons for it. By making comparisons and contrasts on scope and adequacy as established by research studies, curriculum committees, catalogues courses, syllabi, accrediting organizations, textbooks, and authoritative perceptions, one should learn what the identity should be and why.

To interpret perceptions as revealed by the status of the language arts in the two-year colleges and to know how to implement change, it became imperative that one secure recent data.

The following questions were used to secure the information which would provide the necessary data:

1. What is the training and professional experience of the language arts instructors in the Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs?

2. What are their professional responsibilities?

3. What language arts programs are offered in the various technical colleges?

4. How extensive and how adequate are the programs?

5. What types of instructional materials are used and are they adequate?

6. How available and how adequate are the facilities?

7. What are some of the major problems in the language arts programs?
One such study has been made upon the two-year technical college; however, it was a study based almost exclusively upon industrial perceptions.

The need for an effective English program is nowhere more apparent than in the offerings of the technical schools that responded to the questionnaire. It is for that reason that this paper will satisfy the demands of industry.

Because this study violated the very purpose of general education and thereby weakened the language arts program and its effectiveness in the technical colleges, a four-way base study needed to be made: A study that answers the aforementioned questions and formulates the general lines of identity of the language arts in the two-year technical colleges from the perceptions of the colleges, the instructors, the students, and the industries.

This study attempted to reveal what the colleges really offer in their respective curriculums; by finding out what various instructors teach, what they feel they should teach, what they think of their texts, how they perceive themselves and what they teach, and what changes they recommend. This data was compiled, compared, and contrasted. The comparison and contrast was then matched with the perceptions of the students and employers and they with each other. The administrators, students, and instructors were asked much the same questions with a difference in slant. Industries, were asked

---

if they were satisfied with the technical training of hired graduates from the technical colleges and with the language arts training these employees received; and they also were asked what changes in the language arts of technical education would they recommend.

Since California was the first state to have a wide and successful two-year college program with a great emphasis upon technical training, the language arts curriculum of the Ohio Colleges was compared and contrasted with that of the California colleges. Thus, the study established some lines of identity—an identity that was there and an identity of what should be there—from which other needed studies might successfully embark; for example, studies that would help provide improvement in the designing and administering two-year curriculums, the training of two-year language arts instructors, and preparing of appropriate texts for the language arts program of the two-year technical colleges.

ASSUMPTIONS TESTED

The major assumptions of this study were as follows:

1. That colleges and universities ill equip instructors to teach in two-year technical colleges.

2. That it is nearly impossible for the instructor to obtain the
skills he needs because there is no coordinated in-service program—
no program identity in the two-year technical college.

3. That there are no direct lines of communication between the
industries and the communicative skills teachers.

4. That there is no uniformity in the programs between colleges
in terms of courses offered; that there is little uniformity in the
way teachers present the same course, even within the same school.

5. That there is great dissatisfaction, disagreement, and
constant changing within current programs.

6. That these programs should differ from the programs of the
four-year college.

7. That there is a dearth of suitable textbooks that fit the
economy of the student and the needs of the two-year technical pro-
gram well.

8. That there is a great yearly attrition rate of language arts
teachers in the two-year technical colleges.

9. That there is little awareness of the role and the purpose
of the language arts program on the part of technical education
administrators.

10. That there is little concern about the quality of the lan-
guage arts program within the two-year technical colleges in the
State of Ohio.

SCOPE

The study was limited to the public two-year colleges in the
State of Ohio which have technical programs. The study was of the communication skills: speaking, listening, writing, and reading, specifically and generally of all language arts—how they were taught; how much of each was taught; to whom each was taught; who taught each; what methods and texts were used; and what changes, if any, were proposed in the teaching of each. These questions and answers are covered under four major headings: (1) Professional Training and Experience, (2) Professional Responsibilities, (3) Description of Program, and (4) Perceptions. This study also included a survey of administrators, students, and employers as to their perceptions regarding the language arts education in the Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs. A comparison and contrast of each was made. In addition, the two-year technical colleges of Ohio were compared and contrasted with the two-year technical colleges of California.

DESIGN OF STUDY AND METHODOLOGY

The size of the population sample and the scope of the information required to present a valid picture of Ohio technical language arts programs dictated that the survey technique be used. Since it was not expedient to employ the personal interview to all the Ohio technical colleges, both the interview and four instrument questionnaires were used: (1) a language arts instructor questionnaire, (2) an education administrator questionnaire, (3) a technical graduate student questionnaire, (4) an employer questionnaire (see appendix).

In preparation of the questionnaires, comparisons with similar
studies were made. A trial run of the instructor questionnaire was submitted to ten of the language arts instructors teaching at the Columbus Technical Institute and the administrator questionnaire was tried with the Institute's administration. This was done in order to obtain a reaction to the types of questions, interpretation, and ease of completing data. The language arts instructor questionnaire included such items as teacher preparation, teacher responsibilities, scope of program content, types and format of courses, availability of language arts, facilities and equipment, and perceptions of language arts instructors relating to their programs and to the support of their programs. This questionnaire, in turn, was sent to all instructors of the language arts in the forty-six Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs and a separate questionnaire to the administrator in charge of education of each college.

The two other separate and shorter instruments, the technical graduate student questionnaire and the employer questionnaire, were also sent. The first was mailed to each of sixty technical graduates: twenty from the Columbus Technical Institute, twenty from the Cincinnati Technical Institute, and twenty from the Jefferson County Technical Institute. The second was mailed to each of sixty employers of technical students and graduates: twenty in the Columbus area, twenty in the Cincinnati area, and twenty in the Steubenville area. These instruments asked to what extent the colleges were preparing technicians and how well the technicians were trained in written and
oral communications for the job; what emphasis should be made; what changes; and what perceptions the students and employers have of the language arts program in the Ohio two-year technical schools. In the event that certain information was incomplete, an interview was necessary—most often done by telephone.

Along with these questionnaires and interviews, each public two-year college that possessed a technical education program in the State of Ohio and California was sent a letter requesting a copy of its college catalogue and a copy of its language arts syllabi. Only the public two-year colleges with technical education in the State of Ohio received questionnaires. The programs of Ohio and California were compared and contrasted. A comparison and contrast was also made of the various administration, employer, instructor, and student perceptions.

Data processing personnel was consulted, and the items were, upon return of the questionnaire, numbered for keypunch processing. No one was asked to sign his name; however, the three types of Ohio two-year colleges: branches of four-year universities like Zanesville Branch of the Ohio University, community colleges like Sinclair Community College, and technical colleges like the Columbus Technical Institute were given a numerical code number so that the various groups of teacher questionnaires could be identified and cross-checked in analyzing the data. In the mailing process of the questionnaires and catalogue requests, a return envelope was included to make
the likelihood of return greater.

Cover letters were sent with all questionnaires and requests, explaining the contents and procedure (see appendix).

The completed returns were checked and coded for proper form for data processing, and were taken to the data processing department of the Columbus Technical Institute and later to the Numerical Computer Center at the Ohio State University. At the Columbus Technical Institute the data was transferred through the keypunch process to IBM cards for coding, ease of analysis, cross sorting, and tabulation. The statistical analysis of sums, means, sums of squares, standard deviations, frequencies, correlations, and tests of significance was accomplished by the use of the computers at the Ohio State University Computer Center.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Although it was acknowledged that an actual observation and interview in each college would be preferred to obtaining information by a combination of questionnaire and interview, it was not feasible to employ the personal visit to the large number of schools involved.

2. It was not reasonable to anticipate a total response to the survey. However, it was hoped that the number of replies would be sufficient to make an interpretation of the data meaningful.

3. The data were only as reliable as the respondents were accurate and felt free to be honest.

4. There were some inaccuracies in interpreting items for both
respondents and author because of the limitations imposed by a structured evaluation instrument.

5. Since it was not known how many language arts instructors were employed in each technical college, ten language arts instructor questionnaires and one administrator questionnaire were sent to each school. The selection of the language arts instructors was at the discretion of the administrator in charge of education.

6. There was no guarantee that each form was completed by the person for whom it was intended or done so seriously.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Language Arts—skills employed in language and communication.

Communication Skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Course of Study—outline or guide within a certain content area which would offer direction and suggestions as to objectives, content, activities, and evaluation.\(^{15}\)

Technician—a technician is usually employed in (1) research, design, or development; (2) production, operation, or control; (3) installation, maintenance, or sales. The function of the technician in this study is to work under the supervision of an engineer, supervisor, or lead commercial artist performing the manual and reporting tasks in the technical field. He must effectively communicate scientific, sales, or engineering ideas mathematically, graphically,

\(^{15}\)Schoen, Perceptions, p.13.
pictorially, or linguistically.\textsuperscript{16}

Branch Campus—an extension of a four-year institution that offers a campus to a neighboring community and the first two years of a general education that is transferable to any four-year program or a terminal pre-employment technical education, normally two years in duration. At the end of two-years, it may grant the Associate Degree.

Community College—a college which provides for the needs of a particular community, often owned and run by the community. It offers a transfer and a terminal program and usually many special adult programs. At the end of two-years, it may grant the Associate Degree.

Technical College—a two-year college which provides a technical education. It, too, may grant the Associate Degree.

Technical Education—an education designed to prepare for, or upgrade persons in, occupations for which graduation from a four-year college is unnecessary. Jobs that require specific knowledge and skill in planning and control, operation and maintenance, testing and production, and supervision are in the technical area. A technical education program is a terminal program not preparatory to a college degree above the Associate Degree. The program is geared to meet the needs of industry, business, agriculture, homemaking, and other occupations.\textsuperscript{17}

General Education—(see pp.2-3).

\textsuperscript{16}Erickson, "An Effective English Program," p. 3.

\textsuperscript{17}Roberts, Vocational and Practical Arts Education, p.289.
Perception— a consciousness, awareness, or insight registered by a person about a situation, action, fact, or other phenomenon.

Identity— the condition or fact of being some specific thing and in this study, the degree of individuality and the degree of sameness.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research was designed to ascertain perceptions as revealed by the existing status of the language arts education in the Ohio two-year colleges with technical program and how this compared with that of other state programs. Of key importance was the ascertaining the identity of the language arts program. In the light of national turmoil in the areas of the humanities, especially in education, and the concern for improved programs, this study should prove significant. The understanding of how the various language arts programs are perceived by instructors, administrators, students, and employers is vital to the establishing of this program identity because it is a prerequisite for initiating change. The study also offers data which should make it possible to strengthen the language arts training programs at the college level by obtaining a realistic picture of what the future teachers may expect in the two-year technical college. The information received from this survey should prove valuable not only for improving existing college programs by revealing weaknesses, but it should also give direction for creating new ones. Professional organizations should find this significant in helping them to understand their membership and their responsibilities in teacher training.
recommendations, in-service education, and in preparing research study. The data should also supply information needed for comparative purposes by state education officials, administrators, language arts organizations, and teachers. It should aid in the preparing appropriate texts for the language arts programs of the two-year technical colleges. It was also hoped that by responding to these questionnaires that administrators, instructors, students, and employers would develop an awareness of the scope and opportunities inherent in the area of language arts education and that through this a bond of common purpose might materialize.

THE PLAN OF THE DISSERTATION

The present chapter has discussed the background of the problem, statement of the problem, assumptions tested, design of the study and methodology, limitations, definition of terms, and the significance of the study. Contained in Chapter II is a review of the literature pertinent to the topic of this study: the identity of the language arts education programs in the Ohio two-year colleges with technical education. In the third chapter, the design and procedures of the study is described. The data and statistical analysis derived from the research is presented in Chapter IV, and is interpreted in Chapter V. Chapter VI concludes with the summary of the information obtained from the investigation, conclusions drawn from the data, and recommendations for further action and study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature related to this study, focuses first upon the two-year colleges, then upon the teaching of the language arts in the two-year colleges, and finally upon the teaching of the language arts in the two-year technical colleges. This format was chosen to establish a better understanding of "actual" and "potential" curricular offerings in technical colleges.

THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

Much has been written about the two-year college in the United States; Jesse P. Bogue, The Community College; Michael Brick, Form and Focus for the Junior College Movement; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges; Burton Clark, The Open Door College: A Case Study; Ralph Fields, The Community College Movement; Edmund Gleazer, This Is the Community College; Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College Movement; John Roueche, Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Remedial Education in the Community Junior College; James Thorton, The Community College; Roger Yarrington, Junior Colleges, Fifty States, Fifty Years to name but a few. Perhaps the most complete study is Leland Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.
Medsker's study was thirteen years old, it said nearly everything that was said in the other literature and it was still relentlessly accurate in its depiction of the over-all characteristics of the two-year colleges.\textsuperscript{18}

Medsker's description and evaluation of the two-year college was part of an extensive series of investigation conducted under the broad title of "The Diversification of American Higher Education" at the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of California at Berkeley under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The purposes of these investigations were to provide a more adequate description of the diversity than now occurs, and to lay a part of the groundwork for more effective differentiation of educational opportunities. Obviously, the studies could not be exhaustive, but rather had to be selective (use of a representative sample). The studies were grouped under these topics: (1) the diversity of student characteristics, not only in academic ability, but also in social and cultural background, attitudes, beliefs, values, and basic characteristics of personality; (2) the two-year college as an instrument for diversifying educational opportunities and distributing students among appropriate educational programs;

(3) the state-wide coordination of higher education as a means of providing, with reasonable economy and efficiency, a pattern of educational institutions and programs commensurate with the characteristics and needs of students and the requirements of the State of New York.

Concerning the two-year college and the diversity of the two-year college student first, the major assumption of the study was that the functions which the two-year college performs were the result of the students who attend it. The average academic aptitude level of students entering the two-year college was found to be somewhat below that of those who enter four-year colleges. However many of them were found to be superior in ability to many students in the four-year colleges. It was also obvious from this study that in the two-year colleges, the students enrolled in transfer programs score higher than students enrolled in terminal programs.

The study showed the socioeconomic background of three-fourths of the two-year college students was lower white- and blue-collar. The fact that two-year college students tended to represent a cross-section of a given community had at least two implications. First, it further confirmed the role of the two-year college as a democratizing agent in higher education. It was therefore easier and less expensive for many students to attend a local two-year college than a state college some distance away. Secondly, a great burden was placed on the two-year college to motivate capable students
from lower social groups to continue in college and to perform at an acceptable academic level. The service of the two-year college to society depended upon how well the institution can assimilate the entire student body into a social, cultural, and intellectual context in which each student was inspired to grow according to his aptitude and interests.

Slightly more than half of the students, the study related, were in the 16 to 21 category—the typical college age range. The proportion of two-year college entrants who were high school graduates will be even greater in the future than now. Jerome Archer and Wilfred Ferrell predicted for example, "That Junior College enrollment will eventually include perhaps eighty percent of each year's high school graduates". Forty-seven percent of the students were between 25 and 34. The two-year college in which half of the student body was 20 years of age or more was obviously accommodating persons who either did not graduate from high school or, what was more likely, for various reasons did not enter college immediately after high school graduation. Such students brought maturity, experience, definiteness of purpose, motivation, and other assets.

As in all colleges, men students in two-year colleges outnumber-

ed women students considerably—ratio of men to women was three to one. Of more than 8000 students enrolled in the six colleges, twenty-three percent were married.

As for student reasons for attending and withdrawing from a two-year college: Entering, two-thirds of these students listed (1) persuasion by parents, counselors, and friends, (2) relocation of the college (proximity), or (3) lower cost. Withdrawing, nearly one-third left for full-time employment and most others for a lack of belonging or identification with college environment. The most important single point to be made was that each student brought a set of emotional and mental characteristics which in a sense were the raw materials for the college to process. The study contended, "It is most important for the school to know what its students are like."

Concerning the identity of two-year junior college, the study described the two-year college as being designed to play a special, unique, and strategic role in American higher education. The college did it in a variety of ways: It was perhaps the most effective democratizing agent in higher education. It decentralized post-high school opportunities. It made higher education available at low cost. It offered wide range of educational programs not found in other colleges. The two-year college played a special role, too, as a distributing agency. It offered a constructive way to terminate or transfer. The major limitations of the two-year college was described by the study as (1) the failure to meet some of its claims
(lack of emphasis on terminal education, inadequacy of student personnel services, deficiencies in general education, job placement), (2) failure in some instances to achieve an identity of its own (patterns after four-year institution).

The principal types of two-year colleges were (1) locally controlled and supported junior or community college with or without state aid, (2) the junior college or technical college fully controlled and supported by the state, and (3) the two-year extension center of a four-year college or university. The three offered and education program of two varieties: (1) a transfer program for those students going on to another school or college, and (2) a terminal program for students completing their education with the awarded two-year Associate Degree or a one-year certificate. These two included adult, occupational, general, specific special programs, community service and personal programs.

The faculty of the two-year college, according to the Medsker study, were mainly full-time teachers, administrators, and counselors. The faculty was made up of more men than women. Three-fourths of them held a graduate degree and ninety-three percent, at least, held a bachelor's degree, the major exception was the technical colleges which hired many instructors out of the occupations. More than a fourth of them had attended a two-year college. Most of the staff came from white-collar or farm-family backgrounds. Of the total group, one-half indicated that, if other conditions were
equal, they would prefer to teach in a four-year college or university; however, they agreed that the two-year college instruction was usually as good or better than lower-division teaching in most four-year colleges or universities and that the two-year college was less an educational factory than four-year schools. The administrators and counselors tended to share the instructors' opinions.

The study pointed a very accusing finger at the counselor programs of the two-year colleges, charging that relatively few two-year colleges had student personnel programs adequate to meet the needs of their students, that student personnel work was not recognized in sufficient degree as one of the major functions, and that testing and counseling of students were not satisfactorily developed or pursued. It further charged that professionally qualified personnel workers were not used in sufficient numbers, that adequate in-service training for staff members doing personnel work was lacking, and that the chief administrator of the institution or his assistant tended to carry too much responsibility in student personnel programs.

Considering statewide coordination of a recommended program for the State of New York, the study pointed out three basic patterns: the fully state-controlled, the state-supported, and the locally controlled community college. Of the three, the locally controlled community college received the strongest recommendation. The extension centers (branch campuses) were not recommended because they possessed the following weaknesses: (1) the curriculum was general-
ly narrower than in the junior colleges, (2) the dominance of the parent university over its centers was not necessarily in the best interest of higher education, (3) generally, they lacked the financial stability, (4) they did not democratize higher education at the lower-division level.

Finally, the study listed these implications from its findings:

1. The diversity of students to be served suggests that the public two-year college of the future must be even more comprehensive than it has been in the past.

2. Information here makes it clear that the public pressure will be exerted on any two-year college, established either as a preparatory or as a terminal institution, to move more toward the dual function.

3. The two-year college must set and maintain realistic standards for itself and its students.

4. Although high academic standards must be maintained in courses leading to transfer, the junior college staff must guard against the adoption of standard that are unrealistic for all its students.

5. The two-year junior college must find its own way of doing things—its own identity.

6. An immediate task is the procurement and training of teachers, counselors, and administrators qualified for the two-year college.

7. The two-year college is the wave of the future in higher
education, especially in the United States.

For the purpose of review and extension, this chapter now quotes some thoughts of a few other writers that should be mentioned:

Regarding the feasibility of the two-year college, Clyde Blocker, Robert Plummer, and Richard Richardson posed the following questions:

Should the two-year college retain the "open-door" policy, or should it impose selective admission policies, thus eliminating individuals of limited academic ability or inadequate background? Can the college simultaneously provide college-transfer programs of high quality and vocational, technical, and community-service programs? How can the college adapt its programs to the wide differences in abilities, motivations, and ages of its students? What are the distinctive roles of the two-year colleges which are not merely reflections of either the secondary schools or the four-year colleges?

James Reynolds stated the following upon this same matter:

The student body cannot very well be divided into first, second, and third class citizens. Discrimination against some types of students in certain courses cannot be permitted. The "open-door" policy is not intended as an arrangement by which a college for the academically apt takes on an adjunct of miscellaneous individuals who are tolerated for the sake of charity. In maintaining the proper campus spirit, the instructional staff has a tremendous responsibility.

Regarding the identity of the two-year college, James Richards and Larry Braskamp posed these notable questions:

...is public education through the fourteenth grade the birthright of every American child? Is the public junior

---


college an extended secondary school, or is it part of higher education? 22

One could not have failed to note the intertwining of feasibility with identity, especially upon the problem of whether the two-year college was more or less a secondary school or a four-year college; somewhere in between but wherein between. Along with this, Jerome Archer and Wilfred saw another problem—that of evaluation standards:

There cannot be only one standard of achievement, or only one expectancy level, any more than there can be only one program, if equality of educational opportunity is to be a reality in an institution which enrolls a heterogeneous student group. 23

THE TEACHING OF LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Much, too, was found written upon the teaching of the language arts in the two-year colleges. Before reviewing the various studies upon the subject, these personal glimpses of what some of the perceptions were from excerpts of articles written by a few teachers who have taught the language arts in the two-year colleges are offered to increase the understanding of some of the problems. Michael Svob had this to say:

Course offerings in English are necessarily more limited on the junior college level. The standard program seldom goes beyond remedial English, transfer-level composition, technical writing, reading techniques, an "honors" course in composition and literature, a couple of genre courses, and several one- or two-semester surveys of American, English, and world literature. Since the main business of a junior college English department is the teaching of composition, the A.B.D. or new Ph.D. who wants to divest himself of the onerous task of teaching writing and wants to devote himself fully to literature had better look

elsewhere for a job. The normal ratio in junior college English loads is one literature course (at best, two) to three or four composition classes.\(^{23}\)

He went on to add:

For faculty and students alike, the atmosphere of a junior college is likely to be less pervasively intellectual than that of a four-year school. The technical and vocational aspects of the community college no doubt account partially for the greater utilitarianism, as does the college's interest in meeting community needs. Also contributory are the faculty's thinner post-graduate study (Ph. D.'s are rare in junior colleges, are not actively recruited, and are sometimes passed over in favor of M. A.'s who have greater teaching potential), and its greater preoccupation with getting the day-to-day job of teaching done.\(^{24}\)

Nancy Prichard offered this:

Perhaps, through all of this, what I have really tried to stress is what the junior college English teacher in the public community college must be prepared for. He must be prepared for teaching non-traditional students who will increasingly require from the faculty non-traditional attitudes, methods, materials, evaluation criteria, and goals, for both themselves and their instructors.\(^{25}\)

Earlier in her article she quoted Dr. Earle Eley of Chicago as saying:

\(\ldots\) approximately 30 to 50% of the students who come to our doors...have come from homes where books are little read or discussed...it will be extremely difficult for them to understand such terms as romanticism, classicism, meta-


\(^{24}\)Ibid.

physical wit, neo-Platonism. They must be taught accordingly and with sympathy...we must begin with them more or less from scratch.25

To these experiences and perceptions of two-year college teachers,

Father Walter Ong added:

Probably a great many things are stirring; but it is certain that many of them can be summed up by saying that we are leaving the Gutenberg era behind us. As we move further into a technological civilization, we meet with abundant signs that the relationship between the teacher and the printed word and hence those between the teacher and a large area of communication, which includes practically all of what we generally mean by "literature," are no longer what they used to be. These relationships were set up in the Renaissance...The present swing is to oral forms in communications...As a result...older relationships are undergoing a profound, if not often perceptible, realignment.27

This afforded some idea of the atmosphere, teaching load and courses, types of students, and some of the change in emphasis that was apparent in the two-year college language arts program.

Besides the 1968 Judith Henderson study: An Investigation of Practitioner Evaluation and Agreement Regarding Effective Language Arts Instruction which concluded that professional practitioners with diverse roles could agree on levels of competence of language arts instructors,28 there were three other significant studies in

26 Ibid., p.52.


this area. They were the 1968 Madeline Hammermesh study: A Survey of the Minnesota State Junior Colleges;29 "The Two-Year College and the Teaching of English," a report of the incoming President of the National Council of Teachers of English to the Executive Committee in November 1963;30 and the 1970 Michael Shugrue study: The National Study of English in the Junior College.31

The Madeline Hammermesh study was a survey of eleven of Minnesota's sixteen State Junior Colleges. It began with a discussion of the present situation and problems of the junior college, mainly a reiteration of those already discussed in this paper with two notable additions: (1) Composition teachers' workload—four to five classes with an average of twenty-five students per class with seven to eight themes per student per quarter, and (2) "The statements of aims and purposes, for the most part, read like the academic jargon equivalent of the Boy Scout Laws, laced with an amorphoric piety of intent that sounds unquestionably noble" Although Hammermesh cited examples of objectives which she considers too broad and general, it


seemed to this writer that the examples were both specific and not actually exemplary of the catalog entries of which she spoke. However, the author would agree that her conclusion is true of most catalog and syllabi objectives listings. Too, her conclusion seemed to be in conflict with her first recommendation in which she used the aims and goals as printed in such catalogs for her basis for curriculum evaluation. On this point, "Hammermesh-Recommendation One" the author would emphatically disagree per this studies findings.32

The major portion of the document presented the results of the survey based on a questionnaire which covered:

1. Abilities and educational goals of the students,
2. Titles and descriptions of the courses,
3. Remedial courses offered,
4. Levels of instruction,
5. Class size,
6. Content of freshman composition courses,
7. Types of textbooks,
8. Supplementary materials,
9. Methods of instruction,
10. Syllabi,
11. Follow-up evaluation of the student's communicative skills.

The Hammermesh study ended with the following recommendations:

1. The English curriculum should be re-evaluated in the light of the professional aims and goals as published in college catalogues.

32Hammermesh, Survey of Minnesota's Junior College, pp. 34-35.
2. English teachers should find and use reliable and uniform criteria of student abilities in language understanding and use.

3. English teachers should assemble complete data about all entering students.

4. English teachers should assemble follow-up data, at least for students who go to a four-year college.

5. English teachers should seek ways to sponsor continuous, subsidized, and serious study of several areas:
   a. Differences between transfer and non-transfer courses, especially freshman English,
   b. Placement standards in various levels of courses,
   c. Remedial courses,
   d. Writing.

6. English teachers should work for less class hours and also for released time for curriculum study.

7. English teachers should encourage all possible local and regional workshops, conferences, and meetings, and should seek out all possible sponsors.

Albert Kitzhaber in his presidential address to the National Council of Teachers of English probably spelled out the problems and responsibilities of the English teacher in the two-year college best. The content of this address was the result of a survey study of 215 junior colleges. Kitzhaber described the junior college and its educational objectives. Concentrating on the teaching of English, described as a remedial course patterned after high school grammar and composition courses, Dr. Kitzhaber probed for strengths and weaknesses in the junior college curriculum. The highlights of the address were:

1. ...it is clear that the state of English teaching in the nation's two-year colleges must be a matter of pressing concern to the entire English teaching profession...(p. 2).

2. We should inform ourselves of the number and kinds and quality of the English courses being offered in these
institutions, the quality of the teaching...and the conditions under which instruction takes place (p. 2).

3. Junior colleges, at least the public ones, are open to anyone with a high school diploma--and, if an applicant does not have a high school diploma, he still may be admitted at the discretion of the admissions officer. Furthermore, though undoubtedly some good students enroll at junior colleges, the proportion seems to be relatively small; the average level of academic ability in junior colleges is low. Medsker, in his book on the junior college, refers to a Minnesota study which reported that in the state's ten junior colleges forty percent of the entering men and thirty-five percent of the entering women had been in the bottom half of their high school graduating class (p. 3).

4. ...in spite of a fairly relaxed probationary policy (most junior colleges do not put a student on probation until his grade point average falls below 1.5--D+), a great many students somehow do manage to get put on probation, and a drastic shrinkage in enrollment occurs between the freshman and sophomore years (p. 4).

5. Junior college facilities are likely to bear a closer resemblance to high school faculties than to those of four-year colleges--sixty-four percent are themselves former high school teachers (p. 4).

6. ...classes are large; teaching loads heavy--thirty to thirty-five is common in English composition...18 hours is customary (p. 4).

7. High administrative offices are held by former directors of vocational education in the local school system, people who, in spite of other merits, rarely have an understanding of the goals and nature of higher education and whose attitude toward the humanities may be at best incomprehending, at worst unfriendly (p. 5).

8. ...it is scarcely surprising to find few teachers with doctorates on the faculties of the junior colleges (p. 5).

9. It is against this background of awareness of what two-year college is, what it is trying to do, and what condition are under which it tries to do it that we must view the English curriculum in this kind of institution. If we fail to take this background into account, we run the
risk of oversimplifying and otherwise distorting what is really very complicated... (p. 5).

10. But we all know that academic requirements and course descriptions in catalogues may be at least a year behind current practice; and both those descriptions and syllabuses are likely to represent someone's notion of the ideal more than they do the grubby facts of day-to-day operation in the classroom. This kind of information needs to be verified and when necessary corrected by personal visits to the colleges and conversations with teachers and administrators (p. 6).

11. The kinds of students who used to populate the remedial English classes at state universities, and who have recently found themselves barred or discouraged from enrolling there are now attending junior colleges instead (p. 7).

12. The courses in freshman English are not much different from those found in the four-year colleges and the universities; that is to say, they are in pretty bad shape—confused, unimaginative, low-level... (p. 9).

13. The textbooks are the same as those found in the four-year colleges, except that often one can detect what appears to be a studied preference for selecting the most difficult and prestigious—Locke, Gibson, and Arms, Toward Liberal Education; Martin and Ohmann, The Logic and Rhetoric of Exposition; Perrin, Writer's Guide and Index to English; Connally, A Rhetoric Casebook; and other books of this level. One may question the wisdom of this procedure, since these books, though excellent, are not easy to use well, and many state universities find them too difficult for their average freshman classes (p. 10).

14. The persistence of the review in the junior colleges is no doubt in part a reflection of the lower level of competence in English that characterizes most junior college students. But it may also reflect the conservatism of many junior college English teachers, who carry over to the college freshman classroom the attitudes and practices that they found comfortable for so long in the high school classroom that they left (p. 10).

15. Nearly all the grammatical instruction appears to be traditional... (p. 10).
16. The elective courses in English in two-year colleges, though often fairly numerous, are seldom very interesting. They are usually conventional, likely to be almost exact copies of sophomore courses in the four-year colleges (p. 11).

17. Only a few junior colleges require instruction in English composition and speech (p. 11).

18. (There is)—consequent reluctance of the four-year colleges to accept for transfer the credits from a integrated course which is always difficult to evaluate; officials have trouble deciding what fraction of the courses credits should be assigned to speech and what to English (p. 12).

19. There can be no doubt that American education must provide some agency or agencies to do the jobs that the junior college has accepted. If these things did not need doing, the junior college could hardly have flourished as it has (p. 14).

20. Those junior colleges that have some choice in determining their own curriculum have in general been too subservient to the four-year institutions (p. 15).

The speech ended with the following general recommendations:

1. Better teachers and better prepared teachers are needed for the two-year colleges.

2. English sequences for transfer and terminal students need to be separated.

3. The freshman English courses for terminal students should take account of the special needs of these students and, in consequence, pay less attention to formal drill on matters of conventional correctness than to clarity of thought and statement. "I am suggesting, in otherwords, a drastic revision of most of the English courses offered terminal students, an abandoning of workbooks and an emphasis instead on developing reading ability and that power to discriminate among conflicting ideas that is essential to responsible citizenship. I am not suggesting that no training at all composition be offered or that correctness be totally disregarded; I do suggest a reversal of emphasis, with writing and correctness in a subordinate position--for these students" (p. 19).
4. The freshman English courses for the transfer students should closer parallel in quality and quantity those offered in the four-year colleges so that they are more readily transferable--credits and students.

5. The importance of literature needs to be re-established.

The Michael Shugrue study focused upon the findings of a comprehensive, cooperative study of the junior college English department, its curriculum, and the role of its chairman. The study, built upon earlier mentioned research and publications, was conducted over a one year period involving more than 1,000 junior colleges. The study probed (1) background, (2) goals and procedures, (3) the two-year college, (4) organization and curriculum of the two-year junior college English departments, (5) the junior college English instructors, and (6) the department chairman. Only in the sixth area did the study add any new data not given in earlier studies. The study identified the English department chairman of the two-year college as:

1. Possessing undefined power and responsibilities.
2. Appointed by administration (72%).
3. Serving as educational and administrative leader of the department.
4. The principal liaison between faculty and administration.
5. Seventy-four percent called "chairman," ten percent called "head," two percent called "coordinator," and one percent called director.
6. Serving as indefinite, permanent, or a term appointment.
7. Usually having secretarial help.
8. Two-thirds of them having reduced teaching loads--they teach and serve as chairman.
9. Receiving more money (45%), receiving no more money, no help, and no reduction in teaching load (15%).

10. Rarely making a major decision alone without higher administration advice.

The eight major recommendations were generally similar to the Hammermesh and the Kitzhaber recommendations with two major exceptions, a stressed plea for better training in the graduate schools for the two-year college instructors: "In light of their criticism of the irrelevancy of much of the current graduate study in English," and a grave concern for the very high attrition rate, and the reasons for it, of English teachers in the two-year college (66% of the teachers are new and come from high school teaching and only 41% have taught in the same college more than two years). The study cited the reasons as "cold" treatment and low salary. The study recommended:

1. The English departments should engage in continual examination of their goals.
2. They need to meet the needs of the students from a wide variety of backgrounds: educational, cultural, social, psychological, and economical.
3. Instructors must play an active role in determining the educational goals of the department.
4. Instructors must continue professional growth with assistance, encouragement, and guidance from the two-year college.
5. The chairman must have authority to serve as educational leader and spokesman for the faculty in consultation with them.
6. The two-year college must devise effective ways of using teacher aids and assistance.
7. The graduate schools must better prepare teachers for the two-year college.
8. Language Arts Departments must obtain more funds for research into teaching and learning in the two-year colleges and for the establishment of pre- and in-service programs to train qualified instructors.\(^{34}\)

A current book on this same subject, Teaching English in the Two-Year College by Thomas Barton and Anna Beachner,35 spelled out the problems and answers of doing this:

1. Problem: the "open door"
   Answer: Possess an "open door" curriculum for an "open door" college.
   a. Use placement tests.
   b. Use various remedial courses and devices (no "band-aid" approach).
   c. Offer electives.

2. Problem: the method or methods
   Answer: Work on language development through group interaction and team-teaching.

3. Problem: the teaching of composition
   Answer: Work on composition through the "individual approach."
   a. Diagnose.
   b. Motivate.
   c. Direct learning.
   d. Write independently and individually.
   e. Evaluate with concentration on student style development.

4. Problem: the teaching of reading
   Answer: Attempt to improve each student's ability.
   a. Develop skill by use of reading laboratory and facilities.
   b. Analyse literature by genre centered classroom activities.

5. Problem: evaluation
   Answer: Establish basic evaluation tenents.
   a. Teach the criteria for the evaluation before the assignment.
   b. Accept the responsibility of properly challenging the students.
   c. Use peer evaluation; they are very realistic.
   d. Teach communications in a structured environment, necessary for meaningful testing.
   e. Design tests upon the purpose and student use.

6. Problem: the library

Answer: Work to build an adequate library.

a. The library is the "heart" of the college.

b. The library for the two-year college is a study place and must be convenient for browsing.

c. "Open-door" college has the obligation to provide an "open-door" library: "If you can carry it through the door, you can check it out."

d. The library should remain open continuously.

7. Problem: procedures

Answers: Each college might ask itself the following questions, and then, if the answers are damning, change or relax its procedures.

a. Do admissions procedures make it easy to admit, and then to assist with financial aid, the disadvantaged applicant who discovers the college after the formal deadline for admission?

b. Does the college have unconventional antennae out in the community to find, inform, and then assist the disadvantaged who are passed by under normal operating procedures?

c. Are there funds easily available to pay fees for testing, physical exams, evaluation of financial need, transportation, and, finally, the formal application for admission?

d. Is some financial aid—educational opportunity grants, work-study jobs to high-risk students who are very poor, or is such aid given to the safe students?

e. At what reading level have financial aid and admission forms been set? Has attempt been made to simplify them?

f. Are students used as an arm of the admissions or counseling office to recruit and then to assist the traditional noncollege students?

g. Have special recruitment materials and techniques been devised for reaching the disadvantaged in high school and in the community?

The implications of the book were:

1. The teaching of English in the two-year college differed from that of the four-year institutions and differed still in the
three basic types of two-year colleges: the junior college, the technical institute, the community college.

2. The English program must be student oriented and the methodology must fit the type of student: transfer, terminal, adult.

3. English departments of the two-year colleges must find their own identity.

4. Four-year institutions must train English teachers in accordance to pronounced needs of particular two-year colleges.

5. Items from textbooks to specialized facilities and methods needed study, trial, and perfected (if possible). The whole area of teaching English in the two-year college was in flux and was in need of much study, research, and material.

Added dangers to the English curriculum of the two-year college and will enter by way of the teaching of English as seen by Jerome Archer and Wilfred Ferrell were that the teaching might cater too far to the transfer students or too far to the terminal students:

The obvious danger in the tendency is that courses intended to serve students who are seeking a BA are not necessarily well adapted to the needs of the many students in two-year colleges who have other educational goals...Another pressure will come from programs, often federally subsidized, for vocational education which support the "obviously utilitarian part of the curriculum and therefore the prestige and influence of the vocational point of view and its numerous advocates. Already there are rumblings against literature and similar 'impractical' or 'frill' subjects, and arguments for substituting something called, grimly enough, 'Vocational English' in place of more generalized and liberal courses...."

36 Archer and Ferrell, English Programs, p. 2.
They worried also about the curtailing of the remedial programs in connection to their first mentioned danger:

...we cannot wish out of existence (remedial courses)... which could save them (students) from being poorly prepared and disadvantaged, large numbers of whom are to be found in our two-year colleges.37

TRAINING OF LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS FOR THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

In connection with the training of teachers of English and the language arts for the two-year colleges, there were, again, three notable works. One was the 1969 Patricia Gaj study: The Preparation of Junior College Instructors and her analysis of a Follow-Up Questionnaire administered to 743 students who had been enrolled in Freshman English at nine junior colleges.38 Two was the Oliver Sigworth, et al., study: The Preparation of Junior College English Teachers,39 a report of the conference at the Rocky Mountains Modern Language Association in Provo, Utah, October 1969. There was the Nancy Prichard, assistant executive secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, article, "The Training of Junior College English Teachers."40

37Ibid., pp. 29-30.


40Nancy Prichard, "Training Junior College English Teachers."
The Patricia Gaj study was the result of a survey of graduate English departments (Association of Departments of English), responses of young junior college English instructors to a request to assess their preparation (National Junior College English Study), and tentative recommendations for junior college teacher preparation (National Junior College English Study). The instructors' opinions received particular attention and the major tenet was that they were ill-trained to teach in the two-year college. Specific complaints were (1) lack of preparation to teach composition, (2) lack of practical instruction on how to teach specific particulars, and (3) lack of preparation for teaching the variety of students in the junior college. Graduate English department survey data showed that out of the 263 replies, only fifty-eight departments "...offer or participate in the offering of special degree programs or courses designed for the preparation of junior and community college teachers." Of the fifty-eight, only twenty-five had such a program; the others plan to have or are just beginning to initiate one. "Even among these relatively few colleges, the programs vary widely in requirements and methods." Of the twenty-five, only eight afforded supervised training for teaching on the junior college campus. Twelve colleges felt that there is no appreciable difference between teacher training on the junior campus and their own (four-year campus) "...even though a large majority of junior college teachers in the field now feel that the experience is inadequate as preparation for the junior college
The remaining five colleges provided no teaching experience at all.

In general, this survey showed that interest in the preparation of junior college English instructors was growing but the total effort of the graduate departments was inadequate both in numbers trained and in the grasp of the nature and quality of training needed to prepare candidates to teach in the junior college program. "Most programs have merely readjusted slightly their usual methods of preparing four-year college teachers or even high-school teachers."\(^1\)

As for the analysis of a Follow-Up Questionnaire, Dr. Gaj said:

This study has shown that the dropout is very similar to his scholastic counterpart in grades, parental education, and reading habits. Often his decision to leave is triggered by external circumstances and he rarely looks back on his experiences in junior college as having a negative effect on his life.\(^2\)

She added that the occupational and technical students possessed the least interest in the English courses and that these students felt composition to be more important than literature. A great many students in the two-year school felt that too many restrictions in form and in grammar were placed upon their communicating. Dr. Gaj commented, "I would stress expression and thought rather than exact precise form: general form and rules are necessary, but to cut a grade point for one comma out of place is ridiculous."\(^3\)

\(^1\)Gaj, Preparation of Junior College English Instructors, p. 1.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 2.
\(^3\)Gaj, Follow-Up, p. 2.
\(^4\)Gaj, Follow-Up, p. 7.
The Oliver Sigworth, et al., study was a conference report on the preparation of junior college English teachers and it presented programs inaugurated at three schools in the fall of 1969. Offered in a two-year program at the University of Arizona was the Master of Arts Degree in English (M.A.) with an Arizona Junior College Certificate. The University of Nevada's Master of Arts in the Teaching of English (M.A.T.E.) Degree, normally requiring twelve months to complete, was also described. Western Washington State College's eight quarter program leading to the M.A. in English and supported by the Education Profession Development Certificate (E.P.D.A.) was also described. In general the study outlined the course requirements of each and commented that all three were preferable to most existing programs.

The Nancy Prichard article, "The Training of Junior College English Teachers," began with a quote from William Scannell's summary of the 1966 regional conference sponsored by the NCTE:

It seems clear from the opinions of conference participants, data presented in English in the Two-Year College, and the evolving situation of American two-year colleges, that no one-track identical educational preparation is possible or even practical for all teachers of English in two-year colleges. Various needs exist, and the demands for generalists with broad and varied backgrounds and for specialists in such areas as remedial reading and literature are likely to continue. The key may be...to persuade four-year colleges and universities to provide more guidance and encouragement and to offer a greater variety of alternatives at both the undergraduate and graduate levels for prospective teachers of English.\(^{45}\)

\(^{45}\)Prichard, "Training Junior College English Teachers," p. 50.
Dr. Prichard believed that in these new and projected teacher training programs a thorough grounding in English language, literature, and composition were most important. Concerning literature, she warned: "Just because the junior college English teacher will teach increasing numbers of freshman composition sections and more and more 'remedial' or terminal or non-transfer students does not do away with his obligation to keep English a humane discipline nor permit him to deprive those students of the expansion of consciousness that literature provides." Of composition she said, "I don't think there is a fresh way of saying that like death and taxes, some form of it will be with us for a long time to come. So, I would have the prospective junior college English teacher take courses in both basic and advanced composition, be aware that there is a 'new' rhetoric, that there are new approaches to the motivation of writing and new and more humane and more helpful ways of evaluating written work." And she added, "Closely allied with English as language, literature, and composition is, of course, reading...we should be aware of the process as it applies to those parts of our competence. But in the junior college we need to know more. We need to know enough to be able to spot our students' reading problems so we can recommend them to the reading specialist, and so that we can

---

46 Ibid., p. 51.
47 Ibid.
support a sensible reading program for our college." Dr. Prichard saw a great need for training in philosophy, sociology, and psychology for the two-year college instructor. "I must take seriously the need to help them (students) find a legitimate role for their manhood and womanhood. Some knowledge beyond Psych 100 will also help us to recognize student problems we cannot and should not handle, and to know when to recommend that a student seek help from a counselor." She concluded her article with these thoughts:

The potential junior college English teacher must be prepared for finding some of his colleagues (and his administration) talking about "a sense of identity" in an obviously anxious way. These are often the people who would like to see a neatly structured, clearly defined, immutable set of courses, with texts chosen once and for all and course outlines to match, which would constitute a tidy package to be peddled year after year without change, so they could quit worrying about it and "concentrate on 'teaching!'", as they usually say. This, of course, won't work at any level, and particularly not at the junior college...the junior college English teacher must be prepared for both change and uncertainty. Someone has suggested that the initials C.C. stand not for "Community College," but for "constant confusion." This is slightly exaggerated. But we have to learn to tolerate uncertainty while working at the same time both to reduce it and add to it.

**LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE TECHNICAL COLLEGE**

Only one study had been made upon the teaching of the language arts in the two-year technical colleges, and it was based almost

---


49 *Ibid*.

solely on the perceptions of industry. Although several technicians were questioned, the study was an "on the job" and "about the job" questioning with little or no correlation to education other than from that perspective. This study was the 1967 Harold Erickson study: *An Effective English Program for the Technical School.*

On the basis of responses from (1) 133 of 379 industries in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota to which questionnaires were distributed, (2) 14 "on the job" interviews with technicians in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and (3) seven technical schools which submitted copies of their two-semester English programs with the needs, as the schools saw them, of the technician in industry.

Mr. Erickson found from his study of the employers' questionnaires and from the interviews with the technicians that between 57.2 and 69% of the technicians' time was spent in communication skills—originating letters (6%), writing technical articles (11%), reading technical articles (10.1%), and oral communication (30.1%)—with the balance being spent in manually or purely technical tasks. The questionnaires and interviews also revealed that technical reporting, a major portion of the job, was equally divided between oral and written reporting. Both groups, employers and technicians, also felt that the English courses were the most important courses in their undergraduate work. However, neither group felt any of the colleges were offering the

---

51 Erickson, "An Effective English Program."
specialized skills needed in industry. Erickson quoted, "Research indicates that the technician is severely handicapped by the lack of ability to communicate."\textsuperscript{52}

Mr. Erickson added this to his comments upon the comments of the employers and technicians: "The skill of effective listening, although not listed on the questionnaire, received enough comment on some of the questionnaires and in all of the interviews to be mentioned in this report."\textsuperscript{53} Listening was one of specialized skills not taught.

From the data collected from the seven technical colleges, all students were required to complete two-semester courses of communication skills. Each semester was 18 weeks and was to cover the basic English skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. The study showed that the English courses were geared toward secretaries, auditors, or accountants rather than technicians. Little attention was given to reading development, speech, spelling, vocabulary, oral and written technical reporting and none to the art of listening.

The need for an effective English program is nowhere more apparent than in the offerings of the technical schools that responded to the questionnaires. It is for that reason that this paper will satisfy the demands of industry ... In spite of the important part the communicative skills courses play in the training of the technician, the majority of the technical schools fail to adapt the English program to the needs of expository communication. Of the seven Wisconsin technical schools that responded to the survey, five were devoting over thirty percent of the time to teaching parts of speech and punctuation. Only one of the schools was teaching oral reporting, while six were devoting less than twenty percent of the time to written report writing.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., p. 2.
\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., p. 20.
\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., pp. 2-8.
Mr. Erickson summed up his study best in his opening remarks:

...With the rapid growth of the Technical, Vocational, and Adult Schools, it is very apparent that the English programs in most of these schools are inadequate. In an age in which the technical serves as a liaison between the engineer and the production worker, or between management and the working force, the need of an effective language program in technical schools must be recognized. The lack of research in the area of English programs for technical schools has hampered the development of core area subjects and has resulted in the use of outdated programs.\textsuperscript{55}

In his proposed program, Mr. Erickson stipulated that the first semester include two weeks of instruction in the writing of business letters, four weeks of developmental reading, and twelve weeks of instruction in speech. The second semester was to include instruction solely in the area of oral and written technical reporting.

The final pertinent study which this paper reviewed was the 1971\textsuperscript{56} Columbus Technical Institute Graduate Follow-Up Study. The study was designed to see if the graduates were able to obtain employment, to obtain employment in the technology for which they were trained by the institute, to obtain employment that offered a liveable salary, to measure how beneficial their training was "on the job", and to receive information regarding CTI curriculum in general. This review only considered eight of the questions upon the instrument used for the study: (1) Did the courses in your technology prepare you for your initial employment position? (2) Did courses in your technology pre-

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., p. 1.

\textsuperscript{56}Columbus Technical Institute Graduate Follow-Up Study. An unpublished study conducted by the Columbus Technical Institute, Columbus, Ohio, 1971.
pare you for your present position? (3) What courses have been particularly valuable? (4) What courses would have been particularly valuable? (5) How well did the following general education courses help prepare you for your work: business communications, composition, speech? (6) Considering your present job activities, do you think the business communications, composition, speech courses too practical, too theoretical, a good combination of theory and practice or not applicable? (7) What courses or activities in general studies would you like to have added? (8) What courses or activities in general studies would you like to have omitted?

Out of 351 questionnaires returned, the results of the study were as follows:

1. Did the courses in your technology prepare you for your initial employment position?
   Greatly 123 35%
   Adequately 159 45%
   Very Little 45 12%

2. Did the courses in your technology prepare you for your present position?
   Greatly 82 23%
   Adequately 138 39%
   Very Little 83 23%

3. What courses in your technology at the institute have been particularly valuable? (The following are those that mentioned communication skills or a particular language arts course.)
   Business Communications 40 11%
   Composition 41 11%
   Speech 41 11%

4. What courses would have been particularly valuable? (The following are those mentioned that are within the language arts.)
Oral communication in human relations 21 6%
Decision Making 31 9%
Advanced Speech 16 4%
Advanced English and Literature 9 3%

5. How well did the following general studies prepare you for your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Some Good</th>
<th>Little Good</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Communications</td>
<td>90-26%</td>
<td>149-43%</td>
<td>74-21%</td>
<td>24- 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>102-29%</td>
<td>136-38%</td>
<td>63-18%</td>
<td>38-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>117-34%</td>
<td>130-37%</td>
<td>67-18%</td>
<td>26- 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Considering your present job activities, do you think the general studies were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Too Practical</th>
<th>Too Theoretical</th>
<th>Good Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Communications</td>
<td>26- 9%</td>
<td>26- 7%</td>
<td>181-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>17- 4%</td>
<td>23- 5%</td>
<td>216-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>25- 6%</td>
<td>33- 9%</td>
<td>186-53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What courses in general studies would you like to have added? (The following are those mentioned that are within the language arts.)

- Advanced reading 5 1%
- Advanced writing 6 2%
- Advanced speech 5 1%
- Listening 3 1%
- Business relations 27 7%
- Advanced literature and language 30 9%
- Electives 16 4%

8. What courses would you like to have omitted? (The following are those within the language arts.)

- Communication Skills I 24 6%
- Communication Skills II 9 3%
- Communication Skills III 11 3%
- Business Communications 19 5%
- Technical Writing 5 1%
- Speech 10 3%

(Most of these were coupled with pleas to upgrade.)

The results of the study showed that the large majority were in the acquiring of a job; they felt that in part it was because of their education – for the first position, eighty percent. As for the language arts in the technical school, thirty-three percent of the
students felt the courses particularly valuable even though the ques-
tion stipulated "technology" courses. And when asked what courses
would have been particularly valuable, twenty-two percent chose lan-
guage courses. The students, also, overwhelmingly supported the
value of the language arts and communicative skills training in the
question concerning preparation for the job and they thought the
courses to be a good combination of theory and practice. Twenty-six
percent wished for added language courses while twenty-two percent
wished to have one or more omitted--fourteen percent of these wanted
a course omitted in its present form and upgraded.

SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed established the unique identity of the
two-year colleges and the problems to be faced by the junior college
language arts instructors. The most pressing problems were the change
and rate of change within the discipline and within the two-year
colleges. Other problems pointed to, in general, were (1) the teaching
to wider backgrounds and interests, (2) the teaching of successful
remedial programs, (3) the teaching of both the terminal and the trans-
fer students, (4) staying in the humanities, (5) obtaining adequate
teacher training in the graduate schools, (6) obtaining adequate text-
books, (7) devising an effective evaluation of the various students and
courses, (8) being professional, (9) research into needed areas, (10)
continuing and expanding instructor's education. Too little had been
written upon the teaching of the language arts in the technical colleges.
But of what had been written; there was little doubt that the students, employers, and schools recognized the vast role of and the need for language arts training in the technical colleges and that these courses were in need of much study. This, of course, was the very reason for the present study.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

POPULATION SAMPLE

In order to obtain a state-wide picture of the language arts education in the two-year technical programs and of perceptions of those most apt to know and to influence the quality and the scope of the programs, the sample of population used for this study was made up of four smaller samples: (1) all instructors of the language arts in the two-year colleges of Ohio that offer a technical program, (2) all administrators in charge of overseeing the curriculum of the programs, (3) sixty employers of technicians from the Columbus, Cincinnati, and Steubenville areas, and (4) sixty students who had graduated from the Columbus Technical Institute, the Cincinnati Technical College, and the Jefferson County Technical Institute. The study limited itself to the Ohio colleges that possessed a two-year technical program listed in the Ohio Board of Regents 1971-1972 publication, Ohio's Two-Year Colleges Academic and Technical Programs. The names and addresses of the Ohio colleges researched in this study were obtained from this pamphlet (see appendix). Each of forty-seven colleges (twenty-two branches, seven community, and eighteen technical) were mailed one administrator questionnaire, ten instructor questionnaires, a large return

57Ohio Board of Regents, Ohio's Two-Year Colleges Academic and Technical Programs, Columbus, Ohio, October 1971.
addressed, stamped business envelope, and a cover letter explaining the contents and requesting a copy of the college's catalog and a copy or copies of the various course syllabi (see appendix). Each was addressed directly to the Director of Instruction of each college; the names were acquired from an interview with the Director of Student Services at the Columbus Technical Institute. The names of the language arts instructors were unknown; therefore, it was determined that these contacts would be made through the administrators who would, in turn, pass on the instructions and materials to the instructors. Names and addresses of the employers and graduate students were solicited from the Directors of Student Services of the Columbus Technical Institute and the Cincinnati Technical College respectively, and the Director of Placement, News, and Publications of the Jefferson County Technical Institute. Each employer and graduate student was sent a questionnaire, a stamped return addressed envelope, and a cover letter explaining the contents (see appendix).

To compare the Ohio technical language arts programs

58 Dale Tippett, interviewed by James Fullen, Columbus Technical Institute, Columbus, Ohio, 1:00 P.M., January 22, 1973.

59 Ibid., 1:00 P.M., February 5, 1973.


with another state program, each of ninety-one, two-year colleges of
California offering technical programs was sent a letter requesting a
copy of the college's catalog and a copy or copies of course syllabi.
Also enclosed in each request was a large return addressed, stamped
business envelope for convenient reply. This list was obtained from
the Ohio State University Library (see appendix).

PROCEDURES

The size of the population sample and the scope of the informa-
tion required to present a valid picture of the language arts pro-
grams in the two-year technical colleges of Ohio dictated that the
survey technique be used. Since it was not expedient to employ
personal interview beyond inquiry and follow-up, instruments were
constructed for language arts instructors and technical administra-
tors which included items concerning preparation, responsibilities,
scope of the program content, types of courses of study used, avail-
ability of facilities and equipment, and perceptions of instructors
and administrators relating to support of their programs. These were
the people directly responsible for the language arts programs; there-
fore, it was assumed they were important for information concerning
technical language arts program.

Equally important were the two receiver groups. Two separate,
shorter instruments were devised for the employers and the graduate
students which concentrated on areas of preparation, adequacy of
training, and status, support and perceptions of the language arts
program in the technical colleges.
In the preparation of the questionnaires, comparisons were made with similar studies in terms of format, responses, weaknesses, and recommendations. Units of study for the separate course offerings were based on suggestions of course outlines of national professional organizations, popular textbooks, college syllabi, and personal experience. As a pilot check, ten language arts instructors of the Columbus Technical Institute who would be included in the final research were requested to respond individually to the draft questionnaire and offer constructive criticism in the ease of interpretation and completion of the data. The refined questionnaire included 172 objective items for instructor response in addition to five essay questions. The administrator was asked to mark 101 objective and five subjective items. The employer was asked 11 objective and five subjective items. The five subjective questions on all four questionnaires (instructor, administrator, employer, and student) dealt with perceptions and were the same questions.

This large amount of data needed automation. Data processing personnel of the Columbus Technical Institute and the Ohio State University were consulted. As a result of these conferences, the items were numbered and keypunched for processing.

In an attempt to induce the reciprocants to make an honest response no one was asked to sign his name. However, the types of colleges were given a numerical code number so the administrator and teacher questionnaires could be identified and cross checked in
analyzing data. A cut-off date of April 6, 1973, was observed in order to allow adequate time for processing and for the writing of the rough draft.

**STATISTICAL PROCESSES**

Completed returns were checked and coded for proper form for data processing, and they were taken to the Numerical Computer Center at the Ohio State University. There, data from the questionnaires were transferred to the computer after being keypunched to IBM cards and programmed at the Columbus Technical Institute by members of the Data Processing Department. The statistical analysis of sums, means, sums of squares, standard deviations, frequencies, correlations, and tests of significance was accomplished by the use of the IBM 7094 Computer and the Ohio State University Computer Center. The data are presented in Chapter IV and interpreted in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

The following data derived from the procedures discussed in
Chapter III was presented in the following order; (a) number of
responses received, (b) types of schools involved, (c) availability
and enrollment, (d) preparation and responsibilities of administra­
tors and instructors, (e) courses taught and general course content,
(f) specific content taught, (g) facilities and equipment, (h)
success of present program, and (i) perceptions of responding
administrators, employers, instructors, and students concerning the
Ohio two-year college technical language arts program.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES

From the Ohio segment of the study, there were 46 administrator
questionnaires, 60 employer questionnaires, 460 instructor question­
naires, and 60 student questionnaires mailed. Responses received
within the scheduled time limits of the survey totaled 18 adminis­
trator, 25 employer, 131 instructor, and 25 student questionnaires.
Out of the 18 administrator questionnaires, three were discarded
because two of them stated that the administrator could not complete
the form because the administrator did not feel his school was a
technical college and, therefore, could not participate in the study.
The other administrator instrument was discarded because the admin­
istrator's secretary filled it out and left most of the "hard" data
blank or with a question mark. Of the 25 employer questionnaires returned, five were not used because the employers answering stated that they could not provide the necessary information; and two were not used because the employer did not hire technicians. Of the 131 instructor questionnaires returned, three were discarded: one was returned with an "X" on each page and two stated that the instructor did not have the time. All 25 responding student questionnaires were completed fully and were usable.

Table 1 depicts the number of questionnaires sent, responses received, and number selected for statistical analysis.

**Table 1: Analysis of the Total Number of Questionnaire Responses and Selection for Statistical Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Sent</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>460*</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Meaningless Responses</th>
<th>Number of Questionnaires used in Statistical Procedures</th>
<th>Percent of Total Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of instructors per school was unknown.

**SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND TYPES OF COLLEGES**

From the Board of Regents' Ohio's Two-Year Colleges, Academic
and Technical Programs and from Item #30 of the Education Administrator Questionnaire, the following enrollment and enrollment figures for each type of two-year college with technical programs were established. This shows the actual and possible numbers of students involved in the language arts programs described within this study. These are outlined in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

**TABLE 2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENT OF THE COLLEGES WITH TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL PROGRAMS IN THE STATE OF OHIO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Total Number of Schools</th>
<th>Total Responding Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 300</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 - 900</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901 - 1200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 - 1500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501 - 1800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801 - 2100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER - 2100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3: TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND PORTION STUDIED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Colleges</th>
<th>Total Enrollment of Students</th>
<th>Number in Study</th>
<th>Portion of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>69,142</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION BY TYPE OF COLLEGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Two-Year College</th>
<th>Of the State's 46 Schools</th>
<th>Of the Schools Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AVAILABILITY OF LANGUAGE ARTS IN THE TWO-YEAR SCHOOLS

Using Item #14 of the Educator Administrator Questionnaire as measure, Tables 5A and B, show the percentage of responses regarding the availability of language arts courses to the students in the Ohio two-year colleges possessing technical programs.

TABLE 5A: AVAILABILITY OF LANGUAGE ARTS COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Availability in Schools Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Administrator Questionnaire</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the catalog entries of the 32 two-year colleges that sent their school's catalog, it appeared that 31 offered language arts courses. Out of the 33 colleges of Ohio that participated in the study, one did not send a catalog or syllabi and one did not offer any language arts course. The first school was called and the administrator stated that the school had a language arts program, but that he did not know the nature of it nor did he have time to discuss it.

TABLE 5B: AVAILABILITY OF LANGUAGE ARTS COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools Participating in Study (Ohio)</th>
<th>Schools Sending Catalogs</th>
<th>Schools Offering Language Arts Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

Instructor responses to items concerning training and experience showed that 100% of the language arts instructors in the two-year
schools possess a Bachelor's degree; 87%, a Master's degree; and 9%, a Doctor's degree. The responses also showed that a majority of the Bachelor and Master degrees were received from Ohio Colleges and that the majority were in the language arts.

The poor sequencing of the thesis (2e) and dissertation (3c) items brought heavy criticism under "Comments". The answers to the "Other" question (2f and 3d) had to be interpreted as to response because of the ambiguity caused by the sequencing. The "Other" was intended to refer to the training; however, it could be interpreted to relate to the writing of a thesis or dissertation, meaning the writing of other or some other choice other than writing a thesis, dissertation or other. Thus, replies were, for example, "sociology" or "wrote an essay" or "M.A. Plan B." These statistics were numerically disregarded in this study.

Tables #6A and B depict the professional training and experience of the instructors in percentage of responses. This was provided in columns depicting overall, branch, community, and technical groupings.
### TABLE 6A: PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF 128 LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTORS OF THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGES OF OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Number of Instructors:</th>
<th>Resp</th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Bran</th>
<th>Comm</th>
<th>Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Possess a Bachelor's Degree.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduated from an Ohio college.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Majored in English or English Ed.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Majored in Speech or Speech Ed.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Majored in journalism or related.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Possess a Master's Degree.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduate from an Ohio college.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Majored in English or English Ed.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Majored in Speech or Speech Ed.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Majored in journalism or related.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Wrote a thesis.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Worked beyond Master's</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Possess a Doctor's Degree.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduated from an Ohio college.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Majored in language or related.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Wrote a dissertation.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was well prepared in college for teaching in the two-year college.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was well prepared in college for teaching in a technical school.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note abbreviations in table are as follows:*
- Resp: Response
- Over: Overall
- Bran: Branch
- Comm: Community
- Tech: Technical
TABLE 6B: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF 128 LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTORS OF THE TWO YEAR COLLEGES OF OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Number of Instructors:</th>
<th>(35)</th>
<th>(16)</th>
<th>(74)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Number of quarter hours in speaking training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Number of quarter hours in listening training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of quarter hours in writing training</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Number of quarter hours in reading and literature training</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Total number of years taught</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Total number of years taught in language arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Total number of years taught in this college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Total number of years since further university training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine a more accurate analysis of teacher preparation in speaking, listening, writing, and reading, a frequency distribution was prepared. These responses are recorded in Table #7.
TABLE 7: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF QUARTER HOURS IN SPEAKING, LISTENING, WRITING, AND READING TRAINING OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS

CODE: T=Total; B=Branch; C=Community; Tc=Technical; *Schools

Responses: B=16(38)* C=2 (16)* Tc=15 (74)* (Questionnaires).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T B C Tc</td>
<td>T B C Tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20 6 0 14</td>
<td>07 33 14 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>18 12 44</td>
<td>17 4 2 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>10 2 10</td>
<td>3 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>6 4 0 2</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>4 0 2 2</td>
<td>12 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 80</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td>22 11 6 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the administrator responses, 100% of the administrators possess a Bachelor's and a Master's degree. One-fourth of them possess a Doctor's degree. The majority of the Master's degrees were earned from Ohio colleges. One-fourth of the administrators earned their Bachelor's and Master's in the language arts and less than half earned their Master's in Administrator Education. Very few earned their Bachelor's or Doctor's degree in Administration. Only 8% of those in Educational Administration did their Master's in Vocational Education, and only 3% did their Doctoral work in Vocational Education. Fifty-eight percent of the administrators worked beyond their Master's.

Tables #3A and B relate the professional training and experience
of the administrators in charge of technical curriculum as related through the sample used for this study.

**TABLE 8A: PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF 15 TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Possess a Bachelor's Degree.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduated from an Ohio college.</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Majored in English or speech.</td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Majored in Teacher Education.</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Majored in Administrator Education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Possess a Master's Degree.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduated from an Ohio college.</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Majored in English or speech.</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Majored in Teacher Education.</td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Majored in Administrator Education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Worked beyond Master’s</td>
<td><strong>58%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Possess a Doctor's Degree.</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Graduated from an Ohio college.</td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Majored in language arts.</td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Majored in Teacher Education.</td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Majored in Administrator Education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8B: PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF 15 TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Was well prepared in college to work in the two-year college.</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was well prepared in college to work in a technical school.</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total number of years taught.</td>
<td>17% (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total number of years as an administrator.</td>
<td>5 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total number of years in this position.</td>
<td>3 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total number of years with this college.</td>
<td>3 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total number of years since further university training.</td>
<td>6 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Total number of years since most recent &quot;on-the-job&quot; training.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The majority of instructors felt that it was required of them to teach all of the communicative skills. Table #9 depicts the responses of the 128 instructors in percentage; it also gives the percentage of responses in the branch, community, and technical groupings. Each entry for each item was out of 100% of the instructors in that particular grouping.
TABLE 9: REQUIRED TEACHING IN THE COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS RESPONSE AVERAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Literature</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty of the 128 instructors responding taught other subject areas besides language arts. Most of these taught psychology and/or sociology. Table #10 illustrates this with a frequency distribution.

TABLE 10: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OTHER SUBJECTS TAUGHT OTHER THAN THE LANGUAGE ARTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tc</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco/His</td>
<td>Economics/Human History/Behavior/Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Fo</td>
<td>Math/Foreign History/Gov't/Ethics/Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang/</td>
<td>Language/Art/Smart/Smart/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>Technical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X

Tc-1     XP
Tc-2     XP X
Tc-3     XS
Tc-4     XS-P
Tc-5     XS
Tc-6     XS
Tc-7     X XP
Tc-8     X X XP X
Tc-9     X
Tc-10    X
Tc-11    X
Tc-12    X
Tc-13    X XS X
Tc-14    X
Tc-15    XS
Tc-16    XP
Tc-17    XS
Tc-18    X
Tc-19    XP-S
Tc-20    X XS
Tc-21    XS
Tc-22    X X
**TABLE 10: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF OTHER SUBJECTS TAUGHT OTHER THAN THE LANGUAGE ARTS (CONTINUED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE: B Branch; C Community; Tc Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction: Economics/ Human Behavior/ Language/ Subj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics/ Math/Foreign History/Gov't/Ethics/Tech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B-24</td>
<td>XS</td>
<td>B-25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>B-26</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-27</td>
<td>XS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-31</td>
<td>XS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-34</td>
<td>XS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-36</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-39</td>
<td>XS-P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average classroom hours spent in teaching language arts was 15 hours per week and the average classroom hours spent in other subject was 1.22. The branch group averaged 12 hours in teaching the language arts; the community group, 12 hours; and the technical group, 18 hours. Teaching the above subjects, the branch instructors averaged 0.08 hours per week; the community, 1 hour, and the technical, 2.3 hours.

The administrators answered Items #12 and #13 of the administrator questionnaire with an assorted array of titles; however, the responsibilities were described within three categories. These are shown in Table #11.
TABLE 11: PROFESSIONAL TITLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TECHNICAL ADMINISTRATORS BY FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLES:</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Educational Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Technical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Services Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Communication Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESPONSIBILITIES:

In charge of all curriculum: transfer and terminal - 6

In charge of terminal curriculum - 8

In charge of communication skills department - 1

Table #12 describes the other duties of the two-year college instructors, other than teaching.

TABLE 12: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO DUTIES AS DESCRIBED BY INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. You are responsible for the following activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Professional committee</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Administrative duty</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Research or study</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Athletic program</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Yearbook</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Newspaper</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Student affairs</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Debate and/or quiz team</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Drama or musicals</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Community program</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #13 shows hourly breakdown per week of instructor tasks.

### TABLE 13: THE MEAN HOURS PER WEEK SPENT IN INSTRUCTOR TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Average classroom hours spent weekly in language arts instruction.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Average classroom hours spent weekly in other subject.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Average number of hours spent weekly at school on all activities.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. For which of the duties listed in #19 do you receive extra pay?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How many office hours are you required weekly?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How many classroom hours are you required weekly?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How many separate class preparations?</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described by the administrators who participated in this study, the average language arts instructor of the two-year college in Ohio with a technical program was female, 30 to 40 years old, married, possessed an MA, came to the two-year program from teaching in high school and taught full time. Table #14 depicts by percentage of responses the administrator's description of the two-year language arts instructor and related data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Mean or Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Number of full-time language arts instructors.</td>
<td>5 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Number of part-time language arts instructors.</td>
<td>4 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Most language arts instructors are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Male</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Female</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 20-30</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 30-40</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 40-50</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 50-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Single</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Married</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. BA</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. MA</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. PhD.</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Instructors teaching in other areas.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What areas: General</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How many minutes are the class periods?</td>
<td>50 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. What is the average number of students per language arts class?</td>
<td>25 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. If part-time, instructors also work for:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. High Schools</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two-year colleges</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Four-year colleges</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Professions or businesses</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Most language arts teachers come to work:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Directly after graduation from teaching training.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. After teaching in high school.</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. After teaching in another two-year college.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. After teaching in a four-year college.</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Compared to other departments, language arts instructor attrition rate is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Final decision for course content:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Students</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Instructors</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Department chairman</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administration</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM: GENERAL AND SPECIFIC

From the catalogs of the California colleges, 69 of the 71 responding schools were "open door" community colleges offering college preparation, vocational, and avocational training and awarding certificates and associate degrees in arts, sciences, and business. Two of the colleges (Cogswell Polytechnical and the College of Mortuary Science) were purely technical schools. The State of California Board of Regents required 6 to 8 semester hours in the language arts and 6 in the humanities, which included all language arts, for the technical student, and none for the avocational student.

Oddly enough, only one California two-year college with a technical program (Pierce) allotted an open 6 semester hours in the humanities—all others charted requirements or electives of at least 3 semester hours in one or more of the communicative skills. In the technical programs of the California colleges, only this one college required no language arts course; the others required 3 to 9 semester hours with the usual being 6. California colleges used both the semester and the quarter systems. Fifty-nine of the colleges were on the semester system and 12, on the quarter. Of the 59, fifty required 6 semester hours in the language arts. All but three offered an entrance placement test within their language arts program and the majority possessed reading, writing, basic English and foreign remedial programs. The majority (53) required beginning composition.

Requirements in the language arts for the technical colleges were less structured and less rigidly "spelled-out" by the
State of Ohio Board of Regents. The language arts requirements were
left much to the dictates of each particular college, however, within
the following framework.

The Ohio two-year colleges, although more different than
similar in what specific language arts courses they required, required
three courses in composition (in which students could place by taking
a placement test) and one in speech. The colleges, especially the
technical colleges, required more classroom hours than they awarded
course credits. For example, the Stark Technical College required
the students to attend 5 hours a week in Beginning Composition and in
Advanced Composition, but awarded only 3 credit hours. Since the
colleges were under the jurisdiction and received funding from the
State and from the Federal vocational program, the college had to
meet the requirements of both the State's Board of Regents and the
requirements of the Ohio Vocational Education Division. The Ohio
Board of Regents requirements were based on quarter credit hours. In
each curriculum a minimum of 22 credits must be offered in "non-tech-
nical" courses such as English, social studies, and the humanities.
An additional 22 credits of "basic" courses common to a cluster of
technologies must be offered. Examples of basic courses for some of
the technologies were:

- Engineering Technologies - mathematics and physics
- Business Technologies - business law, mathematics, economics,
  management, accounting
- Health Technologies - physiology and anatomy, chemistry,
  physics
- Public Service Technologies - community affairs, social
  sciences
A final 46 credits must be offered in "technical" courses. These were the courses that differentiate one technology from another. A maximum of 18 credits may be offered per quarter and the curricula may be six, seven or eight quarters in length.

The Vocational Education Division, Ohio State Department of Education, requirements were based on classroom and laboratory contact hours. A minimum of 1,800 hours was required during the two-year curriculum. One-half of these hours must be offered in the "technical specialty and related" courses. These technical specialty and related courses include the basic courses of the Board of Regents. A minimum of 270 hours must be offered in "communication and leadership" courses in English, speech, supervision, and management. A minimum of 270 hours must be offered in "basic laboratory skills of a manipulative nature." The remaining 270 hours could be distributed among the three categories at the discretion of the particular college.

It was understood that the total of 1,800 hours was being reduced to 1,650 hours. However, at the time of this writing, no official confirmation of this change had been received from the Vocational Educational Division.

From the catalogs of the 32 state-supported two-year colleges of Ohio with a technical program which returned catalogs, 16 were branches; 2, community; 15, technical. The branches were basically "college prep" with a few technologies and avocations offered. All "college prep" and terminal students attending were required to take
the same language arts courses, usually composition based upon literature. The Kent campuses had added a specially designed technical writing course for technical students. But only those technical programs of the Ohio State University branches had become independent technical colleges requiring separate communication skills courses aimed at improving speaking, listening, reading, and writing skills. The two participating community colleges were more on the "open-door" model of the California schools but only one (Sinclair) offered complete programs in all three of the community colleges' educational aims: to fully provide college preparation, vocational, and avocational training. However, as did the California colleges, the community colleges of Ohio offered language arts courses to their technical students that more closely resembled the courses of the "college prep" composition-literature courses of the branches than resembled the communication skills courses of the technical colleges. The 15 technical colleges were also "open-door" but almost exclusively vocational in aim with little emphasis on avocational and even less on "college prep". With the exception of the Agricultural Technical College and the Raymond Walters Technical College, all of the technical colleges of Ohio required communication skills courses—most included technical writing with three of the colleges teaching technical writing in their technology departments rather than as a communicative skill. The Agricultural Technical College required no language arts and the Raymond Walters Technical College modeled its language arts courses after those of the community colleges and bran-
The 14 technical colleges which had a language arts program tended to require more quarter hours in the language arts program, as did the California schools, into the conventional English and speech areas—no matter the nomenclature. For example, Communication Skills 1002 at the Columbus Technical Institute is composition; Communication Skills 1024 is speech. The communication skills courses were not designed to teach over-all effectiveness in all of the communicative skills. All 33 of the responding Ohio two-year colleges with a technical program used the quarter system. The technical colleges required 6 to 15; the community colleges, 8 to 12; the branches, 0 to 9 quarter hours in the language arts. It would seem by all of this that transfer of language arts credits from a two-year college to a four-year college would be easily accomplished, but because of the diversity in the contents of these various courses, transfer of credits was no easy matter, except from a branch campus to the parent school. All but 6 colleges offered an entrance placement test in their language arts program and the majority offered reading, writing, and basic English remedial programs. The majority (22) required beginning composition. All of the Ohio two-year state-supported colleges offered certificates and associate degrees with the technical colleges limited by the Board of Regents to the Associate of Applied Science and the Associate of Applied Business.

Both the California colleges and Ohio colleges had a tendency to select prestigious textbooks. From the syllabi of both segments as reported earlier in the Kitzhaber Report, such books like Perrin,
Writer's Guide and Index to English; McCrimmon, Writing with a Purpose; and Mills and Walter, Technical Writing--all of which are difficult books to use well, which level of language and instruction is dubious for the two-year technical college, which, in the last case, is written for the engineer, not the technician and in many of the other cases, written for the transfer student--were listed as texts for the language arts courses.

The following were typical language arts catalog descriptions of the various courses found offered in the various technical education programs of California and Ohio.

**Beginning Composition**

A course aimed at developing skills in writing clear, concise exposition. Emphasis on the paragraph and essay.

**Advanced Composition**

A course aimed at writing directions, summaries, argumentation and research. A research paper is required.

**Beginning Technical Writing**

Practice in writing memos, business letters, resumes, and reports. Review of definition, categorization, process, description of materials, and interpretation.

**Advanced Technical Writing**

Practice in writing for novice, peer, and supervision various processes and reports, including progress, status, observation, abstracts, analysis, and the formal tech report. Also practice in handling various data.
Literature I

Selected classics in ancient through Renaissance literature. Their relevance to our time. Exercises in English usage and composition.

Literature II

Literature from eighteenth century to modern. Stress on philosophical concepts. Instruction in literary critique, review, and analysis. Papers on concepts are required.

Literature III

An in-depth study of a particular period of literature. This course requires intense reading, writing, and thinking. Class discussions and written reports.

Speech Fundamentals

Public speaking employing principles of effective oral communications in a variety of practical speaking situations. A course for building self-confidence, developing effective volume, clarity, and pace in the voice, and improving content in oral communication. Topics include conversation, interviews, demonstrations, and instructions.

Speech Forms of Address

Principles of and practice in composition, delivery and analysis of expository and persuasive speeches. Introduction to speech criticism.

Speech Conference

A course in various types of conferences: staff, production, committee, training, convention, and interview using the various formats: round-table, panel, forum, and symposium. Training in the usage of "hard" and "soft" data, human relations, exposition, argument, and parliamentary procedure.
Reading and Listening

Training in reading and listening, with emphasis on retention and comprehension of printed material, and on overcoming the barriers of listening. This course includes study skills and vocabulary.

Tables #15 and 16 depict the language arts requirements and the courses offered in the technical programs of 33 Ohio and 71 California two-year colleges. Also depicted are the number of elective hours that were allowed to fulfill requirements for graduation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio Schools:</th>
<th>QTR</th>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>REMEDIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural tech</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron comm. &amp; Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlandia-kent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit-ill.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central ohio tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe-0.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Tech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus tech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Liverpool-kent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga-kent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking Tech</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tronton-0.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson P. tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster-ill.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima Tech</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlandtown-Willim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum Tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okla Tech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth-0.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray- Vallors tech</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salum-kent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair comm.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark-0.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull-kent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscarawas-kent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington C.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown Tech &amp; Comm.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COURSES REQUIRED:**

**CODE:**
- T = Taught by technical instructors, not communications skills
- E = Electives
- R = Remedial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No required roles in language arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer placement test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced comp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech fundamentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech forms of address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading remedial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing remedial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening remedial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and remedial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Some courses are marked with an 'X', indicating they are required.
- Other courses are marked with a '-' or 'N', indicating they are not required.
- The table continues on the next page.
Table #17 shows by percentage of responses how the administrators described what percentage of required and elective courses were offered during the day and what percentage of each were again offered in the evening.

**TABLE 17: PERCENTAGE DESCRIPTION OF TIME OFFERING OF REQUIRED COURSES AND ELECTIVES AND PERCENTAGE REQUIRED TO TAKE LANGUAGE ARTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. All required language arts courses are offered during the day.</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. All required language arts courses are offered during the evening.</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Elective language arts courses are offered during the day.</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Elective language arts courses are offered during the evening.</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. All students are required to take language arts courses.</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. No student is required to take a language arts course.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second page of the instructors questionnaire was originally designed to show complete courses particular instructors taught within a particular communication skill: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. However, it was apparent that the majority of instructors marked everything they taught as a matter of content of a course rather than as denoting a complete course in a particular area of a communicative skill. Therefore, since some did as directed and most did as a matter of content, Items 27, 28, 29, and 30 became unusable for this study.
Table #18 pictures language arts areas which instructors include along with their specific courses. The table shows the overall, branch, community, and technical groupings' percentage of instructors that included these areas.

**TABLE 18: LANGUAGE ARTS AREAS INCLUDED WITH REGULAR COURSE INSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Other language areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Vocabulary, Denotation, Connotation</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Historical Background of English</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Linguistics</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Semantics</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Analysis</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Dictionary, Pronunciation, Spelling</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Dialects and Cultural Levels</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. English as a Second Language</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. How to Study</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Shorthand</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Handwriting</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT AVAILABLE**

Items 32 and 33 of the instructors' questionnaire showed that 65% of the instructors felt that they have appropriate classrooms and that basic facilities and equipment were ample.

Table #19 charts the percentage of responses of the instructors relating the facilities and equipment available to them.
TABLE 19: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES AS TO FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT AVAILABLE FOR LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Appropriate classrooms</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Lecterns</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Blackboards and chalk</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Library</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Resource materials</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Radio studio</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Recording equipment</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Phonographs</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Records</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Film projectors</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Film strips</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Education films</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. TV equipment</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Transparencies</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Overhead projector</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Stage and lighting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Slides and projectors</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Movie making equipment</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Handcuts and models</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Costumes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUCCESS OF LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

The success of the present language arts program was measured in the replies of the students and employers as depicted in Table 20 and 21. These were the answers of students to Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the students' questionnaire and the answers of employers to Items 1, 2, and 3 of the employers' questionnaire. Seventy-six percent of the students felt they were benefited by taking language arts courses and that the communication skills courses were a good combination of theory and practice. Seventy percent of the employers felt that the graduates of the two-year technical programs that they hired were well or adequately trained in the communicative skills. The
employers felt that the general ability of the graduates was good, but that the graduates were weakest in listening.

**TABLE 20: SUCCESS OF LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM AS REFLECTED IN THE REPLIES OF 25 STUDENTS AND 18 EMPLOYERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students:</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended a two-year technical college</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from a technical college</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt well prepared for first job</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt well prepared for present job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Communication Skills courses beneficial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Communication Skills courses were a good combination of theory and practice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employers:</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduates were well or adequately trained technically</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates were well or adequately trained in the communicative skills</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 21: GENERAL ABILITY OF STUDENTS AS DESCRIBED BY 18 EMPLOYERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>1 = Excellent</th>
<th>2 = Good</th>
<th>3 = Fair</th>
<th>4 = Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The general ability of hired graduates of the technical colleges in the communicative skills is:

**Skills:**

- Speaking: 2.27
- Listening: 2.16
- Writing: 2.72
- Reading: 2.50

**PERCEPTIONS**

The majority of the instructors perceived that they were to teach all four of the communicative skills. Except for the skill of reading, the technical group were most inclined to perceive it so and
the branch group was less inclined. Table #22 charts the percentage of responses by groupings.

**TABLE 22: PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES REPRESENTING INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS ARE REQUIRED TO BE TAUGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Communicative skills you are required to teach</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Speaking</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Listening</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Writing</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reading</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both instructors and students felt that the present program placed the emphasis upon writing. The instructors felt that they placed more emphasis upon reading than the students did, but the students felt more was placed upon listening training than the instructors. Table #23 depicts these perceptions.

**TABLE 23: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES SHOWING PERCEPTIONS OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PRESENT PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Item 25.</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 100%, what percentage of the department's program is spent in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Speaking</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Listening</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reading</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Item 12.</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of 100%, my communication skills or language arts training consisted of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Speaking</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Listening</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Writing</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Reading</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructors and administrators tended to think of themselves
as not well trained by the universities; and the administrators also thought of instructors as not well trained. The students disagreed with the administrators. Table 24 compares Items 5 of the instructor's questionnaire, 5 and 36 of the administrator's questionnaire, and 10 of the student's questionnaire.

TABLE 24: PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers felt they were well trained</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for technical college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students felt teachers were well trained</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for technical college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators felt teachers were well</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained for technical college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators felt administrators were</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well trained for technical college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 lists the administrators' perceptions of the language arts program and instructors.

TABLE 25: ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Compared to the other programs in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college, the language arts program of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Compared to the other instructors, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language arts instructors are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Compared to the training of other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instructors, the training of the language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts instructors for the two-year technical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better than average</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The language arts program of the two-year technical college should be the same or similar to that of the four-year school.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The instructors' ranking of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges are depicted in Table #26.

**TABLE 26: INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. How would you rank the college's language arts program compared to others you have known:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The language arts are adequately covered in the college's program.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #27 compares Items 26 of the instructors' questionnaire, 38 of the administrators', 13 of the students', and 4 of the employers'. This was a comparison of what the four groups perceived the language arts program should be.

**TABLE 27: GROUP COMPARISON OF WHAT THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM OF THE TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL COLLEGE SHOULD BE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis should be place upon:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 27: GROUP COMPARISON OF WHAT THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM OF THE TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL COLLEGE SHOULD BE (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis should be placed upon:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators and students were the only groups to show poor support for the language arts program. Instructors tended to rank in the middle their perceptions of support while the employers tended to evade. Table #28 compares the perceptions of support of the instructors, administrators, students, and employers.

TABLE 28: COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS REGARDING SUPPORT OF THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM OF THE TWO-YEAR TECHNICAL PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>No Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Industries' support</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Above department support</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Department support</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Staff support</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Student support</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Industries' support</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Above department support</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Department support</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Staff support</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Student support</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Student support</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Industries' support</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #29 compares the ranking of the students by the instructors and the administrators.

**TABLE 29: COMPARISON OF STUDENT RANKING BY INSTRUCTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. How would you rank the students that you teach compared to other students you have taught:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. The students that attend the technical college differ from other students of higher learning.</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. If so, how:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All answers fell in four categories. They are as follows.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More interested in practical application of knowledge and skills</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More conservative in motive and manner</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn slower and less motivated</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the responses to Item 11 of the students’ questionnaire and Item 42 of the instructors’ questionnaire, the textbooks were rated as poor for two-year college language arts instruction. The two replies, student and instructor, were almost identical. Table #30 depicts these perceptions.
TABLE 30: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF 25 STUDENTS AND 128 INSTRUCTORS REGARDING THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF THE ADEQUACY OF TEXTBOOKS USED IN THE LANGUAGE ARTS COURSES IN TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

How would you rank the textbooks selected for the language arts courses:

Percentage of Responses:

Instructors:
- Good: 10%
- Fair: 14%
- Poor: 75%
- Unknown: 1%

Students:
- Good: 9%
- Fair: 10%
- Poor: 78%
- Unknown: 3%

All groups, the administrators, employers, instructors, and students were asked the same four open-ended questions. Tables #31 through #34 correlate the most frequent replies to each. The majority of the questionnaires remarked upon more than one item. They were as follows:

TABLE 31: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MOST FREQUENT RESPONSES TO THE PURPOSE OF THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM IN A TECHNICAL PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose of the language arts program in the technical college?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To educate &quot;college prep&quot; students on the university level and to teach writing to the technical terminal student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To provide basic language skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To appreciate fine literature and to understand self.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To insure literacy and good citizenry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To prepare students for work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. No response.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 32: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MOST FREQUENT RESPONSES TO THE BEST FEATURES OF THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider the best features of the language arts program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Remedial program                                                  4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Flexibility                                                      3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Writing program                                                  8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oral program                                                     3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Business program                                                 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Practical applicability                                           7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Individualization                                                1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty                                                          6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self-development                                                 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Well roundedness of program</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No response                                                     15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 33: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MOST FREQUENT RESPONSES TO THE LEAST DESIRABLE FEATURES OF LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you feel are the least desirable features of your program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Insufficient time and scheduling inflexibility.                   4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not enough listening training.                                    7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emphasis on grammar; no literature.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Division of communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inadequacy of textbooks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Over lenient admittance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Over lenient passing.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Continual changing of program and transfer credit difficulties</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of evaluation criteria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lack of communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lack of support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lack of student motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lack of remedial laboratories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Money</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 34: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF MOST FREQUENT RESPONSES TO THE NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS OF EXISTING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What recommendations are needed to improve the existing program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Standardized entry skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change of course of curriculum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continuing refinement of</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. More literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More Speech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More emphasis on the practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. More developmental programs and laboratories</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More student involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More community involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Better inter-school communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Smaller classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Better texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fitting program to student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. More electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Expansion of facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Better training in Grad School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. More training in listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Need better coordination of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. More time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Less grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. More relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Improve transferability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under comments, the instructor offered two with frequency: (1) the vagueness of the questionnaire, and (2) the need for more relevant texts. The employers commented most on the inability of graduates to listen well. The students complained of too much grammar and buying high-priced "no-good" books. And the administrators mentioned the need for better graduate training and the need for greater dedication and understanding, specifically dedication to and understanding of technical education on the part of all participants.
CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The organization of this chapter followed closely the format of Chapter IV in order to facilitate ease of reference in comparing interpretation of data with the presentation of data.

NUMBER OF RESPONSES RECEIVED

The study was a four-way investigation and examination of the perceptions of administrators, employers, instructors, and students—all associated with the Ohio two-year college with technical programs. With the exception of the Jefferson County Technical Institute, no college participated in all four surveys. For example, the Columbus Technical Institute participated in the employer, instructor, and student surveys, but did not participate in the final administrator survey; the Michael J. Owens Technical College participated in the administrator survey but not in the employer, instructor, or student surveys; the Cincinnati Technical College participated in the employer and student surveys but not in the administrator or instructor surveys. This was interpreted to be—because of the complexity of the study and because of the great amount of time it required on the part of the participating persons and schools—time which they just did not have to give. It was felt that most all of the 33 responding Ohio schools and the 193 cooperating persons representing these schools attempted to help in the study as best they could. The
response soundly demonstrated that the interest in the study and in the quality of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges of Ohio was definite and positive. With 71% of the Ohio colleges and 78% of the California colleges responding and participating in the study, it was felt that the study was recognized by them as needed, desired, and valuable.

Thus study Assumption #10: "That there is little interest in the quality of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges of Ohio" was not valid or true.

Of the administrator returns, nine of the 15 were returned separately, 6 of the 9 with no return address. Thus, the study could not code the administrator sample into branches, community, or technical. The administrator sample represented 33% of the administrators in charge of two-year technical college curriculum. Twenty-five (42%) of the employers contacted responded. All 60 employers contacted were associated with a technical college, meaning that they hired graduates, counseled instructors, bought special courses, or served on an advisory board. Seven of the employer questionnaires were unusable, five employers could not furnish the necessary information and two did not hire technicians. Many of the items upon the Employer Questionnaire was left blank by the employers. Since most of the items upon the Employer Questionnaire were concerned with the language arts, the five unusable questionnaires and the "no response" to many items upon the instrument was interpreted as tending to validate study Assumption #3: "That there are no direct lines of communication between the industries and the
communicative skills teachers."

The student response was also 25 (42%) of the contacted 60 students. The students were graduates of a technical college. Of the four groups: administrators, employers, instructors, and students, the students did the best job in filling out their questionnaire. This could be because they were sent a shorter questionnaire; because the students had more time to offer, or, it could be, they were most interested and concerned.

Although the return of instructor questionnaires was 28% of those sent, the number of instructors per school was unknown and, therefore, many more were sent than necessary. Even with this discrepancy, nearly one-third (28%) of the inflated original sample was returned. Forty-eight percent of the instructor return was from instructors of the branch campuses, 46% from instructors of the technical colleges, and 6% from the instructors of the community colleges. This was considered a valid cross-sampling.

The technical colleges were represented the most in the four individual group samples. Table #35 illustrates the percentage of branch, community, and technical colleges that participated in the study and how much each of these were represented in the samples of each group: administrators, employers, instructors, and students (see Table #35, page #102).

The response and the samples were interpreted to be sufficient to validate the findings of this study.
### Table 35: Percentage of Elements in Representative Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>colleges overall</th>
<th>administrators</th>
<th>instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- BRANCHES
- COMMUNITY COLLEGES
- TECHNICAL COLLEGES

**Ohio**

- **Colleges Overall:**
  - 48%
  - 46%
  - 6%

- **Unknown:**
  - 100%

- **Instructors:**
  - 30%
  - 58%

- **Students:**
  - 100%

- **Employers:**
  - 100%
SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND TYPES OF COLLEGES

The study was also deemed a representative sample of the two-year college enrollments in Ohio and of the types of two-year colleges in both Ohio and California. From the data in Table #2, the total number of schools possessing the various enrollments were well represented in the study. The only two-year college enrollment size not represented was the 1501 to 1800 student college, but there was only one college of this size (Hamilton-Miami) in Ohio. The colleges ranged from 121 to over 2,100 and the study's sampling represented colleges with enrollments of 121 to over 2,100. There was not a preponderance of any particular size. And as illustrated in Table #4 and Table #35, the types of colleges were represented well in the study's sample: Out of 21 Ohio branches, 16 colleges participated; out of 7 Ohio Community colleges, 2 participated; and out of 18 Ohio technical colleges, 15 participated. Of the 91 two-year California colleges with technical programs, 3 were technical colleges and 2 of the colleges participated; 88 were community colleges and 68 of these participated in the study.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE OF ADMINISTRATORS AND INSTRUCTORS

Table #6, Table #8A, and Table #8B related that one hundred percent of the administrators and instructors of the Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs possessed a Bachelor's Degree. One-third of the administrators and 59% of the instructors graduated from an Ohio college. Twenty-five percent of the administrators and 86% of the instructors received their Bachelor's Degree in the language arts (journalism was not
listed on the administrator questionnaire but neither was it entered upon the "Other" blank, Item 1-e, by the administrators). Thirty-three percent of administrators received their Bachelor's in Teacher Education and thirty-three percent received it majoring in other areas: mathematics, biology, geology, business administration, sociology, chemistry, and physical education.

One hundred percent of the administrators and eighty-seven percent of the instructors held a Master's. Better than half of both groups received their Master's from an Ohio college. Twenty-five percent of the administrators and fifty-three percent of the instructors receiving Master's majored in the language arts. In contrast to the Kitzhaber study which reported that most high administrator offices were held by vocational educators, only eight percent of the administrators who majored in Educational Administration were found, in this study, to have majored in vocational education. Fifty percent of the instructors and 58% of the administrators had worked beyond Master's.

Twenty-five percent of the administrators and 9% of the instructors hold Doctor Degrees and only a very few received them from an Ohio college. Eight percent of the 25% of the administrators majored in the language arts, 8% of them majored in Educational Administration with only 3% of these majoring in vocational education, and 6% majored in other fields. Nine percent of the language arts instructors held a doctorate; 4% of the 9% majored in the language arts and wrote a dissertation.
So, as found in previous studies, most (ninety-one percent) instructors and most (seventy-five) administrators in charge of technical curriculum did not hold a doctorate. It also appeared that by the percentage totals running slightly above one hundred percent in the Bachelor and Master majors that a number of the administrators and instructors had double-major. Although the administrators and instructors were well educated and in full agreement with Shugrue, Hammermesh, Kitzhaber, and Erickson, neither the administrators nor the instructors felt that they were well trained for work in a technical school. Only sixteen percent of the administration and eighteen percent of the instructors felt they were well prepared for the technical college.

In reference to Table #6-B and Table #7, even though the branches and community college instructors exceeded the technical instructors by better than fifteen quarter hours, most of the language arts instructors of all these three groups were trained very heavily in reading and literature with an average of forty-seven quarter hours. Training in composition ranked second with an average of seventeen quarter hours per instructor—less than half the number of quarter hours in reading and literature. Speech ranked third with an average of twelve quarter hours—little more than a fourth of that in reading and literature. And listening ranked last with a mere one quarter hour—an almost unmentionable. Table #3 demonstrates the contrast between training, present course requirements, and perception of need-
ed course requirements in the language arts.

**TABLE 36: A CONTRAST BETWEEN INSTRUCTOR PREPARATION, PRESENT COURSE REQUIREMENTS, AND PERCEPTION OF NEEDED COURSE REQUIREMENTS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preparations Perceived</th>
<th>Present Departmental Practice</th>
<th>Perceptions of Needs Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Literature</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the tables in the study were charted in whole numbers, all columns did not total 100%, but it was evident that the training of the instructors did not match well the needs of the instructors. If the percentage of training should equate the percentage of practice, then speech and composition were under the need; reading and literature, far over the need; and, as also reported by Erickson, listening, far, far below the need. Therefore, in full agreement with Erickson, Hammermesh, Kitzhaber, and Shugrue, this data established as completely valid study Assumption #1: "That colleges and universities ill equip instructors to teach in two-year technical colleges."

As for experience of administrators and instructors, Table 6-B and 8-B showed that the average administrator in charge of the technical curricula had taught 17 years and that the average instructor had taught 9 years. The average administrator had been in administration 5 years and 3 years of it in the present position. The average language arts instructor had taught 8 years and had taught 3 years for the college for which he now worked.
Responses to Item #33 of the administrator questionnaire indicated that: "Compared to other departments, language arts instructor attrition rate..." was 50% lower than other departments. But, because, most Ohio technical colleges were relatively new (most had not been in operation more than five years), the average 3 years in the present college position registered by the language arts instructors tended to invalidate study Assumption #8: "That there is a great yearly attrition rate of language arts teachers in the two-year technical colleges."

One alarming factor in this seeming job-satisfaction was that administrators showed an average of 6 years since further university training and instructors showed 4 years. Because of the ambiguity and vagueness of the "in-service" items (Language Arts Instructor Questionnaire, Item #14, and Education Administration Questionnaire, Item #11) and the great number of comments received stating this, the in-service training information was unusable. Thus, the first half of study Assumption #2 became, for this study, untested.

**PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

As Table #9 depicted, the majority of instructors felt responsible to teach all of the communicative skills. Table #13 showed that out of an average of 13 required hours, the language arts instructor of the average two-year technical college spent 15 hours per week and a little better than one hour per week for other subjects. In Table #14, (the administrators showed only 11% of the instructors taught other subjects.
These were taught in general education); however, 40 (31%) instructors said they taught other subjects besides language arts and, of the 40, 3 (7%) taught technical subjects. The majority of instructors who taught other subjects language arts taught human behavior: psychology and sociology. The average classroom preparation were 2.3.

The average number of hours instructors spent weekly on all activities was 29. No instructor received extra pay for extra duties. The leading extra duty was serving on a professional committee. The average number of office hours which a language arts instructor was required to keep was 9 per week.

According to the administrators, the average number of language arts instructors per school was 9--five full-time; four, part-time (see Table #14). Again according to the administrators, most of the instructors were female (75%), 30-40 years-old (50%), married, and possessed an M.A. But although the administrators showed 100% of the language arts instructors married, it must be remembered that this was in only 15 of the schools and should be interpreted only to mean that a high percentage of instructors were married. The instructors came to the technical college mostly from high school teaching (75%). The part-time instructors worked also for high schools (38%) and for professions and businesses (41%). This data tended to uphold the Kitzhaber premise that the language arts instructor and the instruction of the two-year college more closely resembled the high school than the four-year college although catalogs and syllabi, as well as textbooks selection, copied the
In reference to Table #11, the educational administrators bore almost as many titles as there were administrators. Most were responsible for the terminal curriculum and many of them for both the terminal and the transfer curriculum. One very obvious administrator reply and one that was in line with the Shugrue Report, 58% of them stated that the final decision for course content in the language arts curriculum was theirs. This demonstrated Shugrue's tenet that the department chairman and staff made no major decision regarding course content.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM: GENERAL AND SPECIFIC

Although more different than similar to each other in the number of hours and courses they required, the Ohio two-year colleges generally required three courses in composition (in which students could place by taking a placement test) and one course in speech. For the students taking language arts, the usual required classroom hours were five and this earned them but 3 credit hours. The Ohio colleges, especially the technical colleges, required many more classroom hours than they awarded course credits.

The Ohio technical students attended far more classroom hours in the language arts than their counterparts in other Ohio higher learning programs and, in many ways, received less credit hours, less course transferability, less content. However, because of the terminal and specialized nature of technical education, the technical students
received a more individualized, more economical, more practical, and shorter program. Although the Ohio technical students were required to put in much more time than other college students per credit hour, they received the most education per dollar. The branches and community colleges ranged $100 or more above the average $150 per quarter cost for the resident technical student.

In comparing and contrasting the language arts program of the Ohio and California two-year colleges with a technical program (Table #15 and Table #16), the California colleges showed similarity with each other in the amount of required hours in language arts study (six semester hours), but a greater degree of difference in required courses beyond the beginning composition course than did the Ohio schools. The California schools also tended to place a more equal emphasis upon composition and speech, but at the same time, placed little emphasis upon reading and none upon listening. They allowed a great number of elective hours to fulfill required hours in language arts toward graduation. The Ohio colleges, in contrast, showed a great difference in required hours and a little more similarity in their language arts course requirements than California. The Ohio colleges tended to place heavier emphasis upon writing with some emphasis upon speaking and reading and a very small emphasis upon listening. They

Erickson showed Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota technical colleges as also requiring six semester hours in the language arts.
allowed few elective hours to fulfill requirements. The California two-year colleges were mostly community colleges, plentiful in number, and almost all offered "college prep", vocational, and avocational programs. The Ohio two-year colleges, on the other hand, were nearly equally divided between branch campuses and technical colleges, moderate in number, and offered the three programs with uneven emphasis. The branches emphasized "college prep" and the technical colleges emphasized the vocational. There was only one college like the California two-year college model in Ohio—Sinclair Community College.

In the technical programs of the Ohio two-year colleges, the differing language arts requirements for the students ranged from 0 to 15 quarter hours; however, the programs shared the average fifty-minute instructional period, the classroom, one instructor per twenty-five students, and a strong emphasis upon composition.

All the two-year colleges with technical programs in Ohio and California shared the curriculum of Beginning Composition, Advanced Composition, Beginning Technical Writing, Advanced Technical Writing, Literature I, Literature II, Literature III, Speech Fundamentals, Speech Forms of Address, Speech Conference, Reading and Listening and various remedial programs. However, some offered more. None required all and, except for Beginning Composition, few required the same.

It was therefore interpreted that this data tended to validate the first part of study Assumption #4: "That there is no uniformity
in the programs between colleges in terms of courses offered" but because of the unusability of Items 27, 28, 29, and 30 of the Language Arts Instructor Questionnaire, in which it had been hoped, by marking the complete courses plus sub-areas and added materials, that instructor presentations of the courses could be compared and contrasted. However, this did not materialize, and the data received was inconclusive because of either the failure of the instrument to be clear or the instructors to follow instructions. In either case, the last part of Assumption #4: "...that there is little uniformity in the way teachers present the same course, even within the same school" was placed outside the range of the study.

The greater amount of difference and the lesser amount of similarity in the language arts curriculum of the Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs was also interpreted as validating the latter part of study Assumption #2: "...no program identity in the two-year technical college." here meaning no "clear cut" common practice within the complete language arts curriculums of the technical programs of the Ohio two-year colleges. (This seemed to be equally true of the California colleges.) For example, a comparison of the requirements of an Ohio technical student in Electrical Engineering and a student in Business Management would demonstrate this best: Stark Technical would require the same four Communication Skills courses for both; Columbus Technical Institute would require the same first two complete courses and a course in speech, but
require Technical Writing of the electrical engineer and Business' Correspondence of the business management student and allow one elective for each student; the Kent campuses would require both of them to take Literature I (freshman English) but require Fundamentals of Speech and Technical Writing of the engineer while for the business student, allow two electives in the language arts; and so on.

Grammar, usage, mechanics, vocabulary, denotation, connotation, historical background of English, dictionary study, pronunciation and spelling seemed to be the most added language areas to the regular offered courses of study. The branch instructors stressed the importance of the addition of historical background, first, and dialects and cultural levels, second; the community college instructors stressed the importance of the addition of vocabulary, denotation, connotation, first, and grammar, usage, and mechanics, second; the technical college instructors stressed the importance of the addition of grammar, usage, and mechanics, first and vocabulary, denotation, and connotation, second.

The basic equipment and facilities for the language arts programs in the Ohio two-year colleges were perceived by the instructors adequate and ample as demonstrated by Table #19.

**SUCCESS OF THE LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMS**

The language arts programs of the Ohio two-year colleges with a technical program seemed to have been successful, measured by the
replies of students who have attended them and the employers who had hired those students. Even though the Ohio programs defied definition as a statewide language arts program with a great number of common characteristics, the individual college programs seemed to have accomplished their task to the satisfaction of the students and their employers.

Of the students that attended, 96% of them graduated. Seventy-five percent of the students felt well-prepared for their job, and 52% felt well prepared for their present job. Seventy-six percent felt that the language arts courses were beneficial and a good combination of theory and practice.

Table #37 compares this study with the findings of the Columbus Technical Follow-Up study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items:</th>
<th>CTI Responses</th>
<th>Study's Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felt well prepared for first job</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt well prepared for present job</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Communication Skills courses were beneficial</td>
<td>70% (average)</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Communication Skills courses were a good combination of theory and practice</td>
<td>55% (average)</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of both studies shared a similar pattern. The largest exception was in Item #4 of Table #37, and this was probably because the Columbus Technical Institute's study included all of the general education subjects in this item, not just language arts.
The employers felt that 93% of the students were trained well or adequately in their technology, but only 77% of them felt the students were well or adequately trained in the communicative skills. The Erickson study reported that the employers felt that listening training was a general weakness of the language arts program. The present study, too, showed that the employers felt that listening was the weakest communicative skill of the hired students. However, this ability, along with speaking, writing and reading, was ranked as good by the employers (see Table #21).

PERCEPTIONS

This portion of the interpretation concerns the perceptions of administrators, employers, instructors, and students of the language arts curriculum in the technical programs of the Ohio two-year colleges.

The role and importance of teaching the communicative skills were endorsed most by the language arts instructors in the technical colleges and least by the language arts instructors of the branch campuses. More than two-thirds of all language arts instructors in the technical colleges saw all four of the communicative skills as teaching requirements; less than half of the language arts instructors in the branch campuses saw speaking and listening as required skills to be taught within their courses; only half of the language arts instructors in the community colleges saw listening as a required skill to be taught. This was interpreted to mean that the Ohio two-year colleges with a technical program were staffed with faculties divided nearly
50 to 50—communicative skills oriented faculties, strongly repre-
sented by the faculties of the technical colleges, on the one hand
and traditional English composition-literature oriented faculties,
strongly represented by the faculties of the branch campuses, on the
other hand. This interpretation of data tended to further validate
study Assumption #4 (first half): "That there is no uniformity in
the programs between colleges in terms of courses offered" and the
second part of study Assumption #5: "That there is great...disagree-
ment...within current programs."

Instructors and students felt that the present language arts
programs in technical education placed the most emphasis upon the
communicative skill of writing (see Table #23). However, the students
saw the teaching and learning emphasis more evenly placed upon all
four of the skills than did the instructors who perceived writing as
heavily emphasized and listening as lightly touched upon. The major-
ity of the instructors, students, employers, and administrators rank-
ed the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges as
good. However, only 9% of the instructors felt that the language
arts were adequately covered. This tended to validate the first and
support the second part of study Assumption #5: "That there is great
dissatisfaction, disagreement...within current programs." The dis-
agreement was also apparent in Table #27: Group Comparison of What
the Language Arts Program of the Two-Year Technical College Should Be.
The table showed that the instructors would keep the emphasis of
instruction upon the communicative skill of writing; the administrators would place the emphasis upon reading; the students, upon speaking; and the employers, upon listening. The interpretation of this was highly speculative, but it did demonstrate that all four of the communicative skills needed to be more actually and evenly taught. Upon the identity of the two-year college language arts program differing significantly from that of the four-year college, there was little disagreement. Only 15% of the administrators felt that the language arts program of the two-year technical college should be the same or similar to that of the four-year school, and only about 10% of the instructors (see Item #46 of the Education Administrator Questionnaire and Items, 43, 44, 45 of the Language Arts Instructor Questionnaire). This data tended to validate study Assumption #6: "That these programs should differ from the programs of the four-year college."

Support for the present language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges proved poorest on the part of the employers. The instructors ranked employer support as 42% unknown, administrators ranked it as 25% poor and 35% unknown, and the employers, themselves, ranked it as 66% unknown. This tended, once again, to validate study Assumption #3: "That there are no direct lines of communication between industries and the communicative skills teachers." Another weakness in support was apparent in student support for the language arts program. Only the instructors felt that student support was good. The students and the administrators ranked student support as fair.
This data was interpreted: Since the students and employers were the actual gauge of success of the two-year technical college language arts programs, there was ignorance of the program content on the part of the employers, and a degree of dissatisfaction with the program on the part of the students. This again supported study Assumption #3 and part of #5.

Administrators felt that the language arts programs and the language arts instructors were very effective. But instructors and administrators did not think themselves well trained by the universities for working in the two-year technical college. The administrators also thought the instructors were not well trained for the two-year technical college. This again supported study Assumption #1: "That the colleges and universities ill equip instructors to teach in the two-year technical colleges."

In reference to Table #30, two-year technical college instructors and students ranked the textbooks used by them in their language arts courses as poor. The percentages left little doubt of the vastness of the dissatisfaction with the suitability and adequacy of the books presently used. Enough such comments under "Comments" of the questionnaires were made; the dissatisfaction was listed often under "least desirable feature" and "needed improvements"; and was mentioned enough by other studies to overwhelmingly support the validity of study Assumption #7: "That there is a dearth of suitable textbooks that fit the economy of the student and the needs of the two-year technical
Instructors and administrators felt that technical students were good students, but more interested in practical application of knowledge and skills. This was in keeping with the Medsker study which described the technical students in much the same way.

The five "open-end" questions which concluded each of the four questionnaires showed that administrators, employers, instructors, and students felt that the purpose of the language arts course in technical education was to:

1. Educate transfer students for the university.
2. Teach basic language skills to the technical terminal student.
3. Prepare technical students for work.

They felt the best features of the present programs were its:

1. Practical applicability.
2. Individualization.
3. Oral Program.
4. Well-roundedness.
5. Flexibility.
6. Remedial programs.

The least desirable features that they listed were as follows:

Administrators
1. Continual changing of the language arts program.
2. Lack of support for the language arts program.
3. Lack of money for the language arts program.
4. Lack of clear evaluation criteria.

Employers
1. Not enough listening training in the program.
2. Over lenient passing of students by instructors.
Instructors
1. Lack of communication within the language arts departments, with other departments, with other two-year technical colleges, and with other segments of technical education.
2. Inadequacy of textbooks for the language arts courses in the two-year technical colleges.
3. Continual changing of language arts program.
4. Lack of general support for the language arts program in the two-year college.

Students
1. Too great an emphasis upon grammar and not enough upon literature.
2. Inadequacy of textbooks for the language arts courses.
3. Lack of clear evaluation criteria.

The frequency of "continual changing of the language arts program" was interpreted to support the validity of the last part of study Assumption #5: "What there is great dissatisfaction, disagreement, and constant changing within current programs." Also, the repetition of "lack of clear evaluation criteria" and "overlenient passing" were interpreted to be matters of concern, if not alarm.

Working from the most mentioned to the least mentioned, the administrators, employers, instructors, and students listed as needed improvements in the language arts programs in the two-year technical college:
1. More developmental programs and laboratories
2. More emphasis upon the practical
3. More speech instruction
4. Better textbooks
5. Better inter-school communications
6. Improved transferability of course credits
7. Better graduate school training for instructors and administrators
8. Less grammar
9. Changes in courses and curriculum
10. More electives
11. More student involvement
12. More relevance
13. More literature
14. More listening instruction
15. Smaller classes
16. More community involvement
17. Continuing refinement of program
18. Fitting program to student
19. Expansion of facilities
20. Better coordination of efforts
21. Standardized entry skills
22. More time

Under "Comments" upon the four questionnaires, the large majority of returns added none. Those that did either criticized the question-
naire or extended previous remarks. This, again, was interpreted as a showing of positive interest and concern for the study and technical education.

The concluding chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for action and further research.
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF PURPOSE

The problem that this study attempted to answer was: What is the identity of the language arts program in the Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs. Technological demands, social pressure for improved instruction in education, findings of earlier studies, and lack of data concerning this problem contributed to the need for such a study. An appraisal of existing programs and of administrator, employer, instructor, and student perceptions was necessary before one could identify both present and potential language arts programs and recommend action and change.

Identity was defined as the condition or fact of being some specific thing; individuality; or, as referred to in this study on occasion, the condition or fact of being the same as something.

Perception was defined as a consciousness, awareness, of insight registered by a person about a situation, action, fact, or other phenomenon.

To accomplish this task, four questionnaires were constructed to survey all Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs and requests for catalogues and syllabi were sent to all California two-year colleges with technical programs. A comparison and contrast study was made of the individual schools and of the Ohio and
SUMMARY OF PROCEDURE

The research procedures involved (1) a survey of the literature to gain background and direction; (2) the development of items for the questionnaires which would reveal the identity of the technical language arts program and the perceptions of the educational administrators, language arts instructors, technical students, and employers of technical graduates; (3) administering the two large questionnaires in a pilot study; (4) refining the items; (5) mailing the questionnaires and requests, cover letters, and return envelopes to 46 Ohio two-year colleges, 60 employers, 60 students, and 91 California two-year colleges; (6) coding the returns and transferring numbers through keypunch processing to IBM cards; (7) computer programming; (8) statistical treatment and analysis of data; and (9) presenting the data in tabular and graphic form.

The major assumptions investigated were as follows:

1. That colleges and universities ill equip instructors to teach in two-year technical colleges.

2. That it is nearly impossible for the instructor to obtain the skills he needs because there is no coordinated in-service program--no program identity in the two-year technical college.

3. That there are no direct lines of communication between the industries and the communicative skills instructors.

4. That there is no uniformity in the programs between college's
in the terms of courses offered; that there is little uniformity in the way instructors present the same course, even within the same school.

5. That there is great dissatisfaction, disagreement, and constant changing within current programs.

6. That these programs should differ from the programs of the four-year college.

7. That there is a dearth of suitable textbooks that fit the economy of the student and the needs of the two-year technical program well.

8. That there is a great yearly attrition rate of language arts instructors in the two-year technical colleges.

9. That there is little awareness of the role and the purpose of the language arts program on the part of technical education administrators.

10. That there is little interest in the quality of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges in Ohio.

**SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL TREATMENT**

In order to test the assumptions of this study, the following statistical procedures were used: Sums, means, sums of squares, standard deviations and frequencies were determined by the Ohio State Computer Center and the Columbus Technical Institute's Business Data Processing Department. Correlation of coefficients was established by use of the Tippett Table and the Pearson Index.
LIMIT OF THE RESULTS

Because the general identity of the language arts program in the two-year colleges with technical education was unknown and because few such studies had been made, the instruments for this study were drawn up from the writer's experience and assumptions and from what little information was available. As the study progressed, it was learned that in these colleges there was no language arts program but programs -- no one overall design, nor one within each type: administration, employer, student, of questionnaire would meet the demands of exact measure of so many programs with such great variance. For not only were there technical language arts programs in the technical colleges, but in community colleges and branch campuses--each and all differing considerably.

Consequently, it became apparent in the analysis of the data that the four instruments used were imprecise and poorly designed for some areas of the study. For example, the items dealing with textbooks failed to provide the specific reasons for the dissatisfaction with present texts; Also, the items dealing with the content of courses failed to solicit reliable response and, therefore, failed to explain the study's broad content categories of speaking, listening, writing, and reading.

Obviously, because of the imperfection of the study's tools, the study raised more questions than it was able to answer and, even here, left many of these answers open to question. However, it did offer appreciable information that should be valuable to the designing of such instruments for future studies regarding this or like problems. But despite its shortcomings, the study did supply enough evidence to substantiate and incept the following findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

1. Of the 46 Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs, there were 21 branch campuses, 18 technical colleges, and 7 community colleges.

2. The language arts program was a vital part of the total technical curriculum in these colleges.

3. One hundred percent of the educational administrators and 87% of the language arts instructors held Master's Degrees.

4. Only 25% of the administrators and 9% of the language arts instructors held doctorates.

5. About one-fourth of the administrators and more than four-fifths of the language arts instructors had majored in language arts for one or more of the degrees.

6. Most administrators and language arts instructors were Ohio college graduates.

7. Administrators and instructors did not feel that they were well trained by the graduate schools for work in the two-year technical college.

8. The preparation received by the language arts instructors in the university was too heavy in reading and literature and too light in the other communication skills.

9. The Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs were relatively new—most no older than 5 years.

10. The majority of language arts instructors felt responsible
to teach all of the communicative skills. The branches felt the least responsible; the technical colleges, the most responsible.

11. About one-third of the language arts instructors taught in other subject areas.

12. The average number of hours instructors spent weekly on all activities was 29.

13. No language arts instructor received extra pay for extra duties.

14. The average number of language arts instructors per school was nine—5, full-time; 4, part-time.

15. The average language arts instructor in the Ohio two-year technical college was female, 30-40 years old, married, and possessed a Master's.

16. Most instructors came to the two-year technical college from teaching in high school.

17. The educational administrators of the technical colleges bore many titles and were the final decision makers upon the contents and format of the language arts curriculum.

18. The average class size was 25 students.

19. The Ohio colleges are more similar to each other in the specific language arts courses required of the technical students; the California colleges were more similar in the number of language arts required hours.

20. Few Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs provided
electives or possessed a full combination skills remedial or developmental program.

21. The language arts programs of the two-year colleges placed a very heavy emphasis upon writing.

22. Although the instructors did not feel that the language arts were adequately covered in the present programs and although the administrators, students, and employers were somewhat dissatisfied with the present language arts programs, the administrators, employers, instructors, and students felt that the present programs were effective and adequate.

23. The instructors felt that the available facilities were adequate.

24. The instructors felt that writing should retain the emphasis in the language arts curriculum.

25. The administrators felt that reading should be emphasized in the language arts curriculum.

26. The employers felt that listening should be emphasized in the language arts curriculum.

27. The students felt that speaking should be emphasized in the language arts curriculum.

28. Technical students attended more class hours for their language arts course credits than other college students.

29. Instructors and students registered great dissatisfaction with present textbook offerings.
30. Employer support and knowledge of the language arts in the technical colleges were insufficient.

31. The large majority of administrators, employers, instructors, and students saw the purposes of technical education language arts as to teach basic language skills to the technical students and prepare them for work.

32. The best features of the present language arts program in the technical schools were perceived to be its practical applicability and degree of individualization; the least desirable features were mainly the constant changing of the language arts curriculum and poor textbooks.

33. The top ten mentioned improvements were (1) more developmental programs and laboratories, (2) more emphasis upon the practical, (3) more speech instruction, (4) better textbooks, (5) better interschool communications, (6) improved transferability of course credits, (7) better graduate school training for instructors and administrators, (8) less grammar, (9) changes in courses and curriculum, and (10) more electives.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS

1. The Ohio colleges and universities ill equipped administrators and instructors for work in the two-year technical colleges.

2. There was a dearth of suitable textbooks that fit well the economy of the technical student and the needs of the two-year technical student and the needs of the two-year technical language arts
3. The inability of the colleges and universities to train administrators and instructors well and the dearth of suitable textbooks were attributable to the lack of the language arts program of the two-year technical colleges to possess an identity. This manifests itself most in the accompanying problem of nontransferability of course credits.

4. There was no Ohio technical language arts program. The Ohio technical language arts program was not a program but various programs. These programs lacked individuality: They copied much of the four-year college programs. These programs lacked sameness: They differed greatly from each other.

5. Individually and collectively, the Ohio and the California two-year college language arts programs differed significantly. And although the Ohio colleges were more similar than the California colleges in required courses, there was little uniformity in language arts programs of the various Ohio two-year technical colleges in terms of courses offered—elected or required.

6. Although most persons involved in or with the technical language programs felt that the program should differ from that of the four-year college, that the language arts were not adequately covered in the present programs, that the purpose of the technical language arts programs was to teach the basic communicative skills for the preparation of the technical students for work, that all communicative
skills were required teaching content in the technical language arts courses, the Ohio and the California two-year technical colleges practiced an English composition and speech curriculum ignoring the communication skills format and becoming communication skills departments in name only.

7. The individual college programs were perceived relatively successful in meeting the needs of the students and employers, but at the same time there was great dissatisfaction, disagreement on the part of administrators, employers, instructors, and students, and constant changing within the current language arts programs.

8. The language arts programs were recognized as a vital part of technical education; there was a great interest in the quality of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges of Ohio; however, the technical language arts programs received little employer support and only fair student support. There were no direct lines of communication between the employers and the language arts instructors.

9. There was a great awareness of the role and the purpose of the language arts programs on the part of most technical education administrators.

10. However, the administrators made the final language art curriculum decisions; instructors, students, and employers, even the department chairmen had little to say concerning language arts course content.
11. There was, though, substantial tenure among language arts faculties of the Ohio two-year technical colleges.

12. The "teach not research" slogan of the two-year technical colleges needed abandoning. Obviously there was much need for further studies; for example, (1) the establishment of a technical language arts program identity (possessing individuality and sameness), (2) textbook and graduate school guidance, (3) improvement of transferability of language arts course credits, (4) the reason for poor employer support, (5) establishment of direct lines of communication between industry and the language arts instructors.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The following suggestions were offered for action to be taken by the indicated agencies:

To the Ohio Board of Regents:

1. Ohio two-year colleges with technical programs should be encouraged to identify clearly a technical language arts program on which graduate training, textbooks, and course transferability criteria could be adequately constructed.

2. Efforts should be made to provide funds and guidance for needed research in the technical language arts area.

3. Efforts should also be made to establish a more flexible set of hour and course requirements and one which allowed greater compatibility with the State Vocational Education requirements and a greater hour allowance for electives.
To professional language arts organizations:

1. Language arts instructors should be encouraged to share their concerns with each other and with those of professional leaders through conferences, seminars, workshops, and publications.

2. An Ohio two-year technical college language arts instructors association should be created and other local and state education associations should lend support and encouragement.

3. An Ohio two-year technical college journal should be created to solidify purpose and efforts, to aid in identity, to recognize and distinguish schools and personnel, and to ignite esprit de corps.

To teacher-training institution:

1. Prospective two-year college language arts instructors need to be better informed of the nature and expectations of the two-year technical college, better trained to teach the communicative skills, and given experiences in this type of teaching in order to become more successful in all facets of technical language arts teaching.

2. In-service programs should be established to acquaint the instructors and the administrators of recent innovations in the professional field.

3. Administrators should be better prepared to serve in the two-year technical college.

4. Training institutions should solicit two-year technical colleges for placement of student teachers.
5. Prospective instructors should be acquainted with the purpose and the problems of technical education and helped to understand that they are the real curriculum leaders in the field.

6. Efforts should be made to provide technical education administrators with materials clarifying the purpose and aims of the language arts program in technical education.

To the textbooks publishers:

1. The publishers should offer textbooks that more closely fit the needs of the two-year technical language arts program.

2. The use of experienced and knowledgeable two-year technical language arts instructors as writers of such texts should answer the problem.

3. Advanced monies for such purposes would expedite the needed manuscripts.

To technical education administrators:

1. Administrators should help in the quest for language arts program identity and improve course transferability.

2. Administrators should allow instructors time to research upon needed studies.

3. Administrators should allow a greater voice to the language arts department chairmen, instructors, students, and employers concerning the content and format of the two-year technical college language arts curriculum.

4. Administrators should take the initiative and see that the
graduate schools better train prospective technical language arts instructors.

5. Administrators should cooperate fully with the training institutions and place student teachers in their language arts programs.

6. Administrators should aid in setting up better communications between industry and the language arts instructors and attempt to bolster employer support of the technical language arts program.

To two-year technical college language arts instructors:

1. Instructors should collectively identify just what the technical language arts program is in the two-year colleges of Ohio.

2. Professional unity, resourcefulness, and concern is needed to improve the status and identity of the technical language arts program. Instructors should recognize that their professional attitudes are often responsible for the attitudes of others.

3. Instructors should stay abreast with the latest developments within the field.

4. Instructors should communicate with all the facets of technical education and take the responsibility of curriculum making and textbook writing.

5. The instructors should see that all four of the communicative skills are taught the technical student and that the communication skills courses become actual instruction in the communicative skills.

To the employers:

1. Employers should become aware of the great potential of
technical education and more knowledgeable of the vital role of the
to meet the needs and wants of the student body.

To the student organizations:
1. The students should take a more active role in curriculum making, urging the language arts instructors and administrators to

2. Current students and graduates should base such recommendations upon observed job needs, personal experience and the changing demands of industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

Immediate studies needed to be made of the following problems:

1. The establishment of a technical language arts program identity for the Ohio two-year technical colleges.

2. Textbook and graduate school guidance.

3. Improvement of transferability of language arts course credits.

4. The reason for poor employer support.

5. Establishment of direct lines of communication between industry and the language arts instructors.
APPENDIX
Dear Sir:

I am doing a doctoral study for the Ohio State University concerning the various perceptions of the language arts programs in the two-year technical schools in Ohio. A critical part of this study will involve a comparison of the Ohio colleges with the California two-year programs. Working to a cut-off date of April 6, 1973, I ask to include your college in the study and respectfully request a copy of your college catalog and a copy or copies of your language arts syllabi.

For a meaningful result that can both further and better the two-year technical college, I need and ask for your cooperation. Enclosed is a stamped business envelope for convenient reply.

An abstract of the findings will be sent to everyone who participates in this study. Your valued help will be greatly appreciated, and I will thank you in advance for your immediate reply.

Respectfully yours,

James D. Pullen, BA, MA
Communication Skills Instructor
February 20, 1973

I am doing a doctoral study for the Ohio State University concerning the various perceptions of the language arts programs of the two-year technical colleges in Ohio. The purpose of this study is to identify what the language arts program of the two-year technical college is and what it should be. The study will attempt to measure this through the perceptions of the language arts instructors of these schools, the technical education administrators in charge of curriculum, the employers of technicians, and the graduates of the technical colleges.

Working to a cut-off date of April 6, 1973, I will need and request a copy of your college catalog and a copy or copies of your language arts syllabi. Too, I have enclosed one administrator questionnaire to be completed by whoever is in charge of the college curriculum and ten language arts instructor questionnaires to be completed by the college’s language arts instructors. A stamped business envelope is also enclosed for convenient return of the catalog, syllabi, and completed questionnaires.

In order to complete a meaningful study to further and better technical education, I need and ask for your cooperation.

An abstract of the findings will be sent to everyone who participates in this study. Your valued help will be greatly appreciated, and I will thank you in advance for your immediate reply.

Respectfully yours,

James D. Pullen, BA, MA
Communication Skills Instructor
I am doing a doctoral study for the Ohio State University concerning the various perceptions of the language arts programs of the two-year technical colleges in Ohio. The purpose of this study is to identify what the language arts program of the two-year technical college is and what it should be. The study will attempt to measure this through the perceptions of the language arts instructors of these schools, the technical education administrators in charge of curriculum, the employers of technicians, and the graduates of the technical colleges.

In order to complete a meaningful study to further and better technical education, I need and ask for your cooperation.

Working to a cut-off date of April 6, 1973, I have enclosed one employer questionnaire to be completed by you. A stamped business envelope is also enclosed for convenient return of questionnaire.

An abstract of the findings will be sent to everyone who participates in this study. Your valued help will be greatly appreciated, and I will thank you in advance for your immediate reply.

Respectfully yours,

James D. Fullen, BA, MA
Communication Skills Instructor
I am doing a doctoral study for the Ohio State University concerning the various perceptions of the language arts programs in the two-year technical colleges in Ohio. The purpose of this study is to identify what the language arts program of the two-year technical college is and what it should be. The study will attempt to measure this through the perceptions of the language arts instructors of these schools, the technical education administrators in charge of curriculum, the employers of technicians, and the graduates of the technical colleges.

In order to complete a meaningful study to further and better technical education, I need and ask for your cooperation.

Working to a cutoff date of April 6, 1973, I have enclosed one student questionnaire to be completed by you. A stamped business envelope is also enclosed for convenient return of questionnaire.

An abstract of the findings will be sent to everyone who participates in this study. Your valued help will be greatly appreciated, and I will thank you in advance for your immediate reply.

Respectfully yours,

James A. Allen, Ph.D.
Communication Skills Instructor
EDUCATION ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

If the blank is on the left, mark an "X" when the statement is true; disregard when false. If the blank is on the right, supply the needed information. Answer upon all blanks that are pertinent.

I. PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Possess a Bachelor's Degree.
   a. Graduated from an Ohio college.
   b. Majored in English or speech.
   c. Majored in Teacher Ed.
      General Ed.
      Vocational Ed.
      d. Majored in Administrator Ed.
         General Ed.
         Vocational Ed.
   e. Other:

2. Possess a Master's Degree.
   a. Graduated from an Ohio college.
   b. Majored in English or speech.
   c. Majored in Teacher Ed.
      General Ed.
      Vocational Ed.
   d. Majored in Administrator Ed.
      General Ed.
      Vocational Ed.
   e. Other:
   f. Worked beyond Master's.

3. Possess a Doctor's Degree.
   a. Graduated from an Ohio college.
   b. Majored in English or speech.
   c. Majored in Teacher Ed.
      General Ed.
      Vocational Ed.
   d. Majored in Administrator Ed.
      General Ed.
      Vocational Ed.
   e. Other:

4. Was well prepared in college to work in the two-year college.
5. Was well prepared in college to work in a technical school.
6. Total number of years taught:
7. Total number of years as an administrator:
8. Total number of years in this position:
9. Total number of years with this college:
10. Total number of years since further university training:
11. Total number of years since most recent "on-the-job" training:

II. PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

12. Your position is:
13. You are responsible for:

III. DESCRIPTION OF LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAM

14. The college has a language arts program.
15. All required language arts courses are offered during the day.
16. All required language arts courses are offered during the evening.
17. Elective language arts courses are offered during the day.
18. Elective language arts courses are offered during the evening.
19. All students are required to take language arts courses.
20. Some students are not required to take language arts courses.
21. No student is required to take a language arts course.
22. If answer is all, some, no, state why:

23. The number of full-time language arts instructors is:
24. The number of part-time language arts instructors is:
25. Most of the college's language arts instructors are:
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. 20-30 age
   d. 30-40 age
   e. 40-50 age
   f. 50-above age
   g. Single
   h. Married
   i. BA
   j. MA
   k. PhD
26. Some teachers teach other areas besides language arts.
27. What areas? General:
       Technical:
28. How many minutes are the class periods:
29. What is the average number of students per language arts class:
30. How many students presently enrolled in the college:
31. If part-time language arts teachers are employed, they also work for:  
   a. High Schools  
   b. Professions or Businesses  
   c. Two-year Colleges  
   d. Four-year Colleges  
   e. Other:  

32. Most of the language arts teachers come to work for:  
   a. Directly after graduation from teacher training.  
   b. After teaching in high school.  
   c. After teaching in another two-year college.  
   d. After teaching in a four-year college.  
   e. Other:  

33. Compared to other departments, the language arts teacher attrition rate is:  
   higher  same  lower  

34. The final decision as to which language arts courses are to be taught, what syllabus for each course, and which courses are required is the responsibility of:  
   a. The students.  
   b. The language arts instructors.  
   c. The chairman of the language arts department.  
   d. The administration.  
   e. Other:  

IV. PERCEPTIONS  
35. Compared to the other programs in the college, the language arts program of the college is:  
   very effective  adequate  ineffective  
36. Compared to the other instructors, the language arts instructors are:  
   very effective  adequate  ineffective  
37. Compared to the training of the other instructors, the training of the language arts teacher for the two-year technical school is:  
   better than av.  average  below av.  
38. Out of 100%, how much emphasis should be placed upon:  
   a. Speaking  c. Writing  
   b. Listening  d. Reading  
39. Industry support for the language arts program is:  
   good  fair  poor  unknown  
40. Departmental support for the language arts program is:  
   good  fair  poor  unknown  
41. Staff support for the language arts program is:  
   good  fair  poor  unknown  
42. Student support for the language arts program is:  
   good  fair  poor  unknown  
43. The students that attend the technical college differ from other students of higher learning.  
44. If so, how:  
45. The language arts program of the two-year technical college should be the same or similar to that of the four-year school.  
46. What are the best features of the college's language arts program?  
47. What are the least desirable features of the college's language arts program?  
48. What changes do you recommend?  
49. What is the purpose of the college's language arts program?
EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE: If the blank is on the left, mark an "X" when the statement is true; disregard when false. If the blank or answer space is on the right or below, supply the needed information. Answer upon all blanks that are pertinent.

1. Compared to others employed, the technicians that graduated from a two-year technical college hired by the company were trained technically:
   _____ well _____ adequately _____ poorly

2. Compared to others employed, the technicians from the two-year technical college were trained in communicative skills:
   _____ well _____ adequately _____ poorly

3. In the communicative skills and using the following scale, rank the general ability of the employed technical college graduates:
   1 = excellent
   2 = good        Speaking______  Writing______
   3 = fair        Listening______ Reading______
   4 = poor

4. Out of 100% and by percentage, what emphasis in the language arts program of the two-year technical college should be placed upon:
   Speaking______  Writing______
   Listening______ Reading______

5. Industry support of the present language arts program in the two-year technical college is:
   _____ good _____ fair _____ poor _____ unknown

6. What should be the purpose of the technical college's language arts program?

7. Evident from the performance of hired graduates of the two-year technical college, what are the best features of its language arts program?

8. Evident from the performance of hired graduates of the two-year technical college, what are the least desirable features of its language arts program?

9. What changes do you recommend in its language arts program?

10. Comments:
If the blank is on the left, mark an "X" when the statement is true; disregard when false. If the blank is on the right, supply the needed information. Answer your all blanks that are pertinent.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

1. Possess a Bachelor's Degree
2. Possess a Master's Degree
3. Graduated from an Ohio college
4. Majored in English or English Ed.
5. Majored in speech or speech Ed.
6. Majored in journalism or related
7. Other:
8. Worked beyond Master's
9. Possess a Doctor's Degree
10. Graduated from an Ohio college
11. Majored in language or related
12. Wrote a thesis
13. Others:
14. Was well prepared in college for teaching in the language arts
15. Was well prepared in college for teaching in a technical school
16. Number of quarter hours in speaking training:
17. Number of quarter hours in listening training:
18. Number of quarter hours in writing training:
19. Number of quarter hours in reading and literature training:
20. Total number of weeks taught in language arts
21. Total number of weeks taught in this college
22. Total number of years since further university training
23. Total number of years since last employment or "on-the-job" or "self-training" or both:

COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS YOU ARE REQUIRED TO TEACH

A. Speaking
B. Listening
C. Writing
D. Reading

III. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING PROGRAM

24. Out of 100%, what percentage of the department's program is spent in:
A. Speaking
B. Writing
C. Listening
D. Reading
E. Others

25. Out of 100%, what percentage of your individual teaching is spent in:
A. Speaking
B. Writing
C. Listening
D. Reading
E. Others
27. Complete courses you personally teach in speaking:

- a. Conversation and Interview
- b. Oral Interpretation
- c. Letter
- d. Public Address
- e. Informal Argument
- f. Conference and Debate
- g. Poetry and Lyric
- h. Parliamentary Procedure
- i. Group Discussion
- j. Poetry and Prose
- k. Special Laboratory
- l. Developmental Laboratory
- m. Other:

28. Complete courses you personally teach in listening:

- a. "Speaking"
- b. "Notation"
- c. "Theories and Theorems"
- d. "Listening for Appreciation"
- e. "Listening for Information"
- f. "Listening for Critical Perception"
- g. "Special Laboratory"
- h. "Developmental Laboratory"
- i. "Class for Business"
- j. Other:

29. Complete courses you personally teach in reading:

- a. Fiction
- b. Poetry
- c. Plays
- d. Short Stories
- e. Novels
- f. Pros/Cons
- g. Newspapers, Journals, Magazine Articles
- h. Correspondence and Reports
- i. Studies and Research
- j. Textbooks
- k. Special Laboratory
- l. Developmental Laboratory
- m. Other:

30. Complete courses you personally teach in writing:

- a. Creative
- b. Fiction
- c. Poetry
- d. Plays
- e. Short Stories
- f. Novels
- g. Letters, Form, and Correspondence
- h. Research Papers
- i. Essays
- j. "Narration"
- k. "Informal"
- l. "Formal"
- m. "Description"
- n. "Informal"
- o. "Formal"
- p. "Argument"
- q. "Informal"
- r. "Formal"
- s. Special Laboratory
- t. Developmental Laboratory
- u. Other:

31. Other language areas you include:

- a. Grammar, Usage, and Mechanics
- b. Vocabulary, Pronunciation, Connotation
- c. Historical Background of English language
- d. Linguistics
- e. Semantics
- f. Analysis
- g. Dictionary, Pronunciation, and Spelling
- h. Dialects and Cultural Levels
- i. "English as a Second Language"
- j. "How to Study"
- k. Shorthand
- l. "Handwriting"
- m. Other:

32. Appropriate classrooms are provided:

- a. "Lectures"
- b. "Blackboards and Chalk"
- c. "Overhead Projector"
- d. "Strobe Lighting"
- e. "Slides/Projector"
- f. "Movie Making"
- g. "Recording Equipment"
- h. "Handouts/Models"
- i. "Records"
- j. "Film Projector"
- k. "Others"
- l. "Education Films"

IV. DESCRIPTIONS

34. Industries' support of language program:

- a. "Program Good Fair Poor"
- b. "Department support of program"
- c. "Program Good Fair Poor"
- d. "Staff support of program"
- e. "Program Good Fair Poor"
- f. "Student support of program"
- g. "Program Good Fair Poor"
40. They would view work the students that you now teach compared to other students you have taught.

41. How would you rank the college's language arts program compared to others you have known?

42. The language arts are adequately covered in the college's program.

43. You would rank the textbooks selected for the language arts courses of your college.

44. What is the purpose of the language arts program in your college (where you teach)?

45. What do you consider the best features of your program?

46. What do you feel are the least desirable features of your program?

47. What recommendations are needed to improve the existing program?

Comments:
TECHNICAL QUESTIONNAIRE: If the blank is on the left, mark an "X" when the statement is true; disregard when false. If the blank or answer space is on the right or below, supply the needed information. Answer upon all blanks that are pertinent.

1. Attended a two-year technical college or institute.

2. Graduated from a two-year technical college or institute.

3. My technical field is:

4. The courses in my technology prepared me well for my initial employment position.

5. I was initially employed by:

6. The courses in my technology prepared me well for the position I now hold.

7. I am presently employed by:

8. For the work I do, the communication skills or language arts courses of the technical college prepared me well in communications.

9. The communications skills or language arts courses were a good combination of theory and practice.

10. I felt that the communication skills or language arts instructors were well trained in their subject.

11. I was satisfied with the textbooks chosen for the communication skills and language arts courses. Comment:

12. Out of 100% and by percentage, my communication skills or language arts training consisted of:

   Speaking _____
   Listening _____
   Writing _____
   Reading _____

13. Out of 100% and by percentage, this is how I believe the emphasis should be placed:

   Speaking _____
   Listening _____
   Writing _____
   Reading _____

14. While I attended the college, I felt the student support of the language arts program was:

   good _____
   fair _____
   poor _____
   unknown _____

15. I believe the purpose of the two-year technical college's language arts program should be:

16. I found the best features of the college's language arts program to be:

17. I found the least desirable features of the college's language arts program to be:

18. Some changes that I suggest in the college's language arts program are:

   Comment:
MAILING LIST OF THE CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

1. Allan Hancock College
   800 South College Drive
   Santa Maria, California 93434

2. American River College
   4700 College Oak Drive
   Sacramento, California 95841

3. Antelope Valley College
   3041 West Avenue K
   Lancaster, California 93534

4. Barstow College
   2700 Barstow Road
   Barstow, California 92311

5. Butte Junior College
   Durham, California 95938

6. Cabrillo College
   6500 Sequel Drive
   Aptos, California

7. California Concordia College
   6325 Camden Street
   Oakland, California 94505

8. California College of Mortuary Science
   1920 Marengo Street
   Los Angeles, California 90033

9. Canada College
   4200 Farm Hill Boulevard
   Redwood City, California 94061

10. Cerritos College
    11110 East Alondra Boulevard
    Norwalk, California 90650

11. Chabot College
    25555 Hesperian Boulevard
    Hayward, California 94545

12. Chaffey College
    5885 Haven Avenue
    Alta Loma, California 91701

13. Citrus College
    18824 East Foothill Boulevard
    Azusa, California 91702

14. Coalinga College
    300 Cherry Lane
    Coalinga, California 93210

15. Cogswell Polytechnical College
    3000 Folsom Street
    San Francisco, California 94110

16. Columbia Junior College
    Columbia, California 95310

17. Compton College
    1111 East Artesia Boulevard
    Compton, California 90221

18. Contra Costa College
    2600 Mission Bell Drive
    San Pablo, California 94806

19. Cuesta College
    P. O. Box J
    San Luis Obispo, California 93401

20. Cypress Jr. College
    Cypress, California 90603

21. De Anza College
    21250 Stevens Creek Boulevard
    Cupertino, California 95014

22. Deep Springs College
    Deep Springs, California 89010

23. College of the Desert
    Palm Desert, California 92260
24. Diablo Valley College  
Pleasant Hill, California 92260

25. East Los Angeles College  
Los Angeles, California 90022

26. El Camino College  
16007 South crenshaw Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90506

27. Foothill College  
12345 El Monte  
Los Alton Hills, California 94022

28. Feather River College  
300 Grand Avenue  
Oakland, California 94610

29. Fresno City College  
1101 East University Avenue  
Fresno, California 93704

30. Fullerton Junior College  
321 East Chapman  
Fullerton, California 92634

31. Gavilan College  
Santa Teresa Boulevard  
Gilroy, California 95020

32. Glendale College  
Glendale, California 91208

33. Golden West College  
15744 Golden West Street  
Huntington Beach, California 92647

34. Grossmont College  
Grossmont College Drive  
El Cajon, California 92020

35. Hartnell College  
Salinas, California 93901

36. Humphrey's College  
Stockton, California 95207

37. Imperial Valley College  
Imperial, California 92251

38. Laney College  
1001 3rd Avenue  
Oakland, California 94606

39. Long Beach City College  
4901 East Carson Street  
Long Beach, California 90808

40. Los Angeles City College  
855 North Vermont  
Los Angeles, California 90029

41. Los Angeles Harbor College  
1111 Figueroa Place  
Wilmington, California 90744

42. Los Angeles Pierce College  
6201 Winnetha Avenue  
Woodland Hills, California 91364

43. Los Angeles Southwestern College  
1151 Southwestern Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90047

44. Los Angeles Trade-Technical College  
400 West Washington Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90047

45. Los Angeles Valley College  
Van Nuys, California 91401
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Marin</td>
<td>Kentfield, California 94904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marymount International College</td>
<td>6717 West Palor Verdes Drive, South Palor Verdes Estates, California 90274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo College</td>
<td>Menlo Park, California 94025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced College</td>
<td>Merced, California 95340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt College</td>
<td>5714 Grove Street, Oakland, California 94609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracorta College</td>
<td>Barnard Drive, Oceanside, California 92054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto Junior College</td>
<td>Modesto, California 95350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula Junior College</td>
<td>Monterey, California 93940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorpark College</td>
<td>7075 Campus Road, Moorpark, California 93031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount San Antonio College</td>
<td>1100 North Grand Avenue, Walnut, California 91789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Jacinto College</td>
<td>Gilman Hot Springs, California 92340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa College</td>
<td>Napa, California 94558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklone Community College</td>
<td>650 Washington Boulevard, Fremont, California 94537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Coast College</td>
<td>2701 Fairview Road, Costa Mesa, California 92626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Verde College</td>
<td>Elythe, California 92225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palomar College</td>
<td>San Marcos, California 92069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena City College</td>
<td>1570 East Colorado Boulevard, Pasadena, California 91106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td>900 South Main Street, Porterville, California 93257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedley College</td>
<td>995 North Reed Avenue, Reedley, California 93654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Hondo Junior College</td>
<td>Whittier, California 90608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside City College</td>
<td>Riverside, California 92506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City College</td>
<td>Sacramento, California 95822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleback College</td>
<td>26522 Crown Valley Parkway, Mission Viejo, California 92675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
69. San Bernardino Valley College  
   San Bernardino, California 92403

70. San Diego Administration of Junior Colleges  
   San Diego, California 92111

71. San Francisco City College  
   San Francisco, California 94112

72. San Joaquin Delta College  
   3301 Kensington Way  
   Stockton, California 95204

73. San Jose City College  
   2100 Moorpark Avenue  
   San Jose, California 95114

74. College of San Mateo  
   1700 West Hillsdale Boulevard  
   San Mateo, California 94402

75. Santa Ana College  
   1530 West 17th Street  
   Santa Ana, California 92706

76. Santa Barbara City College  
   721 Cliff Drive  
   Santa Barbara, California 93105

77. Santa Clarita Valley Junior College  
   Newhall, California 91321

78. Santa Monica City College  
   1815 Pearl Street  
   Santa Monica, California 90406

79. Santa Rosa Junior College  
   1501 Mendocino  
   Santa Rosa, California 95401

80. College of Sequoias  
   Mooney Boulevard  
   Visalia, California 93277

81. Shasta Junior College  
   Redding, California 96001

82. Sierra College  
   5000 Rocklin Road  
   Rocklin, California 95677

83. Siskiyous College  
   800 College Avenue  
   Weed, California 96094

84. Skyline College  
   3300 College Drive  
   San Bruno, California 94066

85. Solano College  
   100 Whitney Avenue  
   Vallejo, California 94590

86. Southwestern College  
   5400 Otay Lake Road  
   Chula Vista, California 92010

87. Taft College  
   29 Emmons Park Drive  
   Taft, California 93268

88. Ventura College  
   Ventura, California 93003

89. West Los Angeles College  
   Culver City, California 90230

90. West Valley Junior College  
   44 East Latimer  
   Campbell, California 95008
### Mailing List of the Ohio Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Campus Name</th>
<th>Address Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agricultural College</td>
<td>The Ohio State University, Wooster Branch, Wooster, Ohio 45804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Allen County Technical College</td>
<td>Lima Branch Campus, The Ohio State University, Lima, Ohio 45804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ashtabula Regional Campus</td>
<td>Kent State University, 3325 West 13th Street, Ashtabula, Ohio 44004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hocking Technical College</td>
<td>Route 1, Nelsonville, Ohio 45764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belmont Campus</td>
<td>Ohio University, National Road West, St. Clairsville, Ohio 43950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Belmont Technical College</td>
<td>R.F.D. #1, Route 331, St. Clairsville, Ohio 43950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tri-County Academic Center</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati, Macon, Ohio 45143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hamilton Campus</td>
<td>Miami University, 1601 Peck Boulevard, Hamilton, Ohio 45011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Middletown Campus</td>
<td>Miami University, University and Breiel Blvds., Middletown, Ohio 45042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clark Technical College</td>
<td>570 East Leeffels Lane, Springfield, Ohio 45501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Columbus Technical Institute</td>
<td>550 East Spring Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>East Liverpool Regional Campus</td>
<td>Kent State University, 400 East 4th Street, East Liverpool, Ohio 43920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Salem Regional Campus</td>
<td>Kent State University, 2491 State Route 45, R.F.D. #3, Salem, Ohio 44460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cuyahoga Community College</td>
<td>(Central Office), 2123 East 9th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Firelands Branch</td>
<td>Bowling Green State University, 901 Rye Beach Road, Huron, Ohio 44839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lancaster Campus</td>
<td>Ohio University, 1000 Lancaster-Newark Road, Lancaster, Ohio 43130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Geauga County Regional Campus</td>
<td>Kent State University, Chesterland, Ohio 44026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ohio College of Applied Science</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati, 100 East Central Parkway, Cincinnati, Ohio 45210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ohio State University Wooster Branch</td>
<td>Wooster, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Raymond Walters General and Technical University</td>
<td>9555 Plainfield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>University College University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Cincinnati Technical College</td>
<td>3520 Central Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Northwest Technical College</td>
<td>P. O. Box 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Jefferson County Technical Institute</td>
<td>4000 Sunset Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Lakeland Community College</td>
<td>7547 Mentor Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ironton Academic Center Ohio University</td>
<td>Ironton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Central Ohio Technical Institute</td>
<td>University Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Lorain County Community College</td>
<td>1005 North Abbe Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Community and Technical College</td>
<td>The University of Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Technical and Community College</td>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Marion Technical Institute</td>
<td>1465 Mt. Vernon Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
<td>140 South Perry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Zanesville Branch Ohio University</td>
<td>1425 Newark Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Muskingum Area Technical College</td>
<td>400 Richards Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>North Central Technical College</td>
<td>2441 Kenwood Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Chillicothe Campus Ohio University</td>
<td>P. O. Box 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Portsmouth Branch Ohio University</td>
<td>940 2nd Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Scioto Technical College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. Vanguard Technical College  
   1306 Cedar Street  
   Fremont, Ohio 43420

40. Stark Regional Campus  
   Kent State University  
   6000 Frank Road  
   Canton, Ohio 44720

41. Stark Technical College  
   118 McKinley Avenue  
   Canton, Ohio 44702

42. The University of Akron  
   Community and Technical College  
   Akron, Ohio 44304

43. Trumbull Regional Campus  
   Kent State University  
   4314 Mahoning Avenue  
   Warren, Ohio 44483

44. Tuscarawas Regional Campus  
   Kent State University  
   University Drive  
   New Philadelphia, Ohio 44663

45. Washington County Technical Institute  
   215 2nd Street  
   Marietta, Ohio 45750

46. The Ohio State University  
   Agricultural Technical Institute  
   Wooster, Ohio 44691

47. Michael J. Owen Technical College  
   Oregon Road  
   Perrysburg, Ohio 43551
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