

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

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

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-22,030

**SHARROCK, William Roger, 1929-
MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF TRUSTEES OF NORTH
CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: THEIR SELECTED
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD INSTITUTIONAL ROLE AND GOVERNANCE.**

**University of North Carolina at Greensboro,
Ed.D., 1974
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF TRUSTEES OF NORTH CAROLINA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES: THEIR SELECTED PERSONAL
CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD INSTITUTIONAL ROLE
AND GOVERNANCE


by

William Roger Sharrock

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

Greensboro
1974

Approved by


Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

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

Dissertation
Advisor

Thomas Joseph Moore

Oral Examination
Committee Members

Robert L. Lusk

Joseph E. Bryson

C. D. Sharma

Walter B. Smith

March 1, 1974
Date of Examination

SHARROCK, WILLIAM ROGER. Members of Boards of Trustees of North Carolina Community Colleges: Their Selected Personal Characteristics and Attitudes Toward Institutional Role and Governance. (1974) Directed by: Dr. T. Joseph McCook. Pp. 208.

The purpose of this study was to determine for the State of North Carolina: (1) the personal characteristics of local community college board members, (2) the attitudes of board members toward functions of the local community college, and (3) the relationships between personal characteristics and attitudes.

The population potential of this study included 178 board members serving in the State of North Carolina during the spring of 1973. A total of 152 board members, or 85.29 per cent, responded to a questionnaire designed to obtain the necessary data.

The study revealed that in the spring of 1973, the typical board member serving North Carolina community colleges was a white male about 55 years old and a resident of a small town or rural area. He had earned at least a bachelor's degree and a median family income between \$25,001 and \$32,000, with almost one-half reporting a family income of more than \$32,001. He was active in a professional or managerial occupation and reported a parental status of one to three children. The majority of board members reported that they had resided in the county where the college he served was located for over 30 years and had two to three years experience on public school boards. Over 90 per cent had over three years experience on community college boards.

A majority of board members included in the study indicated attitudes favorable to the concept of the comprehensive community college. This included the open-door policy, provisions for a variety of programs

and an acceptance of a basic philosophy consistent with that of the Community College Act. Such programs as adult education, transfer education, technical or semi-technical courses, remedial programs for under educated youth and adults, counseling, testing and placement services for all students were among those supported by a majority of board members.

Board members did not favor extra-curricular programs and inter-collegiate athletics or social organizations and fraternities in the community colleges. A majority did not support faculty or student representation on the board nor did they feel that the faculty should negotiate with the board for salary arrangements and working conditions.

To determine significance of the relationship between personal characteristics and attitudes of board members, a chi-square test was applied to 210 specific comparisons. Of these, 35 were significant at the .05 level of significance, the standard established for acceptance of the hypotheses in the study.

The hypotheses were accepted for 35 relationships between personal characteristics and attitudes of board members. The personal characteristic of family income had nine significant relationships with attitudinal statements, education had seven, experience on community college boards and age had six each, area of residence had five, and four were found between sex and attitudinal statements.

An analysis of the data revealed no significant relationships between personal characteristics and seven of the 30 attitudinal statements.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses special appreciation to Dr. T. Joseph McCook, advisor and director of this study, for his willing assistance, patience, and direction.

Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Joseph Bryson, Dr. C. L. Sharma, and Dr. Arthur Svenson, for their interest and direction throughout this study.

Gratitude is expressed to members of North Carolina community college boards whose interest in community college education is reflected in the high degree of participation in the investigation.

The writer is also grateful to his wife, Ruth, and children, Barry, Susan, Mark, and Renée, for their patience and understanding throughout the period covered by his studies and this writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	6
Importance of the Problem	6
Scope of the Study	10
Hypotheses of the Study	10
Delimitations of the Study	11
Limitations	12
Definition of Terms	13
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	16
Studies on Board Members of Institutions of Higher Education	16
Studies on Junior College Board Members	17
DESIGN OF THE STUDY	24
Selection of Population	24
Sources of Research Data	24
Procedures	27
Treatment of the Data	28
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF BOARD MEMBERS	32
ATTITUDES OF BOARD MEMBERS	40
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES	63
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	81
Summary	81
Conclusion	94
Recommendations	103
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105
APPENDIX A Letter to Trustees	108
APPENDIX B Questionnaire	109
APPENDIX C Follow-up Letter	114
APPENDIX D Tables A through EE Basic Data	115

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 Personal Characteristics of Local Community College Board Members	33
Table 2 Board Member Responses to Statements Reflecting Attitudes Toward Selected Functions of the Local Community College	41
Table 3 Chi-Square Values at .01 and .05 Levels for Relationships Between Personal Characteristics and Attitudinal Statements	65
Table 4 Questionnaires Returned by North Carolina Community College Board Members	83
Table A Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Research on Community College Education (Statement 1)	115
Table B Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Instructors Being Evaluated on Classroom Teaching Only (Statement 2)	118
Table C Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Community College Administrators Having Previous Successful Classroom Teaching Experience (Statement 3)	121
Table D Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Instructional Staff Involvement in Curriculum Development (Statement 4)	124
Table E Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Tuition Being Paid by North Carolina Residents Enrolled in Non-Credit Courses (Statement 5)	127
Table F Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Programs for "Under Educated" Youth and Adults (Statement 6)	130
Table G Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Employment of Husband-Wife Combinations by Local Community Colleges (Statement 7)	133
Table H Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Associate Degree Programs for Semi-Professional Training (Statement 8)	136

	Page
Table I Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Testing, Counseling and Placement Services for All Students (Statement 9)	139
Table J Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Involvement of the Instructional Staff in Policy Development (Statement 10)	142
Table K Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Extra-Curricular Programs and Inter-Collegiate Athletics (Statement 11)	145
Table L Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Development of Socially Acceptable Moral and Ethical Values in Community College Students as a Function of the College (Statement 12)	148
Table M Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Academic Freedom in the Classroom (Statement 13)	151
Table N Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Community College Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees (Statement 14)	154
Table O Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Development of Salary and Working Conditions Through Negotiations (Statement 15)	157
Table P Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Programs to Develop Vocational or Semi-Technical Skills (Statement 16)	160
Table Q Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Involvement of Instructors in Providing Guidance Services for Students (Statement 17)	163
Table R Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Social Organizations and Fraternities in North Carolina Community Colleges (Statement 18)	166
Table S Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Equal Emphasis on Transfer, Terminal and Community Services (Statement 19)	169
Table T Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Academic Ability as the Primary Measure for College Admission (Statement 20)	172

	Page
Table U Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Formal Education Beyond High School (Statement 21)	175
Table V Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Student Representation on the Board of Trustees (Statement 22)	178
Table W Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Community College Attempting to Solve Social Problems (Statement 23)	181
Table X Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Curricula Planned for Students with Different Ability Levels (Statement 24)	184
Table Y Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Similarity Between Administering a Community College and a Business (Statement 25)	187
Table Z Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Vacation Schedule for Community College Instructors (Statement 26)	190
Table AA Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Sick Leave for Community College Staff (Statement 27)	193
Table BB Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Recruitment of Future Faculty and Staff Specially Trained for the Community College Level (Statement 28)	196
Table CC Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Community Colleges Receiving an Increased Percentage of the Total Education Budget (Statement 29)	199
Table DD Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward an Extensive Orientation Program for Board Members (Statement 30)	202
Table EE Significance of Relationships Between Personal Characteristics of Board Members and Their Attitudes Toward Selected Community College Functions	205

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Opportunities for community college trustees to be of service to many thousands of people whom the institutions serve are numerous and rewarding. Trustees have the opportunity to stimulate local interest and progressive improvement of the institutions. Their influence will long be felt.

In remarks made by Dallas Herring (Blackmon, 1970, p. 7), Chairman of the State Board of Education, to the trustees of the North Carolina Community College System, the opportunities, rewards and obligations of trustee service were vividly stated in terms of his own experience. Excerpts from these remarks follow:

The work in which you and I are engaged as citizens of North Carolina is not in the writing, but in the making of history today. I invite you to think of your duty as trustees in this realistic, if somewhat lofty context, because the impact of your efforts will change the course of our history to the extent that you succeed with what you have undertaken to do. Make no mistake: yours is the greatest single opportunity facing the State

The goal of the Community College System must be as comprehensive as the needs of our students are. If this is not understood, then it is our duty to make it clear, so that it will not be misunderstood. We must support policies which will open all of these doors to all of the people who can walk through them with any degree of promise to themselves and to the State.

In the United States prior to the era of Thomas Jefferson, limited formal educational opportunities were afforded the general public; formal

education was reserved for the rich, well born and able (Hicks, 1939, pp. 242-43). Generally, since that time, the socio-economic foundations of the American society have changed so that today many Americans believe that universal educational opportunity is not only desirable, but essential (Thornton, 1966, Ch. 3; Benson, 1961, pp. 22, 23).

There are numerous proposals for ameliorating current social problems in the United States. Some would propose destruction of American society and starting anew. Others propose suppressing those who dissent. Rafferty (1968, p. 69), a proponent of those who would suppress, said concerning young dissenters:

The worst of our youngsters are growing up to become booted, sideburned, ducktailed, unwashed, leatherjacketed slobs whose favorite sport is ravaging little girls and stomping polio victims to death; the best of our youth are coming into maturity for all the world like a young person fresh from a dizzy rollercoaster ride with everything blurred, nothing clear, with no positive standards, with everything in doubt.

Between the two extremes of social anarchy and strict maintenance of the status quo appear more workable alternatives; reorientation of formal educational programs toward increased social relevancy is one such alternative. Dewey (1916), Kirkpatrick (1962), and other social reconstructionists advance the belief that formal education programs have tremendous potential for social reconstruction and improvement.

The comprehensive public two-year junior college, according to some authorities, is better organized than most other formal educational institutions to realize much of this potential for social reconstruction

(Thornton, 1966, p. 25). Thus the junior college is better able to meet the needs of people of the society rather than just the needs of those who are academically oriented.

Concomitant with this growing concern for providing maximum educational opportunities for all people has been the growth in number of junior and community colleges. In 1900 there were but eight junior colleges, all of which were private with a total enrollment of 100 students (Reynolds, 1965, p. 9). In 1971 872 junior colleges opened doors to over 2,680,000 students (Conner, 1972, pp. 10-12). Almost 4,900,000 students are expected to enroll in 1,228 junior and community colleges by 1980.

The problems of organizing, financing, administration, governance, and community involvement in the operation of the junior colleges have increased in complexity along with the astonishing rise of enrollment. Recognizing, understanding, and solving these difficult problems are essential if the junior college is to realize its potential as a viable and socially relevant educational institution.

In North Carolina, the growth of a system of comprehensive community colleges may be traced to September, 1950, when Charles F. Carroll, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed a Community College Committee with representatives from the legislature, state supported senior colleges, public junior colleges, private junior colleges, denominational junior colleges, the State Department of Public Instruction, industry and the public schools. At the same time he requested the Director of the North Carolina Survey of Public Education

to make a study of the need in North Carolina for state supported community colleges and to project a basic plan for the development of community college services and facilities in the state.

In December, 1962, the North Carolina Board of Higher Education and the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School published a document that has had far reaching effects in the state, particularly those recommendations which were proposals for a system of comprehensive community colleges in a statewide system as a part of a Master Plan for post-secondary education in the state (Hamilton, 1962).

The year of 1963 marked the enactment of Chapter 115A of the Public School Laws of North Carolina, which implemented the recommendations of the Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School and provided guidelines for the development of public junior community colleges in the state. The basic sections of the act were: 1) general provisions for state administration, 2) local administration, 3) financial support, 4) budgeting, accounting and fiscal management, and 5) special provisions.

The State Board of Education was designated as the supervisory agency for all public community college districts. Further, the Act created local boards of trustees to govern the various individual institutions.

The importance of the local board was pointed out by Campbell and associates (1965, p. 164) in their statement, "The essence of all government is decision-making; the decisions made by school boards are

the fiber of local school government". It was their conclusion that the public must concern itself with maximizing "good" decisions and minimizing "bad" decisions.

The powers and duties of local public junior college boards were somewhat consistent with those granted to boards serving senior public colleges and universities in the State of North Carolina. Of particular importance here is the traditional reliance on the concept of local control under state auspices. The recognition of basic policy development as the primary responsibility by local lay boards is also an important factor.

The selection of individuals to serve on local junior and community college boards should be a matter of interest and vital concern to those residents of the districts who are interested in higher education. Campbell (1965, p. 175) stated that board members exercised enormous influence through their discretionary powers. Through those powers, board members bring to bear great influence on the directions of the educational institutions they serve.

One of the problems of administration of the junior and community college is that of establishing meaningful working relationships with its board of trustees. Coordination must be attained between the functions of the board and college administration. Each body must perform the function it is legally set up to perform. Communication between these bodies must be effective to enhance understanding and to avoid duplication. Few studies have attempted to describe the nature or characteristics of trustees. Similarly, studies in related

fields of junior college administration have shown that trustees and junior college administrators often have dissimilar opinions of the role of the boards of trustees in the operation of the college (Gaines, 1967, p. 23).

I. The Problem

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to determine for North Carolina: (1) selected personal characteristics of local community college board members, (2) the attitudes of board members toward selected functions of the community college, and (3) the relationships between personal characteristics and attitudes of board members toward community college functions as determined above.

The study sought to identify and examine selected characteristics and attitudes of members of boards of trustees of North Carolina community colleges for the academic year 1972-73. Characteristics studied included demographic information such as sex, age, marital status, occupations and income, and personal information such as the extent of formal education. Attitudes studied included beliefs about role and philosophy, research, program development, financial, administration and governance of community colleges.

II. Importance of the Problem

From 1963 to 1971 enrollment in North Carolina community colleges increased from 1,400 to 30,380 (Conner, 1972, p. 58). There is every reason to believe this rapid increase of community college enrollments will continue for the next several years. According to Thornton

(1966, p. 206), increasing demands on the community college to provide services traditionally provided by the home along with the rising enrollment point to the growing importance and added responsibility for this institution in the community.

As a result of the growth of the junior college, it has become increasingly necessary to insure better coordination of junior college administrators and boards of trustees. These boards, as legally authorized representatives of the people, can significantly enhance the efficient operations of the junior college or, if proper coordination is lacking, can seriously impede the operations.

As a part of the research process for this study, the writer met in conference with Charles Bucher, Dean, Planning and Coordination, Department of Community Colleges, North Carolina State Board of Education, in August, 1971, and in March and May, 1972. On April 20, 1972, and May 24, 1972, Clifton Blue, President, North Carolina Community College Trustees Association, 1971-72, responded by letter to an inquiry made by the writer. John Blackmon, Administrative Assistant to the President, North Carolina Community Colleges, was also consulted on March 14, 1972, and May 15, 1972. The consensus of these individuals was that a need existed for a definitive study of the characteristics and attitudes of board members of North Carolina community colleges. Such a study could provide information to the Department of Community Colleges and the local institutions which had not been available. It also appeared that such a study could identify important information about board members and this information could, in turn, augment board-administration

communications which might result in more effective operation of community colleges.

Important differences were discovered between certain perceived functions of junior college advisory board members and intended functions, as stated by Florida Junior College Advisory Board policies (Gaines, 1967, Ch. III). Similarly, misunderstandings were observed regarding functions, qualifications and problems by Florida Junior College Advisory Board members (Robinson, 1963). Further study was needed to identify and understand characteristics and opinions of trustees of Florida junior colleges in order to improve working relations of boards and administrators (Gaines, 1967, p. 182; Robinson, 1963, pp. 179-183). While there is no evidence that similar studies have been made in North Carolina, it is possible the same kinds of misunderstandings exist; thus the need for a similar study in North Carolina is implied.

The role and function of the local junior college in terms of best meeting the needs of society are not easily determined. There are many who enthusiastically support the concept of the comprehensive junior college, but others who disagree. Medsker (1960, pp. 3-4) in discussing the functions of a junior college, pointed out that such institutions are often the subject of criticism. These criticisms take many forms such as many of the claimed functions of junior colleges not being fulfilled and questioning the ability of any one institution to meet the needs of such a diverse student body. Other issues, such as local versus state financing, the open-door policy, and free education versus tuition are typical of potential decision-making problems

which guide the implementation of programs and services and confront the members of local junior and community college boards.

Martorana (1962, pp. 38-39) said concerning research on boards of trustees of higher education institutions:

The fact remains that relatively little effort has been extended to examine analytically the actual memberships of boards of trustees in terms of the standards expected of such membership.

Recently, as if in answer to this plea for more studies of this type, results of replies to an eight page questionnaire from some 5,200 trustees of 536 institutions of higher education were published (Hartnett, 1969). This study gave a cursory view of selected personal characteristics of these trustees. In addition, a table of the percentage of trustees who agreed with twenty-nine statements regarding academic freedom and governance was presented. This study sampled 5,200 out of approximately 35,000 and no statement was made implying that the results could be generalized to any particular state, such as North Carolina.

In a speech to the Southeastern Regional Junior College Administrative Leadership Program in August, 1964, LaVire said:

I believe that where serious frictions occur in board-administration relationships, it is largely engendered because of an insufficient grasp or understanding of the proper role for the various participants within the structure for decision-making we have established in our society. (p. 17)

The writer of this paper postulates that this friction might be reduced if more were understood about the personal characteristics and attitudes of members of board of trustees. Concomitantly, a more

effective working relationship could develop between boards and the community college administration.

III. Scope of the Study

This study investigated the members of local community college boards in the State of North Carolina for 1972-73. At the time of the study, there were 56 institutions under the direction of the Department of Community Colleges. Of these, 41 were technical institutes and 15 were chartered as community colleges. Each college was authorized a twelve member board. Thus, 180 board members comprised the potential population of the study.

IV. Hypotheses of the Study

It was the hypotheses of this study that statistically significant relationships would be found between certain personal characteristics of North Carolina community college board members and selected attitudes of the board members toward the functions and purposes of the community colleges. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of those board members under 45 years of age and those over 45 years of age toward selected functions of the college.

2. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of the male and the female board members concerning selected functions of the college.

3. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of the white board members and the non-white board members toward selected functions of the college.

4. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of those board members residing in urban areas and those residing in rural areas concerning selected functions of the college.

5. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of those board members with less than three years service on the board and those with more than three years service with regard to selected functions of the college.

6. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of board members with an education level at the bachelor's degree, or less, and those board members with a graduate of professional degree with regard to selected functions of the college.

7. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 per year and those with a family income of more than \$18,001 per year concerning selected functions of the college.

V. Delimitations of the Study

The study was confined to the characteristics and attitudes of the 180 board members serving fifteen existing community colleges in North Carolina during the academic year 1972-73. It was further confined to data gathered on all 180 board members by the Department of Community Colleges, North Carolina State Board of Education and data gathered by means of a questionnaire (Appendix B) returned by the board members.

There are 56 institutions, 41 technical institutes and 15 community colleges, which make up the North Carolina Department of Community

Colleges. The decision to limit the study to the 15 colleges as being representative of the community college system was made because the colleges are to offer the same type programs as the technical institutes in the system; i.e., continuing education and community service programs, technical, and vocational programs. In addition, the colleges offer a two-year college transfer program not offered by the technical institutes.

VI. Limitations

There are four major limitations which are recognized in the design of the present investigation. First, it is recognized that the use of a questionnaire limits the depth of questions that can be asked. Second, it is recognized that to the extent that 100 per cent of the questionnaires were not returned, there is a possibility of bias. However, as indicated later, there is some reason to believe that this limitation was overcome due to the high percentage of returns from all fifteen colleges. This possibility is recognized in the present investigation since 152 of 178 board members returned the questionnaires. (There was a vacancy on one board and one board member was deceased.)

Third, it is recognized that in the case of questionnaires there is a possibility that the board members queried gave responses which they deem to be appropriate in lieu of their true opinions about the statements contained in the questionnaire. Fourth, generalizations drawn from the investigation should be limited to the members of boards of trustees of North Carolina community colleges for the academic year 1972-73.

VII. Definition of Terms

Community College

Public community colleges are institutions which are supported by public tax funds, which are controlled and operated by a board, either elected or appointed by a public official or agency, and which offer programs and courses limited to the first two years of post-high school education including university parallel courses and at least one of the following areas: occupational, technical, and continuing education.

Board

The governing board for a community college is elected or appointed under provisions of the Community College Act and consists of twelve authorized members.

Board Member

An individual serving as a member of the board under the provisions set forth under the Community College Act.

Community College Act

Chapter 115A, General Statutes of North Carolina, passed by the North Carolina General Assembly in 1963 establishes the system of community colleges in North Carolina.

Board Policies

Board policies are policies that are written or unwritten, which are developed by the board and provide operational and developmental

guide-lines for the institutions. Board policies are further defined as reflecting attitudes about the functions of the community college.

Comprehensive Community College Program

This is a program offered by a community college which includes: (1) courses in liberal arts and science and general education, (2) adult education or continuing education courses, and (3) courses in occupational, semi-technical or technical fields leading directly to employment.

Community College Administration

Only those administrators of the community college who have direct personal responsibilities in an official capacity with the board of trustees are considered in this study.

Attitudes

Attitudes include the stated or personally reported beliefs about certain functions of the colleges according to the board members of North Carolina community colleges.

Functions of the College

In this study, functions of the college are defined as those items on the questionnaire pertaining to philosophy, research, program development, financing, administration, and governance of North Carolina community colleges.

Personal Characteristics

Those items included in the questionnaire which reflect a board member's personal characteristics are: 1) age, 2) sex, 3) race, 4) place

of residence, 5) educational background, 6) family income, 7) marital-parental status, 8) years of experience on community college boards, 9) years of experience on public school boards, and 10) years of residence in the community college county. Also included is information pertaining to present occupational status and principal occupation, which was supplied by the Department of Community Colleges.

Urban Area

As used in the statement of the hypotheses and in the analysis of the data, urban area is any area other than a rural area or small town.

In summary, it is the opinion of this writer that the degree to which local community colleges will develop along the lines of the legislative acts and the master plan will depend on the leadership provided by local boards. The functions of the local institution will be based on policies, written and unwritten, provided by the board. Policy development and general leadership directions will depend on how the local board perceives the functions of the local community college. It is to the considerations of the characteristics and attitudes of trustees of North Carolina community colleges that this research is oriented.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The review of research literature relating to this study is presented in two parts:

1. Literature focusing on the studies of trustees and board members serving institutions of higher education.
2. Literature pertaining to research studies focusing on board members of junior colleges.

Studies on Board Members of Institutions of Higher Education

Research focusing on the board members of higher education institutions is still in the pioneering stage (Martorana, 1963, p. 35). Authorities in higher education have called for more definitive studies of members of boards of trustees to facilitate coordination between boards and administrators (LaVire, 1964; Litton, 1964).

Keppel (1958, p. 19), in expressing concern about the lack of research in education, emphasized the particular need for intensive investigations of the forces that played on board members in reaching decisions. This concern is shared by Tuttle (1958, p. 254), who pointed out that comparatively little research had been done in studying members of the board, and that there is a complete lack of statistics concerning compositions of boards and other pertinent data.

Perhaps the most comprehensive study to date on college boards of trustees was performed by Martorana in 1963. He traced the historical development of boards of trustees, commented on types of boards, examined some personal characteristics of board members, and discussed board organizations and operations. This study was not intended to be an in-depth analysis of boards of trustees, but a somewhat general introduction of some of the more important issues surrounding board operations.

Finally, a statement by Martorana clearly established that little research has been done in studying trustees or board members serving institutions of higher education:

In view of the deep public trust placed in persons who serve on boards of trustees, one would expect that they as persons and groups would be the subject of many scholarly studies. Contrary to this expectation, relatively few definitive studies of characteristics of boards of trustees are to be found in published writings on higher education. This remains an area in which research is yet in the pioneering state despite the fact that colleges and universities have been operating for over three hundred years. (p. 15)

Studies on Junior College Board Members

In conducting a survey of literature related to this study, the attention of the writer was called to a bibliography compiled by John E. Rouche (1967) at the Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. The Clearinghouse operates in cooperation with the United States Office of Education's ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), and acquires, indexes, abstracts and disseminates research documents and research related materials in the junior college field.

In so doing, it has compiled a bibliography covering materials written during 1964-66. There is also available an earlier publication covering the period 1918-63.

Rouche pointed out that in the period 1918-63, 608 dissertations were reported that had relevance to the junior college. In contrast, the three year period, 1964-66, included 214 reported titles, supporting the view that the junior college is becoming the subject of more intensive research at the graduate level.

A survey of the two bibliographies and subsequent studies by the Association of Junior Colleges (1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971) and a search of the literature by ERIC in October, 1973, revealed a serious lack of research pertaining specifically to the study of junior college boards and board members. The dearth of research in this area is regarded as serious because of the vital role played by board members throughout the educational history of America, particularly as it relates to the decision-making process employed by boards of education in public schools and public higher education.

A survey of research studies found six investigations which focused on areas related to this study. Sapper (1966, p. 9-17) reported that the lack of research on board members was even more critical in the junior college field than in higher education in general. Sapper studied the personal and attitudinal characteristics of trustees serving California's sixty-five junior colleges. He based his study on responses to a questionnaire. The research design included a population of 357 board members, of whom 248 responded to the questionnaire.

The return of approximately 70 per cent was regarded by Sapper as satisfactory. The study involved personal, social, and economic characteristics as reported by the trustees, about which Sapper offered the following summary to describe the typical California junior college trustee:

This individual is a male between forty and fifty years of age; he has graduated from college with at least a baccalaureate degree; he is white, he is married, and he is the parent of at least two children. Furthermore, the typical California community college trustee is an active member of various voluntary associations, including a Protestant church; he is registered a Republican; and he receives an annual income of between \$15,000 and \$20,000, which he earns by pursuing a professional or managerial career. (p. 16)

Sapper's study also included a summary of the attitudes reported by board members of the California public junior colleges towards certain issues facing these two-year institutions. The following report was offered concerning attitudinal characteristics describing the typical California trustee:

This individual desires that the local junior college serve substantially more full-time students than it now serves, that the "open-door" remain open, that the "no tuition" policies for resident students be continued, and that the present system of statewide coordination for public junior colleges become centralized. The typical California public junior college trustee also reports dissatisfaction with the present identity of the two-year college, a commitment to improve services for non-transfer students, a desire to improve guidance and counseling services, and the wish to champion all five of the junior college functions outlined in California's Master Plan, especially the task of general education. The typical governing board member expects many important changes for the students who attend junior college, particularly in the area of general education and occupational skills. He perceives the selection of a chief administrator for the district as one of his most important tasks as a trustee, and

relies heavily on the recommendations of this administrator for solutions to district problems. Furthermore, the typical California public junior college trustee is generally satisfied with the present community college program in his own district. (pp. 144-145)

A study by Hartnett (1969, p. 1) of the Educational Testing Service attempted to arrive at conclusions about attitudes and activities of members of boards of trustees for institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges. Hartnett received replies from 5,200 board members of 536 institutions; his research instrument was an eight page questionnaire. On the bases of his findings Hartnett said:

College and university trustees in general (are) a group of middle-aged Republican businessmen of a moderate-conservative cast, reluctant to accept principles of academic freedom, opposed to giving students and faculty a role in campus decisions, and poorly read in the field of higher education.

Hartnett concluded by saying that characteristics and attitudes of trustees differ significantly as functions of institutional type. Also, he said that private colleges will have more trustees than a public college with similar enrollment.

Barnett (1964) also used a questionnaire to obtain responses from junior college trustees. The population study included 1,007 board members in the state of Texas. Approximately 48 per cent or 487 board members responded. Barnett collected data on a limited number of personal characteristics such as age, sex and occupation, as well as attitudes towards certain facets of junior college education. The issues involved in the study were not closely related to those studied by Sapper, nor were they related to those included in this investigation.

A study of the trustees of the Kansas public community colleges by Parker (1970, pp. 58-70) was somewhat similar to that of Barnett. Parker conducted his study by sending a questionnaire to the 114 trustees serving during the 1968-69 academic year. Eighty-four usable forms, 74 per cent, were returned. He summarized his study by reporting that:

The typical Kansas community college-junior college trustee is a male, in his late forties (previous studies of college trustees have shown a third over sixty), married, with three children, and financially successful (more than half have earned at least the baccalaureate degree). He is engaged in one of four occupational classifications: professional (44 per cent), Managerial-executive-governmental (21 per cent), and farming (14 per cent).

Two studies were concerned with advisory boards and were specifically those of the Florida system of junior colleges. Gaines (1967) examined the functioning of advisory boards of Florida junior colleges and in his study reviewed the development of the legal pattern of local control of the junior college in that state. He also studied advisory committee functioning as indicated by questionnaires completed by junior college presidents and board members and the key characteristics of advisory committee membership and involvement.

Gaines concluded that there is a wide variation in the functioning of local junior college advisory committees in Florida (p. 120). Significant differences were noted between advisory boards in such matters as frequency and type of meetings, matters discussed at the meetings, guests attending advisory board meetings, and advisory board involvement in administrative decision making (p. 135).

A second study concerning Florida junior college advisory boards was that of Robinson (1963). The purpose of this study was to examine board members and presidents as to their functions, qualifications and problems relative to the public junior college. Robinson used a questionnaire-interview method to obtain perceptions and attitudes of the population included in the study. This was done by having each respondent select from a number of choices (varying from nine to twelve) the three judged to be of major importance and the three to be of least importance. Robinson concluded by saying:

Misunderstanding exists regarding functions, qualifications and problems of groups legally charged with the operations of Florida junior colleges; this was found to be especially true of perception of problems. Further study is needed to more fully understand the dichotomies of perception which exists among these groups. (p. 115)

Ebbesen (1969, pp. 85-88) conducted an investigation of personal characteristics and attitudes towards a junior college's functions of Illinois junior college board members. The typical board member was a white male about fifty years of age, a resident of a small town or rural area, a Republican, a Protestant, and active in community service activities. The majority of board members reported a college degree and a median family income of between \$18,000 and \$25,000.

A majority of the Illinois board members indicated attitudes favorable to the concept of the comprehensive junior college. This included the open-door policy, provisions for comprehensive programs and acceptance of a basic philosophy consistent with that of the Illinois Junior College Act. Such programs as adult education, transfer education, technical or semi-technical education courses, two-

year associate degree programs, programs for under-educated youth and adults, testing programs and guidance services for students were among those functions supported by the majority of board members. There was no attempt to determine differences between personal characteristics and attitudes of the board members.

In summary, it is a concern to the writer that despite the reality that higher education plays such an important role in the total educational structure in the United States, that so little has been written about those ultimately responsible for the philosophy and operational policies of local higher education institutions. A review of the studies of board members of higher education institutions seems to indicate that such studies are few in number and only deal with the board type, some personal characteristics of board members, and board organization and operations. They have not tended to present in-depth analysis of the boards or of the more important issues surrounding board operations.

A survey of studies specifically dealing with board members of junior and community colleges also reveals a dearth of research in this area. The growth of the number of community colleges and the enrollments in these colleges during the past three decades have apparently spurred the increase in research pertaining to many aspects of community college education. However, research pertaining to those who determine policy and set the educational tone for the local institutions, the boards and board members, continues to be neglected. Very few of the total number of research studies have dealt with the characteristics of the board members and even fewer with their attitudes toward functions of the colleges or the boards.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was undertaken to focus on the characteristics and attitudes of North Carolina community college board members. It was designed to determine if, in fact, a relationship existed between board members' personal characteristics and their attitudes towards selected functions of the community college. Evidence to support or refute this relationship was sought in the following research design.

I. Selection of Population

Board members of the 15 community colleges in the state of North Carolina constituted the population for this study. All board members included in the study were serving in that capacity in the state of North Carolina in the 1972-73 academic year. Sampling procedures were not used since the entire population served as the base for this investigation.

II. Sources of Research Data

Records of the Department of Community Colleges, North Carolina State Board of Education, were used to collect data regarding the identification of the chairman of each board, the occupation of each board member, and the address of each board member.

A questionnaire was utilized to solicit factual information regarding the personal characteristics and attitudes of members of North Carolina community college boards of trustees. The characteristics section of the questionnaire was developed by combining elements from questionnaires developed by Hunter (1963), Jennings (1964), and Kimbrough (1964). The attitudes section combined elements of questionnaires developed by Gilliland (1967) and Ebbssen (1969) and suggestions by Charles Bucher, Dean, Planning and Coordination, and Reid Parrot, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, North Carolina Department of Community Colleges.

Section One of a closed questionnaire was developed to obtain selected personal characteristics of community college board members. The board members were asked to provide information on family income, place of residence and other personal characteristics. Responses were in the form of a check-list required for one of several categories under each of the personal characteristics included in the study.

Section Two of a closed questionnaire was developed to obtain the attitudes of board members towards selected functions of the community college. Specifically, the questionnaire was designed to obtain attitudes regarding the role and philosophy, research, program development, financing, and administration and governance of the college. Each board member was asked to indicate the degree to which he agreed or disagreed with thirty statements focusing on selected functions of community colleges.

The statements developed for Section Two of the questionnaire were designed to reflect a strong position on issues involved. It was felt that strong statements might make more meaningful the use of extreme responses such as "strongly disagree" or "strongly agree".

The design of the rating scale is in accordance with Sax (1968) who discussed the method of summated ratings as introduced by Likert. Basically, statements were developed which reflected a position for or against a particular issue. After each statement, board members were asked to check one of five alternative answers: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) no opinion, (4) agree, (5) strongly agree. A numerical weight of 1 through 5 was arbitrarily given to the alternative answers. This technique made it possible to convert responses to numerical data for use in making comparisons.

It is apparent that one can not include in the questionnaire all of the alternative ways which informed board members might view the functions of a community college, nor all of the personal characteristics possible. Therefore, some degree of selectivity was necessary in choosing general areas of functions and characteristics to be used in the study. The items used were selected after consultation, during the summer, 1972, with certain members of the staff of the President, Department of Community Colleges; the Director of Statistical Services, Dean for Planning and Coordination, Vice President for Administrative Affairs, and the Administrative Assistant to the President. All of these made helpful suggestions, particularly pertaining to the questionnaire, and gave their support and encouragement. A list of all board

members, with addresses and occupation was also provided by John Blackman, Administrative Assistant to the President.

III. Procedures

The following were mailed to each local community college board member in the state of North Carolina:

1. A letter of explanation from the writer. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix A.
2. A closed questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.
3. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

The questionnaire mailed to each board member was openly coded to facilitate forwarding a second set of materials to those who failed to respond to the first mailing. Board members were assured that individuals and individual community colleges would not be identified or associated with the study by name in any way.

A follow-up letter and a second questionnaire was mailed to those who failed to respond to the first mailing. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix C.

All returned questionnaires were screened and thoroughly examined for completeness. The information from the questionnaire was then punched on data processing cards.

A preliminary data report was obtained from an area technical school in Augusta, Georgia, where the cards developed in the previous step were processed. This material provided a frequency distribution report according to the sub-groups of personal characteristics involved in the study. One of the purposes stated for this study was to determine the personal characteristics of local community college board members in the state of North Carolina.

The data processing cards were used to obtain information in final form through the use of a COBOL program and a UNIVAC computer. The following information was obtained through this procedure: (1) a summary of the entire population indicating frequency for each of the thirty attitudinal statements included in the investigation, and (2) a report for each of the attitudinal statements showing the frequency and per cent of responses for each of the personal characteristics and sub-groups included in the study.

IV. Treatment of the Data

Central to the investigation is the problem of whether a significant relationship existed between personal characteristics and board members' attitudes towards functions of community colleges. For the purposes of this study an hypotheses was selected.

To determine acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses, responses of seven personal characteristic sub-groups to each of the thirty attitudinal statements about the functions of the community college were subjected to a chi-square (X^2) test. The chi-square test provided

a satisfactory method of comparing the observed responses in a particular category with the expected responses based on the hypotheses.

The basic chi-square formula for testing agreement between observed and expected frequencies is:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

in which

O = the observed or obtained frequencies in various categories.

E = the corresponding frequencies expected under some hypothesis.

The difference between each observed and each expected frequency is squared and divided by the expected or theoretical frequency. The sum of the quotients is chi-square.

Since the computation of the cases only allowed one degree of freedom, it was necessary to add Yates Correction for Continuity to the basic chi-square formula. The formula then became:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(|O - E| - .5)^2}{E}$$

By subtracting .5 from the absolute difference between O and E the difference is reduced.

Frequency distribution tables were developed from the basic data tables which are included in Appendix D of the study report. The expressed attitudes of personal characteristics sub-groups toward each attitudinal statement were tabulated. In tabulating the data two categories, "Disagreement" and "Agreement" were used. In so doing, "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree" were combined in a single category of "Disagree". "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" were combined in a single

category of "Agree". Since the mid-point of the five-point scale is in effect a neutral or uncertain position it was not included in the computation of the chi-square values.

Using "sex" as an example, cell A consists of the number of male board members who disagree with a given attitudinal statement. Cell B consists of the number of male members who agree with the statement. Cell C consists of the number of female board members who disagree with the statement, while cell D consists of female board members who agree with the statement.

	Disagree	Agree
Males	A Males disagree	B Males agree
Females	C Females disagree	D Females agree

The data developed in the previous step were used to compute chi-square values of each of the seven sets of personal characteristic-attitudinal statements. The data thus processed were presented in the form of chi-square tables indicating for each of the thirty statements whether the differences between observed and expected frequencies were significant.

Having completed the chi-square values for the data discussed in the previous step it was possible to determine whether the differences noted among the various sub-groups were statistically significant. For the purpose of this study the value of chi-square at the .05 level

of significance was accepted as the standard for accepting the hypotheses.

The analysis of the data is presented in Chapter IV of the dissertation.

In summary, in order to determine the personal characteristics and attitudes of board members towards selected functions of the community college, a two-part questionnaire was mailed to the board members of North Carolina community colleges during the 1972-73 academic year. Having obtained these data, it was possible to determine if relationships of differences existed between personal characteristics and attitudes toward selected functions of community colleges. Responses of board members were analyzed by means of a chi-square test to determine if a significant difference existed between observed and expected responses. A detailed analysis of the data is presented in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

CHAPTER IV

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF BOARD MEMBERS

On Part 1 of a questionnaire sent to each community college board member in North Carolina, the board member was asked to provide information about his personal characteristics. The following is a discussion of those personal characteristics as presented in Table 1 of this study.

Age. Board member responses to the questionnaire established that one was 34 years of age or under, 15 were in the 35 - 44 age bracket, 56 in the 45 - 54 age group, 50 in the 55 - 64 age group and 25 were 65 years of age or older. The data shows that over 70 per cent of the board members were in the 45 - 64 year age group, a placement that would include the majority of parents of community college students.

The median age of local community college board members responding to the questionnaire was 54 - 55 years.

Sex. Of the 147 board members responding to the questionnaire, 137 were male and 10 were female, showing that 93.19 per cent of the board members were men and 6.80 per cent were women.

Personal Characteristics of Local Community
College Board Members

Characteristic	Total Cases	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>		
34 or under	1	00.68
35 - 44	15	10.00
45 - 54	56	38.09
55 - 64	50	34.01
65 or over	25	17.00
	147	
<u>Sex:</u>		
Male	137	93.19
Female	10	06.80
	147	
<u>Race:</u>		
White	143	97.27
Black	4	02.72
Other	0	00.00
	147	
<u>Place of residence:</u>		
Rural	59	40.13
Urban	40	27.21
Suburban	41	27.89
Large city	7	04.76
	147	
<u>Educational background:</u>		
Less than high school diploma	3	02.04
High school diploma	19	12.92
College attendance, no degree	32	21.76
Bachelor's degree	57	38.77
Master's degree	19	12.92
Doctoral degree	10	06.80
Other	7	04.76
	147	
<u>Childhood residence, population:</u>		
Less than 5,000	83	56.48
5,001 to 25,000	46	31.29
25,001 to 100,000	9	06.12
More than 100,000	9	06.12
	147	
<u>Residence in community college county, number of years:</u>		
0 - 5	1	00.68
6 - 10	8	05.44
11 - 15	2	01.36
16 - 20	3	02.04
21 - 25	14	09.52
26 - 30	19	13.55
More than 30	100	68.02
	147	

TABLE 1 (continued)

Characteristic	Total Cases	Per Cent
<u>Approximate family income:</u>		
Less than \$10,000	5	03.47
\$10,001 - \$18,000	22	15.27
\$18,001 - \$25,000	30	20.83
\$25,001 - \$32,000	21	14.58
More than \$32,001	66	45.83
	<u>144</u>	
<u>Marital - parental status:</u>		
Not married	1	00.68
Married, no children	15	10.20
1 - 3 children	96	65.30
4 or more children	35	28.80
	<u>147</u>	
<u>Experience on public school boards:</u>		
None	2	01.36
1 year or less	5	03.40
2 - 3 years	85	57.82
More than 3 years	55	37.41
	<u>147</u>	
<u>Experience on community college boards:</u>		
1 year or less	6	04.08
2 - 3 years	5	03.40
More than 3 years	136	92.51
	<u>147</u>	
<u>Present Occupational Status:</u>		
Active	139	94.55
Retired	8	05.44
	<u>147</u>	
<u>Principal Occupation:</u>		
Professional, Technical Personnel	69	46.93
Farmers, Farm Managers	8	05.44
Manager, Official, Proprietor	64	43.53
Clerical, Sales and Kindred Workers	2	01.36
Craftsman, Foreman, and Kindred Workers	1	00.68
Operatives and Kindred Workers	0	00.00
Service Workers (Excluding household)	0	00.00
Housewives	3	02.04
	<u>147</u>	

The typical community college board member included in the study was a male.

Race. Responses to the questionnaire in this study indicated that 143 board members (97.27 per cent) were white and 4 board members (2.72 per cent) were Black. Insofar as the personal characteristic of race was concerned, the typical North Carolina community college board member was white.

Place of residence. According to board member responses in this study, 59 individuals (40.13 per cent) were residents of a rural area, 40 board members (27.21 per cent) resided in an urban area of 2,500 or more population, while 41 persons (27.89 per cent) lived in suburban areas. A total of 7 board members (4.76 per cent) reported a residence in a large city of 50,000 or more population.

These data indicated that the typical North Carolina community college board member included in this study resided in a rural area or an area of less than 50,000 population. He was least likely to reside in a large city.

Educational background. Responses to the questionnaire established that board members included in this study have attained the following formal education. Three board members reported less than a high school diploma while 19 others have a high school diploma (12.92 per cent). College attendance with no degree was reported by 32 board members (21.76 per cent), and a bachelor's degree was earned by 57 persons (38.77 per cent). Graduate degrees earned by board members were

reported as 19 with a master's degree and 10 with a doctoral degree, a total of 19.72 per cent. Seven (4.76 per cent) reported other degrees which were found to be the Jurisprudence Doctor, awarded after the LL.B. degree was earned. Nine of the ten persons with the doctoral degree were in the field of medicine.

These data indicated that the typical North Carolina community college board member attained at least a bachelor's degree plus additional graduate work in a degree program.

Childhood residence, population. According to board member responses in this study, 83 individuals (56.48 per cent) spent their early childhood in towns of less than 5,000 population. Forty-six (31.29 per cent) of the board members were in areas of 5,001 to 25,000 population, 9 (6.12 per cent) in cities of 25,001 to 100,000 population and 9 (6.12 per cent) in large cities of more than 100,001 population.

These data indicate that the typical North Carolina community college board member spent his early childhood in areas of less than 25,000 population (87.77 per cent).

Residence in the community college county. Responses to the questionnaire established that one board member had resided in the county where the community college he served was located for five years or less. Eight (5.44 per cent) had lived there for 6 - 10 years, two (1.36 per cent) for 11 - 15 years and three (2.04 per cent) for 16 - 20 years. Fourteen board members had resided in the community college county for 21 - 25 years (9.52 per cent), 19 for 26 - 30 years (13.55

per cent) and 100 members had resided in the college county for more than 30 years (68.02 per cent).

The typical board member of a North Carolina community college had resided in the county where the college he served was located for more than 30 years.

Approximate family income. Board members responding to this personal characteristic reported that 5 individuals (3.47 per cent) had a family income of less than \$10,000, and 22 persons (15.27 per cent) reported a figure in the \$10,001 - \$18,000 bracket. Board members reporting a family income of \$18,001 - \$25,000 numbered 30 (20.83 per cent), and 21 (14.58 per cent) reported a family income of \$25,001 - \$32,000. Sixty-six board members reported the family income to be more than \$32,001 (45.83 per cent).

These data indicated that the typical North Carolina community college board member had a family income of between \$10,001 and \$32,000 with almost half reporting an income in excess of \$32,001.

Marital-parental status. Board members' responses in this study showed that 1 individual (0.68 per cent) was not married, and 15 (10.20 per cent) reported that they were married, but had no children. The category 1 - 3 children was checked by 96 board members (65.30 per cent), with another 35 persons (28.80 per cent) reporting 4 or more children.

The typical North Carolina community college board member, as reported in this study, had 1 - 3 children. Over 93 per cent of the board members included in this study had children.

Experience on public school boards. Questionnaire responses indicated that only 2 board members (1.36 per cent) had no experience on public school boards. Individuals reporting 1 year or less numbered 5 (3.40 per cent) while 85 (57.82 per cent) reported 2 - 3 years of experience. Fifty-five members (37.41 per cent) reported more than 3 years of experience.

These data indicated that the typical North Carolina community college board member had 2 - 3 years experience on public school boards.

Experience on community college boards. Board members reported that only 6 individuals (4.08 per cent) had 1 year or less of experience on a community college board while 5 (3.40 per cent) indicated 2 - 3 years of experience. One hundred thirty-six persons (90.51 per cent) reported more than 3 years of experience on community college boards.

These data indicated that the typical North Carolina community college board member had more than 3 years experience on community college boards. Since the typical board member had resided in the county of the community college he served for more than 30 years, it seems safe to assume that the typical board member has served on the same board for all of his experience.

Principal occupational status. The North Carolina Department of Community Colleges provided information that 139 individuals (94.55 per cent) were occupationally active. Individuals reported as retired were 8 in number (5.44 per cent).

The typical board member serving North Carolina community colleges was occupationally active.

Principal occupation. Information supplied by the Department of Community Colleges showed that 69 individuals (46.93 per cent) were occupied as professional, technical or kindred personnel. Farmers and farm managers included 8 board members (5.44 per cent), and 64 persons (43.53 per cent) were reported as manager, official or proprietor.

Two board members (1.36 per cent) were reported as clerical, sales and kindred personnel and 3 board members (2.04 per cent) as housewives.

The typical North Carolina community college board member was occupied as a member of the professional, technical and kindred personnel category.

To summarize the analysis of personal characteristics; the typical North Carolina community college board member included in this study was a male between 54 and 55 years of age, white and resided in a rural area or an area of less than 50,000 population. He spent his early childhood in areas of less than 25,000 population and had attained at least a bachelor's degree plus additional graduate work in a degree program. This typical board member had lived in the county where the college he served was located for more than 30 years. He is married with one to three children. He is occupationally active as a member of the professional, technical and kindred personnel category and has a family income of almost \$30,000. He has served from two to three years on public school boards and reported more than three years service on community college boards.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES OF BOARD MEMBERS

Table 2 presents board member responses to the 30 statements reflecting attitudes toward selected functions of the local community college. Analysis of these data is based on a discussion of each attitudinal statement in terms of responses made by the total population involved in the study.

For the purpose of this study, "strongly disagree" and "disagree" responses were combined to indicate the number of board members who did not support the statement in question. "Agree" and "strongly agree" responses were combined to indicate the number of board members who supported the statement. A comparison between the number of board members "disagreeing" and the number "agreeing" was made for each statement. In developing the position that the board members, as a group, supported or refuted a given statement, the writer chose to use the "uncertain" or mid-point responses in terms of their potential effect on the establishment of a group majority. This was accomplished by adding the number of "uncertain" responses to the smaller of the two alternatives, "disagree" or "agree". If this procedure failed to alter the relationship, it was possible to establish the attitude of the group toward the issue involved. If this procedure did alter the relationship between "disagree" and "agree", the writer chose not to indicate what the attitude of the group might be.

TABLE 2

Board Member Responses to Statements Reflecting Attitudes Toward Selected
Functions of the Local Community College

Statement Number	Total Cases	STRONGLY DISAGREE		DISAGREE		NO OPINION		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE		TOTAL DISAGREE		TOTAL AGREE	
		No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1	147	0	.00	23	15.64	20	13.60	81	55.10	22	14.96	23	15.64	103	70.68
2	147	12	8.16	73	49.65	10	6.80	44	29.93	8	5.44	85	57.82	52	35.37
3	147	2	1.63	43	29.25	4	2.72	71	48.29	27	18.36	45	30.61	98	66.66
4	147	2	1.63	8	5.44	6	4.10	84	57.14	47	31.97	10	6.80	131	89.11
5	147	2	1.63	39	26.53	16	10.88	82	35.08	8	5.44	41	27.89	90	61.22
6	147	0	.00	3	2.04	2	1.36	85	57.82	57	38.77	3	2.04	132	96.39
7	147	12	8.16	75	51.02	12	8.16	34	23.12	14	9.52	87	59.18	48	32.66
8	147	1	.68	3	2.04	4	2.72	85	57.82	54	36.74	4	2.72	139	94.55
9	146	0	.00	6	4.10	5	3.42	80	54.79	55	37.67	6	4.10	135	92.46
10	147	11	7.48	20	13.60	3	2.06	101	68.70	12	8.16	31	21.88	113	76.87
11	147	13	8.84	58	34.95	14	9.52	54	36.73	8	5.44	71	48.28	62	42.17
12	147	0	.00	8	5.44	3	2.06	81	55.10	55	37.41	8	5.44	136	92.51
13	147	15	10.20	44	29.33	9	6.12	60	40.81	19	12.92	59	40.13	79	53.74
14	147	20	13.60	82	55.78	12	8.16	22	14.96	11	7.48	102	69.38	33	22.44
15	147	33	22.44	80	54.42	4	2.72	30	20.68	10	6.80	103	70.08	40	27.21
16	147	2	1.36	1	.68	3	2.04	78	53.06	65	44.21	3	2.04	143	97.27
17	147	1	.68	2	1.36	5	3.47	95	64.62	44	29.93	3	2.04	139	94.55
18	147	7	4.76	33	22.44	36	24.48	70	47.61	1	.68	40	27.21	71	48.29
19	147	0	.00	6	4.08	20	13.60	88	59.86	33	22.44	6	4.08	121	82.31
20	147	43	29.25	75	51.02	3	2.04	20	13.60	6	4.08	118	80.27	26	17.68
21	147	2	1.36	9	6.12	0	.00	81	55.10	55	37.41	11	7.48	136	92.51
22	147	29	19.72	75	51.02	11	7.48	25	17.00	7	4.76	104	70.74	32	21.76
23	147	15	10.20	49	33.33	26	11.68	50	34.01	43	29.25	64	43.53	93	63.26

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Statement Number	Total Cases	STRONGLY DISAGREE		DISAGREE		NO OPINION		AGREE		STRONGLY AGREE		TOTAL DISAGREE		TOTAL AGREE	
		No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
24	147	0	.00	6	4.08	3	2.06	101	68.70	37	25.17	6	4.08	138	93.87
25	147	1	.68	15	10.20	10	6.80	106	72.10	15	10.20	16	10.88	121	82.31
26	147	7	4.76	45	30.16	27	18.36	61	41.49	7	4.76	52	35.37	68	46.25
27	147	2	1.36	15	10.20	20	13.60	85	57.82	25	17.00	17	11.56	110	74.82
28	145	10	6.89	64	44.13	22	15.17	41	28.27	8	5.51	74	51.03	49	33.75
29	147	10	6.80	66	44.89	21	14.28	32	21.78	18	12.24	76	51.70	50	34.01
30	147	5	3.40	21	14.28	14	9.52	81	55.10	26	17.68	26	17.68	107	72.78

Statement 1 (research). The first statement to which board members responded reflected the position that the community college should provide research programs to study problems associated with community college education.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which no one strongly disagreed, 23 disagreed, 20 expressed no opinion, 81 agreed and 22 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 23 board members (15.64 per cent) disagreed and 103 (70.68 per cent) agreed. If one were to include uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be 43 (29.24 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement clearly established that a majority of the board members included in this study supported the view that community colleges should provide research programs to study problems of community college education.

Statement 2 (evaluation of instructors). The second statement to which board members responded stated that instructors should be evaluated on classroom teaching only. Research, writing and publishing should not be considered.

As shown in Table 2, board members' responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 12 strongly disagreed, 73 disagreed, 10 expressed no opinion, 44 agreed and 8 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 85 board members (52.82 per cent) disagreed and 52 (35.37 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 10 no

opinion responses in the agreed category, the number agreeing with the statement would be 62 (42.17 per cent).

In summary, responses of board members included in this study indicated that the majority did not support the idea that community college instructors should be evaluated on classroom teaching only.

Statement 3 (teaching experience for administrators). The third statement to which board members responded stated that all local community college administrators should have had successful classroom teaching experience.

As shown in Table 2, board members responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 2 strongly disagreed, 43 disagreed, 4 had no opinion, 71 agreed and 27 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 45 (30.61 per cent) disagreed and 98 (66.66 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 4 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be 49 (39.33 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of board members included in the study agreed that administrators should have had successful classroom teaching experience.

Statement 4 (curriculum development). The fourth statement to which board members responded said that the instructional staff should be extensively involved in community college curriculum development.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 2 strongly agreed, 8 disagreed, 6 had no opinion, 84 agreed and 47 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 10 (6.80 per cent) disagreed and 131 (89.11 per cent) agreed.

If one were to include the 6 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be 16 (10.90 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a strong majority of board members included in this study agreed that the instructional staff should be extensively involved in community college curriculum development.

Statement 5 (tuition charges). The fifth statement to which board members responded stated that tuition should be paid by North Carolina residents enrolled in non-credit courses.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 2 strongly disagreed, 39 disagreed, 16 expressed no opinion, 82 agreed and 8 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 41 (27.89 per cent) disagreed and 90 (61.22 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 16 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be (38.77 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of board members included in this study agreed that tuition should be paid by North Carolina residents enrolled in non-credit courses.

Statement 6 (programs for under-educated students). The sixth statement to which board members responded stated that each local community college should provide programs for "under-educated" youth and adults.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147 of which no one strongly disagreed, 3 disagreed, 2 were uncertain, 85 agreed and 57 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 3 board members (2.04 per cent) disagreed and 132 board members (89.79 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 2 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would only be 5 (3.40 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a very strong majority of board members included in this study agreed that local community colleges should provide programs for "under-educated" youth and adults.

Statement 7 (husband-wife combination). The seventh statement to which board members responded stated that husband-wife combinations should not be employed by a local community college in any capacity.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 12 strongly disagreed, 75 disagreed, 12 had no opinion, 34 agreed and 14 strongly agreed. Combining like responses

found that 87 board members (59.18 per cent) disagreed and 48 (32.66 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 12 uncertain responses in the agreed category, the number of board members supporting the statement would be 60 (40.82 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of board members included in this study disagreed with a policy of not employing husband-wife combinations in local community colleges.

Statement 8 (two-year programs). The eighth statement to which board members responded stated that each local community college should provide two-year programs for semi-professional training.

As indicated in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 1 strongly disagreed, 3 disagreed, 4 had no opinion, 85 agreed and 54 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 4 (2.72 per cent) disagreed and 139 (94.55 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 4 uncertain responses in the disagree category the number of board member responses not supporting the statement would be 8 (5.44 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a very strong majority of board members agreed with each local community college providing two-year programs for semi-professional training.

Statement 9 (testing, counseling, and placement services). The ninth statement to which board members responded stated that each local community college should provide guidance, testing, counseling, and placement services for all students.

As indicated in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 146, of which no one strongly disagreed, 6 disagreed, 5 were uncertain, 80 agreed and 55 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 6 board members (4.10 per cent) disagreed and 135 board members (92.46 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 5 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting this statement would be 11 (7.52 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a strong majority of board members included in this study agreed that each local community college should provide extensive testing, counseling and placement services for students.

Statement 10 (policy development). The tenth statement to which board members responded stated that the instructional staff should be involved in the policy development of the local community college.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 11 strongly disagreed, 20 disagreed, 3 had no opinion, 101 agreed and 12 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 31 board members (21.88 per cent) disagreed and 113 board members (76.87 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 3 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting this statement would be 34 (23.94 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of board members included in this study agreed that the instructional staff should be involved in the policy development of the local community college.

Statement 11 (extra-curricular programs). The eleventh statement to which board members responded stated that each local community college should provide extensive extra-curricular programs, including inter-collegiate athletics.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses numbered 147, of which 13 strongly disagreed, 58 disagreed, 14 were uncertain, 54 agreed and 8 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 71 board members (48.28 per cent) disagreed and 62 board members (42.17 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 14 uncertain responses in the agree category, the number of board members supporting the statement would be 76 (51.69 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement by board members included in this study are so nearly evenly divided that it seems that as a group they neither disagree or agree that the community college should provide extensive extra curricular activities.

Statement 12 (moral and ethical values). The twelfth statement to which board members responded stated that the development of socially acceptable moral and ethical values in community college students is as important a function of the community college as their intellectual development.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which no one strongly disagreed, 8 disagreed, 3 had no opinion, 81 agreed and 55 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 8 board members (5.44 per cent) disagreed and 136 (92.51 per

cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 3 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the board members refuting the statement would only be 11 (7.50 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that the board members included in the study very strongly agreed that the community college should be as concerned about the development of socially acceptable moral and ethical values in community college students as their intellectual training.

Statement 13 (academic freedom in the classroom). The thirteenth statement to which board members responded stated that a community college instructor should be able to speak openly and freely about any issue in the classroom.

As shown in Table 2, 147 board members responded to this statement, of which 15 strongly disagreed, 44 disagreed, 9 expressed no opinion, 60 agreed and 19 strongly agreed with the statement. Combining like responses found that 59 board members (40.13 per cent) disagreed and 79 board members (53.74 per cent) agreed. If one were to include the 9 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number refuting the statement would be 68 (46.25 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of the board members included in this study supported the view that community college instructors should be able to speak openly and freely about any issue in the classroom.

Statement 14 (faculty on the board of trustees). The fourteenth statement to which board members responded stated that the local community college faculty should be represented on the board of trustees.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 20 strongly disagreed, 82 disagreed, 12 had no opinion, 22 agreed and 11 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 102 board members (69.38 per cent) disagreed and 33 (22.44 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 12 uncertain responses in the agree category, the number supporting the statement would be 45 (30.60 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement clearly established that a majority of the board members included in this study reject the view that faculty should be represented on the local community college board of trustees.

Statement 15 (faculty negotiations with the board). The fifteenth statement to which board members responded stated that faculty members should develop salary arrangements and working conditions through negotiations with the board.

As shown in Table 2, board members' responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 33 strongly disagreed, 80 disagreed, 4 expressed no opinion, 30 agreed and 10 strongly agreed with the statement. Combining like responses found that 103 board members (70.08 per cent) disagreed and 40 board members (27.21 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 4 uncertain responses in the agree category, the number supporting the statement would be 44 (29.93 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement clearly established that a majority of the board members included in this study rejected the idea that faculty members should develop salary arrangements and working conditions through negotiations with the board.

Statement 16 (vocational and semi-technical programs). The sixteenth statement to which board members responded stated that each community college should provide variable length programs to develop vocational or semi-technical skills in areas such as welding, auto mechanics, carpentry and cosmetology. As shown in Table 2, board members' responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 2 strongly disagreed, 1 disagreed, 3 were uncertain, 78 agreed and 65 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 3 board members (2.04 per cent) disagreed and 143 (97.27 per cent) agreed with the statement, the largest number agreeing with any of the statements. If one were to include the 3 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members not supporting the statement would only be 6 (4.08 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement very clearly established that a majority of the board members included in this study agreed that each local college should provide programs to develop vocational or semi-technical skills.

Statement 17 (instructor involvement in guidance services). The seventeenth statement to which board members responded stated that community college instructors should be involved in providing guidance service for students.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 1 strongly disagreed, 2 disagreed, 5 had no opinion, 95 agreed and 44 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 3 board members (2.04 per cent) disagreed and 139 (94.55 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be only 8 (5.51 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a very strong majority of the board members included in this study agreed that community college instructors should be involved in providing guidance services for students.

Statement 18 (social organizations and fraternities). The eighteenth statement to which board members responded stated that social organizations and fraternities should be allowed to develop in North Carolina community colleges.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 7 strongly disagreed, 33 disagreed, 36 had no opinion, 70 agreed and 1 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 40 board members (27.21 per cent) disagreed and 71 board members (48.29 per cent) agreed with this statement. If one were to include the 36 uncertain responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be 76 (51.69 per cent.)

In summary, responses to this statement by board members included in the study were inconclusive insofar as establishing a majority

supporting or not supporting the statement in question. It should be pointed out, also, that there were more uncertain responses, 36 (24.48 per cent), than to any of the other 29 statements.

Statement 19 (equal emphasis on programs). The nineteenth statement to which board members responded stated that equal emphasis on transfer, terminal and community services programs in the community college is desirable.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which no one strongly disagreed, 6 disagreed, 20 were uncertain, 88 agreed and 33 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 6 board members (4.08 per cent) disagreed while 121 board members (82.31 per cent) agreed with this statement. If one were to include the 20 uncertain responses in the disagreed category, the number refuting the statement would be 26 (17.68 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a marked majority of board members included in this study agreed with the statement that it is desirable for community colleges to give equal emphasis to transfer, terminal and community services programs.

Statement 20 (admitting students on academic ability). The twentieth statement to which board members responded stated that when making decisions about admitting students to the community college academic ability should be the primary measure.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 43 strongly disagreed, 75 disagreed, 3 were

uncertain, 20 agreed and 6 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 118 board members (80.27 per cent) disagreed and 26 board members (17.68 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 3 uncertain responses in the agree category, the number supporting the statement would be 29 (19.74 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a marked majority of board members included in the study did not support the statement that when making admissions decisions, academic ability should be the primary measure.

Statement 21 (formal education beyond high school). The twenty-first statement to which board members responded stated that formal education beyond high school should be provided for anyone who is able to benefit from it.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 2 strongly disagreed, 9 disagreed, no one was uncertain, 81 agreed and 55 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 11 board members (7.48 per cent) disagreed and 136 board members (92.51 per cent) agreed with the statement. This was the only statement of the 30 where no one checked the "no opinion" option.

In summary, responses to this statement clearly indicated that the board members included in the study very strongly supported the view that formal education beyond high school should be provided for anyone able to benefit from it.

Statement 22 (student representation on the board). The twenty-second statement to which board members responded stated that the student body should be represented on the board of trustees.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 29 strongly disagreed, 75 disagreed, 11 were uncertain, 25 agreed and 7 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 104 board members (70.74 per cent) disagreed and 32 board members (21.76 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 11 uncertain responses in the agree category, the number of board members supporting the statement would be 43 (29.24 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of board members included in this study did not support the view that the student body should be represented on the board of trustees.

Statement 23 (solving social problems). The twenty-third statement to which board members responded stated that the local community college should attempt to solve social problems such as the problems surrounding racial discrimination.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 15 strongly disagreed, 49 disagreed, 26 were uncertain, 50 agreed and 43 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 43 board members (29.25 per cent) disagreed and 93 (63.26 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 26 uncertain responses in the disagree category, 69 (40.93 per cent) did not support the statement.

In summary, responses to this statement indicated that a majority of board members included in the study support the view that the community college should actively attempt to solve social problems such as the problems surrounding racial discrimination.

Statement 24 (curricula for different ability levels). The twenty-fourth statement to which board members responded stated that the community college curricula should be planned for students with very different ability levels.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which no one strongly disagreed, 6 disagreed, 3 had no opinion, 101 agreed and 37 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 6 board members (4.08 per cent) disagreed and 138 board members (93.87 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 3 no opinion responses in the disagree category, the number not supporting the statement would be 9 (6.14 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement very clearly established that the board members included in this study strongly supported the view that the community college curricula should be planned for students with very different ability levels.

Statement 25 (administering a community college). The twenty-fifth statement to which board members responded stated that there is a similarity between administering a community college and operating a business or running a hospital.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 1 strongly disagreed, 15 disagreed, 10 had no opinion, 106 agreed and 15 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 16 board members (10.88 per cent) disagreed and 122 board members (82.31 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the no opinion responses in the disagree category, the number refuting the statement would be 26 (17.68 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement clearly established that a marked majority of the board members included in the study supported the statement that there is a similarity between administering a community college and operating a business or other institution.

Statement 26 (vacations for instructors). The twenty-sixth statement to which board members responded stated that community college instructors should observe the same vacation schedule as the students during the academic year. This time should not be counted against annual leave for those on twelve month contracts.

As shown in Table 2, board members' responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 7 strongly disagreed, 45 disagreed, 27 had no opinion, 61 agreed and 7 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 52 board members (35.37 per cent) disagreed and 68 (46.25 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 27 no opinion responses in the disagree category, the number of board members refuting the statement would be 79 (53.73 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement by board members included in the study were inconclusive insofar as establishing a clear majority supporting or not supporting this statement.

Statement 27 (sick leave for staff personnel). The twenty-seventh statement to which board members responded stated that community college staff personnel should be given at least the same number of days sick leave as other state employees (10 days annually).

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 2 strongly disagreed, 15 disagreed, 20 had no opinion, 85 agreed and 25 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 17 board members (11.65 per cent) disagreed and 110 board members (74.82 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 20 no opinion responses in the disagree category, the number of board members not supporting the statement would be 37 (25.26 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement established that a majority of the board members included in the study supported the idea that community college personnel should be given, as a minimum, the same amount of sick leave as other state employees.

Statement 28 (selection of faculty and staff). The twenty-eighth statement to which board members responded stated that future faculty and staff should be selected from among those persons specifically trained for the community college level, rather than from those trained in secondary or higher education.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 145, of which 10 strongly disagreed, 64 disagreed, 22 had no opinion, 41 agreed and 8 strongly agreed with the statement. Combining like responses found that 74 board members (51.03 per cent) disagreed and 49 board members (33.75 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 22 no opinion responses in the agree category, the number supporting the statement would be 71 (48.92 per cent).

In summary, responses to this statement by board members included in the study were inconclusive insofar as establishing a clear majority supporting or not supporting the statement in question.

Statement 29 (increased percentage of the educational budget).

The twenty-ninth statement to which board members responded stated that North Carolina community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the total education budget - even at the expense of elementary and secondary education.

As shown in Table 2, the number of board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 10 strongly disagreed, 66 disagreed, 21 had no opinion, 32 agreed and 18 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 76 board members (51.70 per cent) disagreed and 50 board members (34.01 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 21 no opinion responses in the agree category, the number of board members supporting the statement would be 71 (48.79 per cent).

In summary, responses of the board members included in the study were inconclusive insofar as establishing a majority supporting or not supporting the view that community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the total educational budget.

Statement 30 (orientation for board members). The thirtieth statement to which board members responded stated that each board member should be expected to attend an intensive orientation pertaining to the philosophy and goals of the community college and the responsibilities and functions of the board of trustees and administration of the local community college.

As shown in Table 2, board member responses to this statement numbered 147, of which 5 strongly disagreed, 21 disagreed, 14 had no opinion, 81 agreed and 26 strongly agreed. Combining like responses found that 26 board members (17.68 per cent) disagreed and 107 board members (72.78 per cent) agreed with the statement. If one were to include the 14 no opinion responses in the disagree category, the number refuting the statement would be 40 (27.20 per cent).

In summary responses to this statement established that a marked majority of the board members included in the study agree that each board member should attend an intensive orientation pertaining to philosophy and goals of the college and the responsibilities and functions of the administration and board.

A cursory review of Table 2, which indicates board member responses toward selected functions of the local community college, reveals that

the board members disagreed with 6 statements, agreed with 19 statements and were inconclusive about 5 statements.

CHAPTER VI

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES

As explained in Chapter III a questionnaire was designed to obtain data on personal characteristics from local community college board members. The responses to this questionnaire provided a breakdown of the total population according to sub-groups under each of the personal characteristics. The board member responses to the questionnaire also included an indication of the degree to which the individual member agreed or disagreed with selected attitudinal statements about the functions of local community colleges.

In order to determine whether a significant relationship existed between personal characteristics and attitudes of board members, a chi-square test of significance was used. The basic data used in computing chi-square values are shown in Table A through Table DD, Appendix 5. For analysis purposes, the response frequencies in "strongly disagree" and "disagree" were combined as were the responses in "agree" and "strongly agree". Responses in the mid-point category were not included in the determination of chi-square values for this study.

For purposes of accepting the hypotheses, the .05 level of significance was established as the standard. This means that the observed frequencies differed so greatly from the expected levels that there were fewer than five chances in 100 that the differences were due to chance.

To help the reader to see the interactions that were significant, Table 3 shows the chi-square values which were significant at the .01 or the .05 level. Chi-square analysis of seven of the personal characteristics was based on their relationship to the thirty attitudinal statements included in the study.

A summary of computed chi-square values is reported in Table EE, Appendix 6, and shows that responses of board members produced a chi-square value significant at the .01 or .05 level in 37 instances involving a personal characteristic and an attitudinal statement. One of the instances was associated with the personal characteristic of race where a ratio of 143 white to 4 black board members rendered the data invalid insofar as chi-square analysis was concerned. One significant chi-square value was computed for statement 17; however, there were only three answers recorded in the "disagree" cell. These two values were dropped from further consideration in the study. Thus, a total of 35 personal characteristics yielded chi-square values significant at the .01 and .05 level. These are shown in Table 3 and form the basis for the following discussion.

Age. Table 3 shows that significant chi-square values were found for the personal characteristic of age as it related to Statements 15, 18, 22, 26, 28 and 29.

Statement 15 stated that faculty members should develop salary arrangements and working conditions through negotiations with the board. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 8.40, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between age and attitude toward this

TABLE 3

Chi-Square Values Significant at .01 and .05 Levels for Relationships
Between Personal Characteristics and Attitudinal Statements

Characteristics	State- ment No. 1	State- ment No. 2	State- ment No. 3	State- ment No. 4	State- ment No. 5	State- ment No. 6	State- ment No. 7	State- ment No. 8	State- ment No. 9
Age	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Race	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sex	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Residence	--	--	--	7.75**	22.91**	--	--	--	4.21*
Experience, Com. Col. Boards	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Education	10.24**	--	--	--	--	--	16.39**	--	--
Income	6.43*	--	6.19*	--	6.07*	--	7.91**	--	--

-- Not significant; * Significant at .05 level; ** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Characteristics	State- ment No. 10	State- ment No. 11	State- ment No. 12	State- ment No. 13	State- ment No. 14	State- ment No. 15	State- ment No. 16	State- ment No. 17	State- ment No. 18
Age	--	--	--	--	--	8.40**	--	--	5.89*
Race	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sex	--	5.73*	--	--	--	5.49*	--	16.74**	--
Residence	--	--	5.89*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Experience, Com. Col. Boards	18.85**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Education	--	12.92**	5.11*	--	--	--	--	--	--
Income	9.22**	--	--	9.28**	7.44**	--	--	--	11.00**

-- Not Significant; * Significant at .05 level; ** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Characteristics	State- ment No. 19	State- ment No. 20	State- ment No. 21	State- ment No. 22	State- ment No. 23	State- ment No. 24	State- ment No. 25	State- ment No. 26
Age	--	--	--	4.08*	--	--	--	4.66*
Race	--	--	--	--	4.65*	--	--	--
Sex	--	--	--	5.94*	--	--	--	--
Residence	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Experience, Com. Col. Boards	--	4.44*	14.38**	6.43*	--	--	--	9.16**
Education	--	13.80**	5.69*	--	--	--	7.70**	--
Income	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

-- Not significant; * Significant at .05 level; ** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Characteristics	State- ment No. 27	State- ment No. 28	State- ment No. 29	State- ment No. 30
Age	--	4.66*	6.17**	--
Race	--	--	--	--
Sex	--	--	--	--
Residence	--	--	5.03*	--
Experience, Com. Col. Boards	--	--	7.93**	--
Education	--	--	--	--
Income	--	--	--	11.81**

-- Not significant; * Significant at .05 level; ** Significant at .01 level.

statement. The significant chi-square value was due to younger board members providing more support and older members less support than expected under the hypothesis.

Statement 18 said that social organizations and fraternities should be allowed to develop in North Carolina community colleges. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.89, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between age and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to younger board members providing more support and older members less support than expected for the statement.

Statement 22 stated that the student body should be represented on the board of trustees. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 4.08, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between age and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to younger board members providing more support and older board members providing less support for the statement.

Statement 26 stated that community college instructors should observe the same vacation schedule as the students during the academic year. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 4.66, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between age and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to younger board members providing less support and older board members more support than expected for the statement.

Statement 28 stated that future faculty and staff should be selected from among those persons specially trained for the community college level. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 4.66, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between age and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to younger board members providing less support and older board members providing more support than was expected for this statement.

Statement 29 stated that North Carolina community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the total education budget. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 6.17, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between age and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to younger board members providing less support, and older board members providing more support than was expected for the statement.

Race. Table 3 shows that significant chi-square values were found for the personal characteristic of race as it related to Statement 23. However, the ratio of 143 white to 4 black board members precluded the use of these data in computing acceptable chi-square values.

Sex. Table 3 shows that significant chi-square values were found for the personal characteristic of sex as it related to Statements 11, 15, 17 and 22.

Statement 11 said that each community college should provide extensive extra-curricular programs, including inter-collegiate athletics. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.73, which is significant at the

.05 level, for the relationship between sex and attitude toward this statement.

Statement 15 said that faculty members should develop salary arrangements and working conditions through negotiations with the board. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.49, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between sex and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to male board members providing less support and female members providing more support for the statement.

Statement 17 had fewer than four board members expressing disagreement, therefore the chi-square value was not deemed acceptable for consideration.

Statement 22 said that the student body should be represented on the board of trustees. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.94, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between sex and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square is due to the male board members providing less support and the female members providing more support for the statement.

Residence. Table 3 shows that significant chi-square values were found for the personal characteristic of residence as related to Statements 4, 9, 12, and 29.

Statement 4 said that the instructional staff should be actively involved in community college curriculum development. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 7.75, which is significant at the .01 level, for the

relationship between residence and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to rural board members providing more support for this statement than did urban board members.

Statement 9 said that each community college should provide testing, counseling and placement services for all students. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 4.21, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between residence and this statement. The chi-square value was due to rural board members providing more support for this statement than did urban board members.

Statement 12 stated that the development of socially acceptable moral and ethical values is as important a function of the community college as intellectual development. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.89, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between residence and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to rural board members providing more support and urban board members providing less support than expected for the statement.

Statement 29 stated that North Carolina community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the educational budget. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.03, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between residence and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square level was due to urban members providing more support and rural board members providing less support than expected for the statement.

Experience. Table 3 shows that a significant chi-square value was found for the characteristic of experience on community college boards of trustees as it related to Statements 10, 20, 21, 22, 26 and 29.

Statement 10 said that the community college instructional staff should be involved in policy development. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 18.85, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between experience and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value is due to board members with more than three years experience on community college boards supporting the statement to a greater degree than board members with three years, or less, experience.

Statement 20 said that academic ability should be the primary measure when making decisions about admitting students to community colleges. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 4.44, significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between experience and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value developed because board members with three years, or less, experience on community college boards supported the statement to a greater degree than board members with more than three years experience.

Statement 21 said that formal education beyond high school should be provided for anyone who is able to benefit from it. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 14.38, which is significant at the .01 level for the relationship between experience and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members with more than three years experience on community college boards being less supportive of the statement than board members with three years, or less, of experience.

Statement 22 said that the student body should be represented on the board of trustees. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 6.43, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between experience and attitudes toward this statement. The chi-square value is due to board members with three years, or less, experience on community college boards supporting the statement to a greater degree than board members with more than three years experience.

Statement 26 stated that community college staff should be given at least the same number of days sick leave as state employees. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 9.16, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between experience and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members with more than three years experience supporting the statement to a greater degree than did board members with three years, or less, experience.

Statement 29 said that North Carolina community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the total education budget. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 7.93, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between experience and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members with more than three years experience on community college boards giving more support to the statement than did board members with three years, or less, experience.

Education. Table 3 shows that significant chi-square values were found for the personal characteristic of education as it is related to Statements 1, 7, 11, 12, 20, 21 and 25.

Statement 1 stated that community colleges should provide research programs to study problems associated with community college education. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 10.24, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members educated at the graduate or professional degree level giving more support and board members with the bachelor's degree or less giving less support to the statement than was expected.

Statement 7 stated that husband - wife combinations should not be employed by local community colleges. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 16.39, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was developed because board members educated at the graduate or professional degree level gave more support and board members with the bachelor's degree or less gave less support to the statement than was expected.

Statement 11 stated that each community college should provide extra-curricular programs, including inter-collegiate athletics. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 12.92, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members with an education at the bachelor's degree level or less giving more support to the statement than did those board members with a graduate or professional degree.

Statement 12 said that the development of acceptable moral and ethical values in community college students is as important as their intellectual training. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.11, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was developed because board members with an education at the bachelor's degree or less gave more support to the statement and board members with the graduate or professional degree gave less support than expected to the statement.

Statement 20 said that when making decisions about admitting students to the community college academic ability should be a primary measure. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 13.80, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members with the bachelor's degree or less giving more support to the statement than did those board members with a graduate or professional degree.

Statement 21 said that formal education beyond high school should be provided for anyone who is able to benefit from it. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 5.69, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to board members with an education at the bachelor's degree level or less giving more support to the statement and board members with a graduate or professional degree giving less support to the statement.

Statement 25 said that community college curricula should be planned for students with very different ability levels. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 7.70, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between education and attitude toward the statement. The chi-square value was the result of board members with a graduate or professional degree giving more support to the statement than did those board members with a bachelor's degree or less education.

Income. Table 3 indicates that significant chi-square values were found for the characteristic of family income as related to Statements 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 30.

Statement 1 said that community colleges should provide research programs to study problems associated with community college education. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 6.43, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between family income and this statement. The chi-square value was due to those board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 providing more support and board members with a family income of more than \$18,001 providing less support for the statement.

Statement 3 said that all community college administrators should have previous successful classroom teaching experience. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 6.19, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between family income of more than \$18,001 providing more support than was expected and board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 providing less support than was expected for this statement.

Statement 5 said that the instructional staff should be involved in community college curriculum development. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 6.07, which is significant at the .05 level, for the relationship between family income and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value is due to those board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 providing more support for this statement than did those with a family income of more than \$18,001.

Statement 7 stated that husband - wife combinations should not be employed by community colleges in any capacity. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 7.91, which is significant at the .05 level, for relationships between family income and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value was due to those board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 supporting the statement to a greater extent than did those with a family income of more than \$18,001.

Statement 10 said that the instructional staff should be involved in the policy development of the local community college. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 9.22, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between family income and attitude toward this statement. This chi-square value developed when board members with a family income of more than \$18,001 supported the statement to a greater extent than did those board members with a family income of less than \$18,000.

Statement 13 said that a community college instructor should be able to speak openly and freely about any issue in the classroom. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 9.28, significant at the .01 level,

for the relationship between family income and attitude toward this statement. The significant chi-square value was due to board members with a family income of more than \$18,001 giving more support to the statement than did board members with a family income of less than \$18,000.

Statement 14 stated that the community college faculty should be represented on the college board of trustees. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 7.44 level, for the relationship between family income and attitude toward this statement. The chi-square value developed because the board members with a family income of more than \$18,001 gave more support than expected to the statement while those board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 gave less support than expected to the statement.

Statement 18 said that social organizations and fraternities should be allowed to develop in the North Carolina community colleges. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 11.00, which is significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between family income and attitude toward this statement. This value was developed because board members with a family income of more than \$18,001 supported the statement to a greater extent than board members with a family income of less than \$18,000.

Statement 30 said that each board member should be expected to attend an orientation pertaining to the philosophy and goals of the community college. Table 3 shows a chi-square value of 11.81, significant at the .01 level, for the relationship between family income and attitude toward this statement. This chi-square value was due to board members

with a family income of more than \$18,001 providing more support and board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 providing less support than expected for this statement.

In summary, this chapter has presented an analysis of the responses of North Carolina community college board members to a questionnaire. The presentation focused on the relationship between personal characteristics and the attitudinal statements. A chi-square test was used to determine whether or not a significant relationship existed between observed and expected responses of the seven sub-groups of personal characteristics.

The results of this analysis have been summarized and are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Summary

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to determine for the State of North Carolina: (1) the selected personal characteristics of members of local community college boards, (2) the attitudes of these board members toward selected functions of the local community college, and (3) the relationship between personal characteristics and attitudes of board members toward community college functions.

Statement of the hypotheses. The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of those board members under 45 years of age and those over 45 years of age toward selected functions of the college.
2. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of the male and the female board members concerning selected functions of the college.
3. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of the white board members and the non-white board members toward selected functions of the college.
4. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of those board members residing in an urban area and those residing in rural areas concerning selected functions of the college.

5. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of those board members with less than three years service on the board and those with more than three years service with regard to selected functions of the college.

6. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of board members with an education level at the bachelor's degree, or less, and those board members with a graduate or professional degree with regard to selected functions of the college.

7. There is a significant relationship between the attitude of board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 per year and those with a family income of more than \$18,001 per year concerning selected functions of the college.

Statement of research procedures. The population of the study included a potential of 178 board members serving in the State of North Carolina during the spring of 1973. A total of 152 board members responded to a questionnaire designed to obtain information about personal characteristics and to determine attitudes toward selected functions of the community college. The return of 85.29 per cent of the questionnaires was regarded as satisfactory.

As shown in Table 4, there were responses from board members associated with all 15 of the North Carolina community colleges. There was a vacancy on the Board of 2 colleges, giving an effective potential population of 178. All of the board members from 2 colleges responded to the questionnaire, 11 from 5 colleges, 10 from 4 colleges, 9 from 2 colleges, 8 from 1 college and 7 from 1 college.

TABLE 4

Questionnaires Returned by North Carolina
Community College Board Members

Community College	Number of Board Members At Time of Survey	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Per Cent of Total
Caldwell	12	11	91.66
Central Piedmont	12	8	66.66
Coastal Carolina	11*	10	90.90
College of the Albemarle	12	10	83.33
Davidson County	12	11	91.66
Gaston College	12	7	58.33
Isothermal	12	11	91.66
Lenior	12	11	91.66
Rockingham	12	12	100.00
Southern Pines	12	11	91.66
Southeastern	12	7	75.00
Surry	12	10	83.33
Wayne	12	12	100.00
Western Piedmont	<u>11**</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>81.81</u>
Totals	178	152 ¹	85.29

*Vacancy of the Board

**Board Member Deceased

¹Four questionnaires were returned after the computations had been completed; this would make the total of returned questionnaires 156 or 87.63 per cent.

Of the 152 returned questionnaires, 85.29 per cent of the total, 5 failed to meet a priori standards for completeness and were dropped from analysis in the study. The responses from 147 board members, or 82.58 per cent, were included in the study.

In order to determine whether significant relationships existed between obtained responses to each attitudinal statement and the number of expected responses based on the hypotheses, a chi-square test for significance was used. The .05 level of confidence was selected as the limit at which the hypotheses would be accepted.

Personal Characteristics. This study revealed that in 1973 the typical board member serving local North Carolina community colleges was a white male about 55 years old. Typically, two out of three board members lived in small cities or rural areas, with the remaining one out of three residing in a large city of 50,000 or more population, or in a suburban area near a large city.

The board member typically had earned at least a bachelor's degree and completed additional graduate work in a degree program. The educational level was reflected in a median family income between \$25,001 and \$32,000, with almost one-half of the board members reporting a family income of more than \$32,001.

The typical North Carolina board member was the parent of one to three children, with over one-fourth of the board members reporting a parental status of four or more children.

The North Carolina board member typically spent his early childhood in towns of less than 5,000 population, with over three-fourths living in areas of less than 25,000. He had resided in the county where the college he served was located for over 30 years.

From an experience standpoint, the average board member had two to three years experience on public school boards; over 90 per cent had over three years experience on community college board. The typical board member is still actively employed (1) as a professional or technical person or (2) as a manager, official or proprietor.

The implications of the data reflecting on personal characteristics were perhaps most striking when one considered the role of the board members. As a part of a 12 member group charged with the responsibility of meeting the educational needs of a large community, the board member may be confronted with the tasks of considering and reflecting the many segments of society in the decision-making process.

A survey of the representation on local boards serving local community colleges revealed that such groups as women, young adults, non-whites, large city residents, the less educated, low-income groups and those engaged in non-professional or non-managerial occupations were not well represented by members of their peer groups serving on community college boards. This is not to say that present board members were or were not handling the situation well, but rather to point out that a problem may exist. It was not the purpose of this study to determine representativeness of boards serving the state's community colleges, but there are implications for further study here.

Board member's attitudes. The goal of public community college education in North Carolina was to provide a comprehensive program for residents of the local districts. To this end, the State of North Carolina had enacted legislation and had made financial commitments to support written policies and guidelines to encourage development of local institutions.

To what extent the State of North Carolina will realize this goal of comprehensiveness will depend, to a marked degree, on the basic attitudes of board members toward the alternative functions of the community college. It seemed reasonable to assume that board members who regarded certain types of programs of courses as critically needed, or relatively unimportant, would have a profound influence on the ultimate development of the state's community colleges. This assumption would be particularly significant when a majority of board members serving a local institution tended to have similar attitudes toward community college functions.

This summary and discussion, therefore, focused on the attitudes of board members toward the functions of local community colleges. To accomplish this, each of the thirty attitudinal statements was arbitrarily placed in an appropriate category for discussion purposes. It was recognized that many of the statements could be placed in two or more categories, but for purposes of clarity, the placement was listed in only one area.

1. In the area of philosophy, a majority of board members included in this study (96.39 per cent) agreed that programs should be provided.

for "under educated" youth and adults, that development of socially acceptable moral and ethical standards are a function of the college (92.51 per cent) and formal post-secondary education should be provided for anyone able to benefit from it (92.51 per cent). This has implications for the future of local community colleges in North Carolina because it helps establish a conceptual climate for program emphasis and development.

2. In the area of program development, which is fundamental to the concept of comprehensiveness, the responses of board members in this study indicated a high degree of support for the attitudinal statements. Such programs as transfer education, adult education, technical or semi-technical courses, testing and counseling services, and two-year associate degree programs received support from a majority of board members. The board members indicated support for variable length programs, including courses in the vocational or semi-technical skills area (97.27 per cent). The same degree of support was provided for programs to develop technical skills (94.55 per cent). The board members felt that equal emphasis should be given transfer, terminal and community services programs (82.31 per cent).

In all cases, the board members provided substantial support for the programs, indicating that the goal of comprehensiveness for the state's community colleges was shared by those in a policy making role at the local level.

3. Program areas not receiving support from board members included in the study were those of extra-curricular programs and inter-collegiate

athletics (42.17 per cent) and social organizations and fraternities (48.29 per cent).

4. Research programs to study problems associated with community college education received support (70.68 per cent) from the board members. It is possible that this attitude has developed because community college education has gained some maturity in North Carolina and problem areas have become more clearly defined.

5. In the area of finance, board members in the study indicated support for tuition charges to be paid by North Carolina residents enrolled in non-credit courses (61.22 per cent). An increased percentage of the total state education budget -- even at the expense of elementary and secondary education received poor support from board members (34.01 per cent). Perhaps this attitude prevailed because a large majority (98.54 per cent) of the board members had also served on public school boards.

6. In the area of administration and governance, board members supported a statement that all administrators should have had successful classroom teaching experience (66.55 per cent). At the same time the board members disagreed with the suggestion that future staff and faculty should be selected from among those specifically trained at the community college level (33.75 per cent agreed). It is rather difficult to rationalize the value of classroom teaching to a community college administrator, especially when 82.31 per cent of board members agreed that the skills needed to manage a community college are similar to those needed to operate a hospital or run a business. It is also

difficult to theorize why board members would not want future personnel specifically trained for community college positions, especially when many colleges and universities now train personnel for these positions. It is possible that the community college's relative immaturity and rapid expansion, coupled with the fact that most board members have served on public school boards, has not permitted the board members to see the community college as a specialized field of professional preparation.

7. A majority of board members felt that the instructors should be involved in curriculum development (89.11 per cent), but failed to support evaluation of the instructional staff on teaching ability alone (52.82 per cent disagreed) and would include such items as research, writing and publishing. While a majority of the board members supported the involvement of the instructional staff in policy development in the local community college, they contradicted themselves by failing to support the idea that the faculty be represented on the board of trustees (only 22.44 per cent agreed) and that the faculty should negotiate with the board on salary arrangements and working conditions (27.21 per cent agreed). As teacher militancy becomes more pronounced, it is possible that these may become significant issues in community college education.

8. In the area of admissions, board members in the study indicated a high degree of support for liberalized admissions policies. Only 17.68 per cent of the board members included in the study agreed that academic ability should be the primary measure when admitting students

to the community college. Such an attitude tends to support the open-door concept generally held by community colleges throughout the country and further strengthens the comprehensiveness of the total local community college program.

The board members of the North Carolina community colleges were generally homogeneous in their responses to the attitudinal statements. As a rule, when the group agreed or disagreed with a statement the agreement or disagreement was by a clear majority. In only five cases (16.66 per cent) was there not a clear delineation of agreement or disagreement.

Significant relationships between personal characteristics and attitudinal statements. It was not the purpose of this study to determine cause and effect, but rather to point out relationships existing between personal characteristics and attitudes of community college board members. The data gathered in the study do not permit one to state why board members might differ in their attitudes toward selected issues in community college education. Observations were made within the limits of the research design and applied only to board members in the State of North Carolina included in the study.

Chi-square analysis of the relationship between personal characteristics and attitudes of board members revealed 35 values significant at the .05 level. This was the standard established for acceptance of the hypotheses in the study. Nineteen of the 35 chi-square values were significant at the .01 level and were reported as such.

1. The personal characteristic of age showed a significant relationship with six attitudinal statements. Two of the chi-square values were significant at the .01 level and four at the .05 level. The significant chi-square values were due to younger board members being less supportive toward such issues as instructors observing the same vacation schedules as students, future faculty and staff being selected from among persons specially trained at the community college level and that community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the total educational budget. Older board members were less supportive toward such issues as student body representation on the board, social organizations and fraternities on community college campuses and faculty members negotiating with the board for salary arrangements and working conditions.

2. The personal characteristic of race had too few black respondents to correctly compute chi-square values.

3. A third personal characteristic, that of sex, produced one chi-square value significant at the .01 level and three values significant at the .05 level. The significant chi-square values were due to female board members being more supportive toward such issues as the community college providing extra-curricular activities, faculty negotiating with the board for salary arrangements and working conditions and student representation on community college boards. The chi-square value at the .01 level was not accepted since fewer than four board members disagreed with the statement.

4. A fourth personal characteristic, that of residence, provided five chi-square values which were significant, two at the .01 level and three at the .05 level. The significant chi-square values at the .01 level were due to board members residing in rural areas being less supportive of tuition being paid by North Carolina residents for non-credit courses and more supportive of the instructional staff involvement in community college curriculum development. Board members residing in rural areas were more supportive of providing testing, counseling and placement services for each student, and the belief that the development of acceptable moral and ethical values were as important as intellectual development. This support resulted in chi-square values significant at the .05 level. Rural residents were less supportive of the statement that community colleges should receive an increased percentage of the total educational budget.

5. The personal characteristic of experience on community college boards showed a significant relationship with six attitudinal statements. Four of the chi-square values were significant at the .01 level and two at the .05 level.

The significant chi-square values obtained for this characteristic were due to board members with less than three years of experience on community college board who tended to differ in their response patterns from board members with three or more years of experience. In general, the more experienced board members were more supportive toward such proposals as instructional staff involvement in policy development, community college staff being given at least the same number days sick leave

as other state employees and community colleges receiving and increased percentage of the total educational budget. It was interesting to note that chi-square values for the relationship between experience and these issues were all significant at the .01 level. The more experienced board members were less supportive of items such as academic ability being the primary factor in making admissions decisions, formal education beyond high school being provided for anyone able to benefit from it and representation for the student body on boards of trustees.

6. A sixth personal characteristic, that of education, produced seven significant chi-square values, five of which were significant at the .01 level. The significant chi-square values were due to the support given by board members educated at the graduate and professional degree level for these: 1) community colleges providing research programs, 2) husband-wife combinations should not be employed in the same college and 3) community college curricula should be planned for students with different ability levels. These board members gave less support to proposals that community colleges should provide extra-curricular programs in inter-collegiate athletics and that development of acceptable moral and ethical values are a function of the community college. They also gave less support to the ideas of academic ability being the primary measure for college admissions and that education beyond high school should be provided for anyone able to benefit from it. Board members with the bachelor's degree or less were more supportive of these statements.

7. The personal characteristic of family income produced nine chi-square values which were significant, eight of these at the .01 level. The significant chi-square values were due to board members with a family income of \$18,000 or less differing in their response patterns from board members reporting an income of more than \$18,001. In general, board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 were less supportive toward such issues as college administrators having successful teaching experience, the instructional staff being involved in policy development and academic freedom for instructors. They also gave less support to the proposals of faculty representation on the college board, the development of social fraternities and board members attending an orientation pertaining to the philosophy and goals of the community college. In contrast, this group was the most supportive toward such issues as colleges providing research programs on community college education, instructional staff involvement in curricula development and husband-wife combinations not being employed in community colleges.

II. Conclusions

The following conclusions were based on data gathered in the study and are stated within the limitations of the research design.

Personal Characteristics

1. In regard to characteristics of the board members, they were not totally representative of the people of the State of North Carolina. This conclusion appears justified in view of the fact that the population of North Carolina was approximately 50 per cent women yet only about

6 per cent of the members of North Carolina community college boards of trustees were women. Likewise, according to the 1970 U. S. Census Report, the non-white population of North Carolina was 23.2 per cent of the total population. This is far greater than the reported 2.73 per cent representation of non-whites on North Carolina community college boards.

In the U. S. Census Report of 1970, between 40 and 60 per cent of the population of North Carolina had a family income in the range of \$7,000 to \$9,999. The income range of over \$25,000 is earned by 2 per cent of the total population of North Carolina yet 45 per cent of the board members included in this study reported a family income of over \$32,001. Similarly, occupational categories and board members with different levels of formal education were not represented relative to the general population of the state. Nor were those in lower income categories relatively represented.

Attitudes

2. A majority of board members included in the study indicated attitudes favorable to the concept of the comprehensive community college. This included the open-door policy, provisions for a variety of programs and an acceptance of a basic philosophy consistent with that of the Community College Act.

3. Responses of board members to various attitudinal statements indicated that local community colleges were probably student orientated. Board member recognitions of the need for counseling, guidance and

placement services, plus the view that instructors should be involved in providing guidance to students, supported this conclusion.

4. Board members demonstrated an awareness of the important role assumed by community college instructors by supporting the involvement of instructional staff in curriculum development and policy development and in the guidance of the student. Elimination of discriminatory policies such as not employing husband-wife combinations reflected this concern for instructor welfare also.

5. Responses by board members to certain attitudinal statements indicated that some common element or elements influence the responses of board members. Specifically, there were only 35 significant relation differences found out of a possible 210 combinations.

Relationships between personal characteristics and attitudes

The hypotheses stated that a significant relationship would be found between selected personal characteristics of board members and their attitudes toward selected functions of the community college. A chi-square test was applied to 210 specific comparisons. Of these, 23 were found significant at the .01 level and 12 significant at the .05 level. The standard established for acceptance of the hypotheses in this study was the .05 level of significant.

6. The board members with a graduate or professional degree favored the provision of research programs in the community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less education did not.

The board members with an income of less than \$18,000 per year favored the provision of research programs in the community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of more than \$18,001 did not.

7. The board members with an income of more than \$18,001 per year favored all community college administrators having previous successful classroom teaching experience to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of less than \$18,000 did not.

8. The board members residing in rural areas favored the instructional staff being actively involved in community college curriculum development to a greater degree than was expected whereas those residing in other areas did not.

9. The board members residing in urban areas favored tuition being paid by North Carolina residents enrolled in non-credit courses to a greater degree than was expected whereas those residing in rural areas did not.

The board members with an income of less than \$18,000 per year favored tuition being paid by North Carolina residents enrolled in non-credit courses to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of more than \$18,001 did not.

10. The board members with a graduate or professional degree favored husband-wife combinations not being employed by local community colleges to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less education did not.

Those board members with an income of less than \$18,000 per year favored husband-wife combinations not being employed by community colleges to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of more than \$18,001 did not.

11. The board members residing in rural areas favored each community college providing guidance services, including testing, counseling and placement services for all students to a greater degree than was expected whereas those in non-rural areas did not.

12. The board members with more than three years experience on community college boards favored the instructional staff being involved in policy development on the local community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less than three years experience did not.

The board members with an income of more than \$18,001 per year favored the instructional staff being involved in the policy development of the local community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of less than \$18,000 did not.

13. The board members with the bachelor's, or less, education favored each community college providing extra-curricular activities, including inter-collegiate athletics to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with a graduate or professional degree did not.

The male board members favored each community college providing extra-curricular activities, including inter-collegiate athletics, to a greater degree than was expected whereas the female board members did not.

14. The board members residing in rural areas favored the development of socially acceptable moral and ethical values as an important function of the community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those residing in urban areas did not.

The board members educated at the bachelor's degree level, or less, favored the development of socially acceptable moral and ethical values as an important function of the community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with a graduate or professional degree did not.

15. The board members with an income of more than \$18,001 per year favored a community college instructor being able to speak openly and freely about any issue in the classroom to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of less than \$18,000 did not.

16. The board members with an income of more than \$18,001 per year favored the community college faculty being represented on the college board of trustees to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of less than \$18,000 did not.

17. The board members under 45 years of age favored faculty members developing salary arrangements and working conditions through negotiations with the board to a greater degree than was expected whereas those over 45 years of age did not.

18. The board members under 45 years of age favored social organizations and fraternities being allowed to develop in North Carolina community colleges to a greater degree than was expected whereas those over 45 years of age did not.

The board members with an income of more than \$18,001 per year favored social organizations and fraternities being allowed to develop in North Carolina community colleges to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with an income of less than \$18,000 did not.

19. The board members with three years or less experience on community college boards favored academic ability being the primary measure when making admissions decisions to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with more than three years experience did not.

The board members with a bachelor's degree, or less, favored academic ability being the primary measure when making admissions decisions to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with the graduate or professional degree did not.

20. The board members with three years or less experience on community college boards favored formal education beyond high school being provided for anyone able to benefit from it to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with more than three years experience did not.

The board members educated at the bachelor's degree level, or less, favored formal education beyond high school being provided for anyone able to benefit from it to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with the graduate or professional degree did not.

21. The board members under 45 years of age favored the student body being represented on the board of trustees to a greater degree than was expected whereas those over 45 years of age did not.

The female board members favored the student body being represented on the board of trustees to a greater degree than was expected whereas the male board members did not.

The board members with more than three years experience on community college board favored the student body being represented on the college board of trustees to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less than three years experience did not.

22. The board members with a graduate or professional degree favored the community college curricula being planned for students with very different ability levels to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less education did not.

23. The board members over age 45 favored community college instructors observing the same vacation schedule as the students during the academic year to a greater degree than was expected whereas those under 45 years of age did not.

The board members with more than three years experience on community college boards favored community college instructors observing the same vacation schedule as the students during the academic year to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less than three years did not.

24. The board members over 45 years of age favored future faculty and staff being selected from among those persons specially trained for the community college level to a greater degree than was expected whereas those under 45 years of age did not.

25. The board members over 45 years of age favored North Carolina community colleges receiving an increased percentage of the total educational budget to a greater degree than was expected whereas those under 45 years of age did not.

The board members residing in urban areas favored North Carolina community colleges receiving an increased percentage of the total educational budget to a greater degree than was expected whereas those residing in rural areas did not.

The board members with more than three years experience on community college boards favored North Carolina community colleges receiving an increased percentage of the total educational budget to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less than three years experience did not.

26. The board members with an income of more than \$18,001 per year favored each board member attending an orientation pertaining to the philosophy and goals of the community college to a greater degree than was expected whereas those with less income did not.

27. Since the analysis of the data reveal no significant relationship between personal characteristics and the following attitudinal statements, the hypotheses were rejected for those statements.

a. Instructors should be evaluated on classroom teaching only. research, writing and publishing should not be considered.

b. Each community college should provide programs for "under educated" youth and adults.

c. Each community college should provide two-year programs (associate degree types) for semi-professional training.

d. Each community college should provide variable length programs to develop vocational or semi-technical skills.

e. Equal emphasis on transfer, terminal and community services programs in the community college is desirable.

f. Community college curricula should be planned for students with very different ability levels.

g. Community college staff personnel should be given at least the same number of days sick leave as state employees.

III. Recommendations

The following recommendations for further research are made.

1. In view of the relatively limited number of studies focusing on members of community college boards, it is recommended that this study be replicated in other states. This would be of particular value because of the increased emphasis on community college education throughout the country. It is further suggested that such studies be conducted periodically to determine trends over a period of time.

2. It is also suggested that similar research projects be undertaken to study the governing boards of colleges and universities and of public school systems in North Carolina and in other states.

3. It is recommended that studies be conducted to determine how well the composition of community college boards accomplishes the task of serving groups not represented on the board.

4. There is a need for a concentrated study to determine means by which North Carolina community college boards can be made more representative of the population of North Carolina.

5. It is recommended that studies be conducted to determine the probable cause of significant relationships between personal characteristics and attitudes of community college board members. For instance, why do board members with a family income of less than \$18,000 tend to differ in their attitudes from board members with a family income of more than \$18,001?

6. It is recommended that studies be conducted to determine if common reaction patterns exist among those groups which were denied, at the time of this study, access to a voice in community college governance. Examples of such groups are women, non-whites, young people, and those in lower income levels.

7. It is recommended that further analysis be made of the data collected by this study relative to the "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" responses. Such a proposed study would attempt to determine the existence of common patterns of responses for each personal characteristic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnett, W. H. Qualifications and philosophy of education of public junior college board members. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1964.
- Beck, H. P. Men who control our universities. New York: Kings Crown Press, 1957.
- Benson, C. S. The economics of public education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Blackmon, J. H. Trustee responsibilities for community colleges and technical institutes of the North Carolina community college system. State Board of Education, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1970.
- Campbell, R. F., and others. The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.
- Conner, A., editor. 1972 junior college directory. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972
- Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1916.
- Dissertations in progress and dissertations completed. Junior College Journal. 1968, XXIX, September.
- Dissertations in progress and dissertations completed. Junior College Journal. 1969, XXX, September.
- Dissertations in progress and dissertations completed. Junior College Journal. 1970, XXXI, August and September.
- Dissertations in progress and dissertations completed. Junior College Journal. 1971, XXXII, August and September.
- Dissertations in progress and dissertations completed. Junior College Journal. 1972, XXXIII, August and September.
- Ebbensen, J. A. Junior college board members: their personal characteristics, state of Illinois, 1968-69. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1969.

- Gaines, F. B. The functioning of local junior college advisory committees in Florida junior community colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967.
- Gilliland, J. R. Members of boards of trustees of Florida junior colleges; their personal characteristics and opinions about institutional role and governance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1969.
- Hamilton, C. H. Community colleges for North Carolina, a study of need, location, and service areas. North Carolina Board of Higher Education and the Governors' Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Progress Report RS-42, Raleigh, North Carolina, December, 1962.
- Hartnett, R. T. College and university trustees; their backgrounds, roles and educational attitudes. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
- Hicks, J. D. The federal union. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1937.
- Hunter, F. Community power structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953.
- Hurlburt, A. S. Community college study. Raleigh, North Carolina, (Pamphlet of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction), 1962.
- Jennings, M. K. Community influentials. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1964.
- Keppel, F. In "Forward" to Neal Gross, Who runs our schools? New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Kimbrough, R. B. Informal county leadership structure and controls affecting educational policy decision-making. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.
- Kirkpatrick, W. H. Education and the social crisis. New York: Liveright, Inc., 1962.
- LaVire, W. A. Theoretical bases for board/administrator relationships. Board/Administrator Relationships. Edited by Robert R. Weigman, Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1964.
- Litton, M. L. The effective board. Board/Administrator Relationships. Edited by Robert R. Wiegman, Gainesville, Florida: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1964.

- Martorana, S. V. College boards of trustees. Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1960.
- Medsker, L. L. The junior college: progress and prospects. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Mesker, L. L. What is the most constructive role for the junior colleges? Paper presented at the Fifteenth National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 7, 1960.
- Parker, F., Baily, A., and Ogilvie, W. K. A bibliography of doctoral dissertations, 1918-63. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.
- Parker, P. W. Profile of the Kansas trustees. Junior College Journal. 1972, XXX, April.
- Rafferty, M. New front. Phi Delta Kappan. 1968, XL, September.
- Reynolds, J. W. The junior college. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.
- Robinson, D. G. Preceptions held for Florida's superintendents, school board members, advisory committee members, and presidents of the functions, qualifications and problems relative to the public junior college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1963.
- Rouch, J. E. A bibliograhpy of doctoral dissertations, 1964-66. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Sapper, C. K. Selected social, economic, and attitudinal characteristics of trustees of California's public junior colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1966.
- Sax, G. Emperical foundations of educational research. Edgewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Thornton, J. W., Jr. The community college. (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Tutle, E. School board leadership in America. Chicago: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958.
- U. S. census report: North Carolina, 1970. United States Department of Commerce. Washington D. C.: U. S. Printing Office, 1971.

APPENDIX A

As a member of a board of trustees of a North Carolina community college your cooperation is requested in completing a brief questionnaire which provides information about a few personal characteristics, and reflects your thinking about some of the key issues facing community college education today. Individual board members and individual community colleges will not be identified or associated with responses to the questionnaire.

The information gathered from these questionnaires will be used in a dissertation to be written under the supervision of a doctoral committee at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Your promptness in returning the completed questionnaire will be sincerely appreciated. The results of the study will be made available to each local community college board for your information.

Sincerely,

W. Roger Sharrock
Box 494
Edgefield, South Carolina 29824

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NORTH CAROLINA
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEES

Instructions: Please check the one most appropriate blank.

(01) Your Age:

1. 34 or under
2. 35 - 44
3. 45 - 54
4. 55 - 64
5. 65 or over

(02) Your Sex:

1. Male
2. Female

(03) Your Race:

1. White
2. Black
3. Other

(04) Your Place of Residence:

1. Rural (Farm, sparsely settled, small town or village)
2. Urban area (An incorporated area of 2,500 to 50,000)
3. Suburban area (An unincorporated area of more than 2,500)
4. Large City (50,000 or more population)

(05) Your Educational Background:

1. Less than high school diploma
2. High school diploma
3. College attendance but no degree
4. Bachelor's degree
5. Master's degree
6. Doctoral degree - Type (M.D., Ph.D., etc.) _____
7. Other - Please specify _____

(06) Your Childhood:

The approxiamte population of the town or city in which you received most of your Kindergarten through 12th grade education was:

1. Under 5,000
2. 5,001 to 25,000
3. 25,001 to 100,000
4. Over 100,001

Data Processing Code _____

APPENDIX B (Continued)

(07) Your number of years of residence in this community college district:

1. ___ 0 - 5
2. ___ 6 - 10
3. ___ 11 - 15
4. ___ 16 - 20
5. ___ 21 - 25
6. ___ 26 - 30
7. ___ More than 30

(08) Approximate Family Income:

1. ___ Less than \$10,000
2. ___ \$10,001 - \$18,000
3. ___ \$18,001 - \$25,000
4. ___ \$25,001 - \$32,000
5. ___ More than \$32,001

(09) Your Marital - Parental Status:

1. ___ Not Married
2. ___ Married, no children
3. ___ Married, 1 - 3 children
4. ___ Married, 4 or more children

(10) Your years of experience on public schools boards:

1. ___ None
2. ___ 1 year or less
3. ___ 2 - 3 years
4. ___ More than 3 years

(11) Your years of experience on community college or technical institute boards:

1. ___ 1 year or less
2. ___ 2 - 3 years
3. ___ More than 3 years

Instructions: Consider the overall needs in your local community and college and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a check in the appropriate box.

STRONGLY
DISAGREE
DISAGREE
NO OPINION
AGREE
STRONGLY
AGREE

- (01) Community colleges should provide research programs to study problems associated with community college education.

--	--	--	--	--
- (02) Instructors should be evaluated on classroom teaching only. Research, writing and publishing should not be considered.

--	--	--	--	--
- (03) All community college administrators should have previous successful classroom teaching experience.

--	--	--	--	--
- (04) The instructional staff should be actively involved in community college curriculum development.

--	--	--	--	--
- (05) Tuition should be paid by North Carolina residents enrolled in non-credit courses.

--	--	--	--	--
- (06) Each community college should provide programs for "under-educated" youth and adults.

--	--	--	--	--
- (07) Husband-wife combinations should not be employed by community colleges in any capacity.

--	--	--	--	--
- (08) Each community college should provide two-year programs (associate degree type) for semi-professional training. (Examples: Nursing, Engineering Technician, Police Science, etc.)

--	--	--	--	--
- (09) Each community college should provide Guidance Services including testing, counseling, and placement services for all students.

--	--	--	--	--
- (10) The instructional staff should be involved in the policy development of the local community college.

--	--	--	--	--
- (11) Each community college should provide extensive extra-curricular programs, including inter-collegiate athletics.

--	--	--	--	--

- | | STRONGLY
DISAGREE | DISAGREE | NO OPINION | AGREE | STRONGLY
AGREE |
|---|----------------------|----------|------------|-------|-------------------|
| (12) The development of socially acceptable moral and ethical values in community college students is as important a function of the community college as their intellectual development. | | | | | |
| (13) A community college instructor should be able to speak openly and freely about any issue in the classroom. | | | | | |
| (14) The community college faculty should be represented on the board of trustees. | | | | | |
| (15) Faculty members should develop salary arrangements and working conditions through negotiations with the board. | | | | | |
| (16) Each community college should provide variable length programs to develop vocational or semi-technical skills. (Examples: welding, auto-mechanic, carpentry, cosmetology, etc.) | | | | | |
| (17) The community college instructors should be involved in providing guidance services for the students. | | | | | |
| (18) Social organizations and fraternities should be allowed to develop in the North Carolina community colleges. | | | | | |
| (19) Equal emphasis on transfer, terminal and community services programs in the community college is desirable. | | | | | |
| (20) When making decisions about admitting students to the community college academic ability should be the primary measure. | | | | | |
| (21) Formal education beyond high school should be provided for anyone who is able to benefit from it. Regardless of age, interest or ability. | | | | | |
| (22) The student body should be represented on the board of trustees. | | | | | |

S
T
R
O
N
G
L
Y

 D
I
S
A
G
R
E
E

 D
I
S
A
G
R
E
E

 N
O
 O
P
I
N
I
O
N

 A
G
R
E
E

 S
T
R
O
N
G
L
Y

 A
G
R
E
E

- (23) The community college should actively attempt to solve social problems such as the problems surrounding racial discrimination.

--	--	--	--	--
- (24) Community college curricula should be planned for students with very different ability levels.

--	--	--	--	--
- (25) There is a similarity between administering a community college and operating a business or running a hospital.

--	--	--	--	--
- (26) Community college instructors should observe the same vacation schedule as the students during the academic year. (Two weeks at Christmas, etc.) This time should not be counted against annual leave for those on a twelve month contract.

--	--	--	--	--
- (27) Community college staff personnel should be given at least the same number of days sick leave as state employees (ten days annually).

--	--	--	--	--
- (28) Future faculty and staff should be selected from among those persons specifically trained for the community college level, rather than those trained in secondary or higher education.

--	--	--	--	--
- (29) North Carolina community colleges should ~~receive~~ an increased percentage of the total education budget - even at the expense of elementary and secondary education.

--	--	--	--	--
- (30) Each board member should be expected to attend an intensive orientation pertaining to the philosophy and goals of the community college and the responsibilities and functions of the board of trustee and administration of the local community college.

--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX C

A few days ago I mailed a questionnaire to the trustees of North Carolina community colleges requesting your assistance in gathering information which will be beneficial to the boards and administration of the colleges. I have been most pleased with the number of responses and the speed with which they have been returned. However, to be of maximum value, the study needs the participation of as many of the trustees as possible.

If you happen to be one of the few who has not had time to return your questionnaire, would you take about 20 minutes from your busy schedule to complete and return the questionnaire in the postage paid envelope which is provided.

Personnel of the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges have indicated that information obtained by this study will be of value to them. Mr. Clifton Blue, as President of the Community College Trustees Association, has also given his support and endorsement to the study.

I greatly appreciate your cooperation and assistance.

Very truly yours,

W. Roger Sharrock
Box 494
Edgefield, South Carolina 29824

TABLE A

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Research
Programs to Study Problems Associated with Community
College Education (Statement 1)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	3	20.00	3	20.00	9	60.00	0	.00
45 - 54	56	0	.00	9	16.07	7	12.50	33	58.92	7	12.50
55 - 64	50	0	.00	8	16.00	9	18.00	28	56.00	5	10.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	4	16.00	2	08.00	12	48.00	7	28.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	24	17.51	19	13.86	74	54.01	20	14.59
Female	10	0	.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	5	50.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	0	.00	23	16.08	20	13.98	79	55.24	21	14.68
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	9	15.25	12	20.33	30	50.84	8	13.55
Urban	40	0	.00	10	25.00	7	17.50	25	62.50	1	02.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	5	12.19	5	12.19	26	63.41	6	14.63
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85

TABLE A (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	1	05.26	0	.00	13	68.42	5	26.31
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	1	03.12	7	21.87	21	65.62	3	09.37
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	17	29.82	6	10.52	29	50.87	5	08.77
Master's degree	19	0	.00	1	05.26	6	31.57	7	36.84	5	26.31
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	1	10.00	4	40.00	3	30.00	2	20.00
Other	7	0	.00	2	28.57	1	14.28	4	57.14	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	0	.00	7	08.43	18	21.68	49	59.03	9	10.84
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	15	32.60	1	02.17	22	47.82	8	17.39
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	77.77	2	22.22
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	2	22.22	3	33.33	4	44.44	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	1	12.50	6	75.00	1	12.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	4	28.57	2	14.28	8	57.14	0	.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	6	31.57	0	.00	8	57.89	2	10.52
More than 30	100	0	.00	17	17.00	13	13.00	54	54.00	16	16.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	4	18.18	11	50.00	7	31.81
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	6	20.00	5	16.16	15	50.00	3	10.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	1	04.76	2	09.52	16	76.91	2	09.52
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	16	24.21	8	13.63	39	59.09	3	04.54

TABLE A (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	3	20.00	0	.00	9	60.00	3	20.00
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	10	10.41	12	12.50	59	61.45	15	15.62
4 or more children	35	0	.00	10	28.57	6	17.14	17	40.00	2	05.71
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	17	20.00	14	16.47	48	56.47	6	07.05
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	5	07.27	4	05.87	32	58.18	14	25.45
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	83.33	1	16.66
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	.00	3	60.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	25	18.83	19	13.97	74	52.94	18	13.23

TABLE B

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Instructors
Being Evaluated on Classroom Teaching Only (Statement 2)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	3	20.00	6	31.57	1	05.26	3	20.00	2	10.52
45 - 54	56	4	07.14	26	44.64	7	12.50	19	33.92	0	.00
55 - 64	50	3	08.00	22	44.00	2	04.00	20	40.00	2	04.00
65 or over	25	1	04.00	19	76.00	0	.00	2	08.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	8	05.83	71	51.82	9	06.56	43	31.38	6	04.37
Female	10	0	.00	3	30.00	1	10.00	4	40.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	12	08.39	71	49.65	10	06.99	43	30.06	7	04.89
Black	4	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00	1	25.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	8	13.55	27	45.76	7	11.86	15	25.42	2	03.38
Urban	40	2	05.00	19	47.50	1	02.50	16	40.00	2	05.00
Suburban	41	2	04.87	21	51.21	2	04.87	12	29.26	4	09.75
Large City	7	0	.00	6	86.71	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00

TABLE B (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	4	21.05	11	57.89	2	10.52	2	10.52	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	1	09.37	12	37.50	4	12.50	11	43.37	11	06.52
Bachelor's degree	57	3	05.26	35	61.40	3	05.26	12	21.05	4	07.01
Master's degree	19	0	.00	8	42.10	0	.00	9	47.36	2	10.52
Doctoral degree	10	2	20.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	5	50.00	0	.00
Other	7	0	.00	2	28.57	0	.00	5	71.52	00	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	8	09.63	47	50.00	6	07.22	24	28.91	3	03.61
5,001 to 25,000	46	4	08.69	19	41.30	2	04.34	16	34.78	5	10.86
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	9	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	3	33.33	2	22.22	4	44.44	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	3	37.50	3	37.50	1	12.50	0	.00	1	12.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00
21 - 25	14	3	21.42	6	42.85	2	14.28	3	21.42	0	.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	8	42.10	0	.00	8	42.10	3	15.78
More than 30	100	6	06.00	53	53.00	7	07.00	31	31.00	4	04.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	4	80.00	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	3	13.63	9	40.90	2	09.09	4	18.18	4	18.18
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	3	10.00	16	53.33	5	16.66	4	16.66	2	06.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	3	14.28	9	42.85	0	.00	9	42.85	0	.00
More than \$32,001	66	3	04.54	33	50.00	3	04.54	26	39.39	2	03.03

TABLE B (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	8	53.33	0	.00	6	40.00	1	06.00
1 - 3 children	96	8	08.33	52	54.16	5	05.20	24	25.00	7	07.29
4 or more children	35	4	11.42	13	37.14	4	11.42	14	40.00	0	.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	4	80.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	6	07.05	48	56.47	7	08.23	20	23.52	4	04.70
More than 3 years	55	6	10.90	22	40.00	3	05.45	20	36.36	4	07.27
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	8	05.88	71	52.20	0	06.61	42	30.88	6	04.41

TABLE C

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Community
College Administrators Having Previous Successful
Classroom Teaching Experience (Statement 3)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent	
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	1	06.66	3	20.00	0	.00	10	66.66	1	06.66
45 - 54	56	0	.00	26	46.42	1	01.78	22	39.28	7	12.50
55 - 64	50	1	02.00	10	20.00	1	02.00	25	50.00	13	23.21
65 or over	25	0	.00	4	16.00	2	08.00	14	56.00	5	20.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	2	01.45	41	29.92	4	02.91	67	48.90	23	16.78
Female	10	0	.00	2	20.00	0	.00	3	30.00	4	40.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	2	01.39	43	30.06	4	02.79	68	47.55	26	18.18
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	1	01.69	12	20.33	2	03.38	31	52.54	13	22.03
Urban	40	0	.00	7	17.50	0	.00	22	44.00	11	22.00
Suburban	41	1	02.43	21	52.20	2	04.87	16	39.02	3	07.31
Large City	7	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00	4	57.14	0	.00

TABLE C (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	1	05.26	5	26.31	0	.00	6	31.57	7	36.84
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	1	01.35	12	37.50	0	.00	14	43.75	5	15.62
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	16	28.07	1	01.75	33	57.89	7	12.28
Master's degree	19	0	.00	4	21.05	0	.00	14	73.68	1	05.26
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	3	30.00	0	.00	4	40.00	3	30.00
Other	7	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	2	02.04	22	26.50	1	01.20	41	49.39	17	15.66
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	10	21.73	3	07.31	23	56.09	10	21.73
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	4	44.44	0	.00	5	55.55	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	7	77.77	0	.00	2	22.22	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	62.50	3	37.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	6	42.85	0	.00	6	42.85	2	14.28
26 - 30	19	0	.00	5	25.31	1	05.26	8	42.10	5	26.31
More than 30	100	2	02.00	30	30.00	3	03.00	49	49.00	16	16.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	2	40.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	3	13.63	0	.00	16	72.72	3	13.63
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	1	03.33	12	40.00	0	.00	16	53.33	1	03.33
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	6	28.57	0	.00	9	42.85	5	23.80
More than \$32,001	66	1	01.51	20	30.30	2	03.02	27	40.90	16	24.24

TABLE C (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	3	20.00	0	.00	9	60.00	3	20.00
1 - 3 children	96	2	02.08	29	30.00	2	02.08	45	46.87	18	18.75
4 or more children	35	0	.00	10	28.75	2	05.71	17	48.75	6	17.14
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	2	02.35	25	29.41	0	.00	41	42.23	17	20.00
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	15	27.27	2	03.63	28	50.90	10	18.18
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	2	01.47	40	29.41	4	02.94	65	47.79	25	18.38

TABLE D

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Instructional
Staff Involvement in Curriculum Development (Statement 4)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	1	06.66	8	53.33	6	40.00
45 - 54	56	2	03.57	3	06.35	3	06.35	32	57.14	16	28.57
55 - 64	50	0	.00	3	06.00	2	04.00	29	58.00	16	32.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	2	08.00	0	.00	14	56.00	9	36.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	2	01.45	8	05.83	6	04.37	79	57.66	42	30.65
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	50.00	5	50.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	2	01.39	8	05.59	6	04.19	80	55.94	47	32.86
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	38	64.40	21	35.59
Urban	40	0	.00	0	.00	5	12.50	26	65.00	9	22.50
Suburban	41	2	04.87	8	19.51	1	02.43	17	41.46	13	31.70
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	4	57.14

TABLE D (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	2	10.52	1	05.26	11	57.89	5	26.31
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	0	.00	3	09.37	12	43.75	17	53.12
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	3	05.26	2	03.50	38	64.91	14	24.56
Master's degree	19	0	.00	3	15.78	0	.00	11	57.89	5	26.31
Doctoral degree	10	2	20.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	50.00	3	30.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	2	02.40	4	04.81	6	07.22	47	56.62	24	28.91
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	29	63.04	17	36.95
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	55.55	4	44.44
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	4	44.44	0	.00	3	33.33	2	22.22
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	3	37.50	0	.00	4	50.00	1	12.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	2	07.14	6	42.85	6	42.85
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	42.10	11	57.98
More than 30	100	2	02.00	0	.00	4	04.00	65	65.00	29	29.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	3	13.63	3	13.63	10	45.45	6	27.27
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	0	.00	1	03.33	17	56.66	12	40.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	3	14.28	0	.00	8	38.09	10	47.61
More than \$32,001	66	2	03.03	2	03.03	2	03.03	42	63.63	18	27.27

TABLE D (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	46.66	8	53.33
1 - 3 children	96	2	02.08	2	02.08	5	05.20	58	60.41	29	30.20
4 or more children	35	0	.00	6	17.14	0	.00	19	54.28	10	28.57
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	3	60.00
2 -3 years	85	2	02.35	6	07.05	4	04.07	42	49.41	31	36.47
More than 4 years	55	0	.00	3	05.63	0	.00	40	72.72	13	23.62
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	50.00	3	50.00
2 - 3 years	5	2	40.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	50.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	8	05.88	6	04.37	78	57.35	44	32.35

TABLE E

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Tuition Being
Paid by North Carolina Residents Enrolled in Non-Credit
Courses (Statement 5)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	1	06.66	4	26.66	2	13.33	8	53.33	0	.00
45 - 54	56	0	.00	14	25.00	4	07.14	33	58.92	5	08.92
55 - 64	50	1	02.00	13	26.00	4	08.00	29	58.00	3	06.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	8	32.00	6	24.00	11	44.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	2	01.45	37	27.00	14	10.21	78	56.93	6	04.37
Female	10	0	.00	2	20.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	2	01.39	37	25.87	16	11.18	80	55.94	8	05.59
Black	4	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	2	03.38	27	45.76	9	15.25	17	28.81	4	06.77
Urban	40	0	.00	8	20.00	5	12.50	25	62.50	2	05.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	7	17.07	1	02.43	33	80.48	2	04.87
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00

TABLE E (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	1	33.33	2	66.66	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	9	47.36	0	.00	10	52.63	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	1	03.12	7	21.87	5	15.62	18	56.25	1	03.12
Bachelor's degree	52	1	01.75	18	31.87	5	08.77	29	50.87	4	07.01
Master's degree	19	0	.00	3	15.78	2	10.52	14	73.68	0	.00
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	3	30.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	2	02.40	26	31.32	10	12.04	40	48.19	5	06.02
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	12	26.08	6	13.04	25	54.34	3	06.52
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	100.00	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	100.00	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	2	25.00	0	.00	6	75.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	1	33.33	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	4	28.57	0	.00	6	42.85	4	28.57
26 - 30	19	0	.00	4	21.05	4	21.05	11	57.89	0	.00
More than 30	100	1	01.00	29	29.00	12	12.00	54	54.00	4	04.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	1	04.54	7	36.81	5	18.18	9	40.90	0	.00
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	8	26.66	0	.00	20	66.66	2	06.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	3	14.28	1	04.76	14	66.66	3	14.28
More than \$32,001	66	1	01.51	18	27.27	7	10.60	37	56.06	3	04.54

TABLE E (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	1	06.66	3	20.00	2	13.33	7	46.66	2	13.33
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	24	25.00	12	11.50	56	58.33	4	04.16
4 or more children	35	1	03.13	12	37.50	1	03.13	19	54.28	2	06.24
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	1	20.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	1	01.17	23	27.05	8	09.41	50	57.82	3	03.52
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	16	29.09	8	14.54	26	47.27	5	09.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col.</u>											
<u>Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	100.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	.00	1	20.00	1	20.00
More than 3 years	136	1	00.73	37	27.20	16	11.76	75	55.14	7	05.14

TABLE F

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Programs for
 "Under Educated" Youth and Adults (Statement 6)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	1	06.66	1	06.66	7	46.66	6	40.00
45 - 54	56	0	.00	0	.00	1	01.78	39	69.64	16	28.57
55 - 64	50	0	.00	2	04.00	0	.00	27	54.00	21	42.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	44.00	14	56.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	3	02.18	1	00.72	80	58.39	53	36.68
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	1	10.00	5	50.00	4	40.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	0	.00	3	02.09	2	01.39	81	56.64	57	39.86
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	0	.00	1	01.69	34	57.62	24	40.67
Urban	40	0	.00	3	07.50	0	.00	18	45.00	19	47.40
Suburban	41	0	.00	0	.00	1	02.43	30	73.10	10	24.39
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	4	57.14

TABLE F (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33	2	66.66
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	42.10	11	57.89
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	1	03.12	2	06.25	20	62.50	9	28.12
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	2	03.50	0	.00	36	63.15	19	33.33
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13	68.42	6	31.57
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	40.00	6	60.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	4	57.14
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	0	.00	0	.00	2	02.40	46	55.42	35	42.16
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	2	04.34	0	.00	26	56.52	18	39.13
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	55.55	4	44.44
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	0	.00	8	88.88	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	75.00	2	25.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	34.71	9	64.28
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	42.10	11	57.89
More than 30	100	0	.00	2	02.00	2	02.00	62	62.00	34	34.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	14	63.63	8	36.36
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	3	10.00	0	.00	17	56.66	10	33.33
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	52.38	10	47.62
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	0	.00	2	03.03	41	62.12	23	34.84

TABLE F (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	66.66	5	33.33
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	3	03.12	2	02.83	54	56.25	37	38.54
4 or more children	35	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	20	57.14	15	42.85
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	1	20.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	2	02.35	1	01.17	46	54.11	36	42.35
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	1	01.81	1	01.81	33	60.00	20	36.36
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33	4	66.66
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	3	60.00	1	20.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	2	01.47	2	01.47	80	52.82	52	38.23

TABLE G

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Employment of
Husband-Wife Combinations by Local Community Colleges
(Statement 7)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	10	66.66	3	20.00	2	13.33	0	.00
45 - 54	56	4	07.14	24	42.85	4	07.14	20	35.71	4	07.14
55 - 64	50	4	08.00	22	44.00	4	08.00	10	20.00	10	10.00
65 or over	25	4	16.00	18	72.00	1	04.00	2	08.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	10	07.29	69	50.36	12	08.75	24	17.51	12	08.75
Female	10	2	20.00	6	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	12	08.39	71	49.65	12	08.39	34	23.77	14	09.79
Black	4	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Other	0										
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	3	05.08	31	52.54	8	13.55	13	22.08	4	06.77
Urban	40	9	22.50	21	52.50	2	05.55	2	05.00	6	15.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	17	41.46	2	04.87	18	43.90	4	09.75
Large City	7	0	.00	6	85.71	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00

TABLE G (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
High school diploma	19	1	05.26	12	63.15	0	.00	4	21.04	2	10.52
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	4	12.50	22	68.75	4	12.50	1	03.12	1	03.12
Bachelor's degree	57	4	07.01	22	38.59	3	05.26	23	40.35	5	08.77
Master's degree	19	0	.00	9	47.36	2	10.52	4	21.05	4	21.05
Doctoral degree	10	3	30.00	2	20.00	3	30.00	0	.00	2	20.00
Other	7	0	.00	6	85.71	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	9	10.84	37	44.57	9	10.84	19	22.87	9	10.84
5,001 to 25,000	46	3	06.52	28	60.86	2	04.34	9	17.39	5	10.86
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	7	77.77	0	.00	2	22.22	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	3	33.33	1	11.11	5	55.55	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	7	87.50	1	12.50	0	.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	2	66.66
21 - 25	14	0	.00	5	35.71	2	14.29	4	28.57	3	21.42
26 - 30	19	2	10.52	4	21.05	0	.00	11	57.98	2	10.52
More than 30	100	10	10.00	56	56.00	8	08.00	19	19.00	7	07.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	21	1	04.54	16	72.72	2	09.09	2	09.09	1	04.54
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	1	03.33	21	70.00	3	10.00	3	10.00	2	06.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	3	14.28	10	47.61	1	04.76	3	14.28	4	19.04
More than \$32,001	66	7	10.60	20	30.30	6	09.09	26	39.39	7	10.60

TABLE G (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	2	13.33	6	40.00	1	06.66	1	06.66	5	33.33
1 - 3 children	96	10	10.41	54	56.25	6	06.25	19	19.75	7	07.37
4 or more children	35	0	.00	15	42.85	4	11.42	14	40.00	2	05.71
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	4	80.00
2 - 3 years	85	6	07.05	44	51.76	8	09.41	22	26.89	5	05.88
More than 3 years	55	6	10.90	29	52.72	3	05.45	12	21.81	5	09.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	6	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	2	40.00	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	2	40.00
More than 3 years	136	10	07.35	69	50.73	11	08.08	34	25.00	12	08.02

TABLE H

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Associate Degree
Programs for Semi-Professional Training (Statement 8)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	1	06.66	0	.00	8	53.33	6	40.00
45 - 54	56	1	01.78	1	01.78	3	05.35	34	60.71	17	30.35
55 - 64	50	0	.00	1	02.00	1	02.00	30	60.00	18	36.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	48.00	13	52.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	1	00.72	3	02.18	4	02.91	81	59.12	48	35.03
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	40.00	6	60.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	1	00.69	3	02.09	4	02.79	81	56.64	54	37.76
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00
Other	0										
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	2	03.38	1	01.69	36	61.01	20	33.89
Urban	40	0	.00	0	.00	1	02.50	24	60.00	15	37.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	1	02.43	2	04.87	22	53.65	16	39.02
Large City	7	1	14.28	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	3	42.85

TABLE H (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	14	73.68	5	26.31
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	1	03.12	1	03.12	16	50.00	14	43.75
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	1	01.75	1	01.75	32	56.14	23	40.35
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	2	10.52	12	63.15	5	26.31
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	1	10.00	0	.00	4	40.00	4	40.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	1	01.20	3	03.61	3	03.61	45	54.21	31	37.34
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	0	.00	1	02.17	30	65.21	15	32.60
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	44.44	5	55.55
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	66.66	3	33.33
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	75.00	2	25.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	1	33.33	1	33.33	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	71.42	4	28.57
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	47.36	10	52.62
More than 30	100	0	.00	2	02.00	2	02.00	58	58.00	38	38.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	68.18	7	32.81
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	0	.00	2	06.66	19	63.33	9	30.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	1	04.76	0	.00	2	09.52	9	42.85	9	42.85
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	3	04.54	0	.00	35	53.03	28	42.42

TABLE H (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	20.00	12	80.00
1 - 3 children	96	1	01.04	2	02.08	1	01.04	62	64.58	30	31.25
4 or more children	35	0	.00	1	02.85	2	05.71	20	57.14	12	34.28
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	1	20.00	3	60.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	1	01.17	3	03.52	47	55.29	35	41.17
More than 3 years	55	1	01.81	1	01.81	1	01.81	36	65.45	16	29.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	2	40.00	2	40.00
More than 3 years	136	1	00.73	2	01.47	4	02.94	79	58.08	50	36.76

TABLE I

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitudes Toward Testing, Counseling
and Placement Services for All Students (Statement 9)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	33.33	10	66.66
45 - 54	56	0	.00	4	07.14	3	05.35	32	57.14	17	30.35
55 - 64	50	0	.00	1	02.22	2	04.00	32	64.00	15	26.76
65 or over	25	0	.00	1	04.00	0	.00	12	48.00	12	49.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	6	04.37	5	03.64	75	60.00	51	37.22
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	60.00	4	40.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	0	.00	6	04.19	5	03.49	78	54.54	54	37.76
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other	0										
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	0	.00	2	03.38	31	52.54	26	44.06
Urban	40	0	.00	4	10.00	1	02.50	22	55.00	13	32.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	2	04.87	2	04.87	25	60.97	12	29.26
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	4	57.14

TABLE I (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33	2	66.66	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13	68.42	6	31.57
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	0	.00	3	09.37	17	53.12	12	37.50
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	1	01.75	0	.00	30	52.63	26	45.61
Master's degree	19	0	.00	2	10.52	0	.00	12	63.15	5	26.31
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	4	40.00	3	30.00
Other	7	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00	3	42.85	3	42.85
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	0	.00	5	06.02	3	03.61	42	50.60	33	39.75
5,001 to 25,000	47	0	.00	1	02.17	0	.00	31	67.39	14	30.43
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	2	22.22	4	44.44	3	33.33
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	44.44	5	55.55
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	62.50	3	37.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	50.00	7	50.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	63.15	7	36.84
More than 30	100	0	.00	4	04.00	5	05.00	54	54.00	37	37.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00	4	80.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	2	09.09	14	63.63	6	27.27
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	0	.00	1	03.33	17	56.66	12	40.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	2	09.52	0	.00	9	42.85	10	47.61
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	3	04.54	2	03.03	34	51.51	27	40.90

TABLE I (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	53.33	7	46.66
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	1	01.04	3	03.12	61	63.54	31	32.29
4 or more children	35	0	.00	5	14.28	1	02.85	12	34.28	17	48.57
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	5	05.88	4	04.80	41	48.41	35	41.17
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	1	01.81	1	01.81	36	65.45	17	30.90
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	50.00	3	50.00
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	4	80.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	6	04.41	5	03.57	77	56.61	48	35.29

TABLE J

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Involvement
of the Instructional Staff in Policy Development (Statement 10)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	1	06.66	2	13.32	0	.00	10	66.00	2	13.32
45 - 54	56	3	05.35	10	17.85	2	13.50	38	67.85	4	07.14
55 - 64	50	4	08.00	9	18.00	1	02.00	32	64.00	4	08.00
65 or over	25	3	12.00	1	04.00	0	.00	20	80.00	1	04.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	10	07.29	20	14.59	3	02.18	94	68.61	10	07.29
Female	10	1	10.00	1	10.00	0	.00	6	60.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	11	07.69	21	14.68	3	02.09	97	67.83	12	08.39
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00
Other	0										
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	3	05.08	9	15.25	3	05.08	40	67.79	4	06.77
Urban	40	8	20.00	7	17.50	0	.00	23	57.50	2	05.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	5	12.19	0	.00	32	78.08	4	09.75
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	71.42	2	28.75

TABLE J (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>												
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	
High school diploma	19	1	05.26	1	05.26	0	.00	17	89.47	0	.00	
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	3	09.37	3	09.37	2	06.26	22	68.75	2	06.26	
Bachelor's degree	57	6	10.52	16	28.07	0	.00	36	63.15	3	05.26	
Master's degree	19	1	05.26	0	.00	0	.00	15	78.95	3	15.78	
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	5	50.00	
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00	
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>												
Under 5,000	83	6	07.22	8	09.63	3	03.61	60	72.22	7	08.43	
5,001 to 25,000	46	4	08.69	11	23.91	0	.00	69	63.04	2	04.34	
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	77.77	2	22.22	
Over 100,000	9	1	11.11	2	22.22	0	.00	5	55.55	1	11.11	
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>												
0 - 5 years	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	87.50	1	12.50	
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	
21 - 25	14	3	21.42	5	35.61	0	.00	6	42.85	0	.00	
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17	89.47	2	10.52	
More than 30	100	7	07.00	16	16.00	3	03.00	66	66.00	9	09.00	
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>												
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00	
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	2	10.00	18	80.00	2	10.00	
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	4	13.33	6	20.00	0	.00	18	60.00	2	06.66	
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	2	09.52	0	.00	17	80.95	2	09.52	
More than \$32,001	66	7	10.60	13	19.69	1	01.51	39	59.09	6	09.09	

TABLE J (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	3	20.00	1	06.66	0	.00	10	66.66	2	13.33
1 - 3 children	96	7	07.29	14	14.28	2	02.08	68	70.83	5	05.20
4 or more children	35	0	.00	6	17.14	1	02.85	23	65.71	5	14.28
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	6	07.05	14	16.47	3	03.52	53	62.35	9	10.58
More than 3 years	55	2	05.45	5	09.09	0	.00	44	80.00	3	05.45
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00
More than 3 years	136	10	07.35	19	13.97	3	02.20	96	70.58	8	05.88

TABLE K

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Extra-Curricular
Programs and Inter-Collegiate Athletics (Statement 11)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	2	13.33	2	13.33	3	20.00	5	33.33	3	20.00
45 - 54	56	8	14.28	18	32.14	7	12.50	19	33.92	5	08.92
55 - 64	50	3	06.00	27	54.00	3	06.00	17	34.00	0	.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	12	48.00	1	04.00	12	48.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	13	09.48	57	41.60	12	08.75	50	36.49	5	02.64
Female	10	0	.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	3	30.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	13	09.09	58	40.55	14	09.79	51	35.66	8	05.59
Black	4	1	25.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	1	01.69	24	40.67	4	06.77	25	42.37	2	03.38
Urban	40	2	05.00	22	55.00	3	07.50	13	32.50	0	.00
Suburban	41	10	24.39	10	24.39	3	07.31	14	34.14	4	09.75
Large City	7	0	.00	2	28.57	1	14.28	2	28.57	2	28.57

TABLE K (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	5	26.31	0	.00	12	63.15	2	10.52
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	3	09.37	1	03.12	8	25.00	19	59.37	1	03.12
Bachelor's degree	57	6	10.52	36	63.15	3	05.26	12	21.05	0	.00
Master's degree	19	4	21.05	6	31.51	0	.00	4	21.05	5	26.31
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	4	40.00	0	.00	6	60.00	0	.00
Other	7	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	8	09.63	28	33.73	6	07.28	36	43.37	5	06.02
5,001 to 25,000	46	2	04.34	22	47.82	6	13.04	16	34.78	0	.00
25,001 to 100,000	9	3	33.33	3	33.33	0	.00	0	.00	3	33.33
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	5	55.55	2	22.22	2	22.22	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	11	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	2	25.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	75.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	1	33.33	1	33.33	1	33.33	0	.00
21 - 25	14	3	14.28	3	14.28	0	.00	8	57.14	0	.00
26 - 30	19	2	10.52	6	31.57	0	.00	5	26.31	6	31.57
More than 30	100	6	06.00	45	45.00	13	13.00	34	34.00	2	02.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	2	09.09	7	31.81	2	09.09	9	40.90	2	09.09
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	3	10.00	12	40.00	3	10.00	10	33.33	2	06.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	5	23.80	3	09.52	9	42.85	4	19.04
More than \$32,001	66	8	12.12	30	45.45	6	09.09	22	33.33	0	.00

TABLE K (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	3	20.00	7	46.66	2	13.33	3	20.00	0	.00
1 - 3 children	96	8	08.33	36	37.50	6	06.25	40	41.66	6	06.25
4 or more children	35	2	05.71	15	42.85	5	14.28	11	31.42	2	05.71
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	1	20.00	0	.00	1	20.00	3	60.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	5	05.88	33	38.82	8	09.41	34	40.00	5	05.88
More than 3 years	55	7	12.72	23	41.81	5	09.09	17	30.90	3	05.45
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	3	60.00	1	20.00	0	.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	12	08.82	55	40.44	13	09.55	50	36.76	6	04.41

TABLE L

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Development
of Socially Acceptable Moral and Ethical Values in Community
College Students as a Function of the College (Statement 12)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	3	20.00	5	33.33	7	46.66
45 - 54	56	0	.00	4	07.14	0	.00	33	58.59	19	33.92
55 - 64	50	0	.00	4	08.00	0	.00	28	56.00	18	36.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	60.00	10	40.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	8	05.83	1	00.71	75	54.74	53	38.68
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	2	20.00	6	60.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	0	.00	8	05.59	3	02.09	78	54.54	54	37.76
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other											
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	35	59.32	24	40.67
Urban	40	0	.00	6	15.00	1	02.50	18	45.00	15	37.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	25	60.97	16	39.03
Large City	7	0	.00	2	28.57	2	28.57	3	42.85	0	.00

TABLE L (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	63.25	7	36.84
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	14	43.75	18	59.39
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	6	11.52	0	.00	36	63.15	15	26.31
Master's degree	19	0	.00	1	05.26	2	10.52	10	52.63	6	31.57
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	1	10.00	1	20.00	3	30.00	5	50.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	4	57.14
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	0	.00	3	03.61	0	.00	46	55.42	34	40.96
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	4	08.69	0	.00	24	52.17	18	39.13
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	2	22.22	4	44.44	3	33.33
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	1	11.11	7	77.77	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	1	12.50	5	62.50	2	25.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	1	33.33	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	0	.00	2	14.28	0	.00	7	50.00	5	35.71
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	2	10.52	10	52.63	7	36.84
More than 30	100	0	.00	5	05.00	0	.00	55	55.00	40	40.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	60.00	2	40.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	14	63.63	8	36.36
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	4	13.33	1	03.33	17	56.66	8	26.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	1	04.76	2	09.52	13	61.90	5	23.80
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	3	04.54	0	.00	31	46.96	32	48.48

TABLE L (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	40.00	9	60.00
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	6	06.25	2	02.08	57	59.37	31	32.29
4 or more children	35	0	.00	1	02.85	1	02.85	18	51.42	15	42.85
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	60.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	4	04.70	3	03.52	45	52.94	33	38.82
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	2	03.63	0	.00	24	43.63	19	34.54
<u>Experience on Com. Col.</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33	3	50.00	1	16.66
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	60.00	2	40.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	8	05.88	1	00.73	75	55.14	52	38.23

TABLE M

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward
Academic Freedom in the Classroom (Statement 13)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	3	20.00	2	13.33	0	.00	2	13.33	8	53.33
45 - 54	56	8	14.28	16	28.56	2	07.14	23	42.07	5	08.92
55 - 64	50	3	06.00	21	42.00	4	08.00	16	32.00	6	12.00
65 or over	25	1	04.00	5	20.00	1	04.00	18	72.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	13	09.48	43	31.38	9	06.56	55	40.14	17	12.40
Female	10	2	20.00	1	10.00	0	.00	5	50.00	2	10.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	15	10.48	44	30.76	9	03.49	56	39.16	19	13.28
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	7	11.79	19	32.20	0	.00	25	42.37	8	13.55
Urban	40	6	15.00	15	37.50	2	05.00	12	30.00	4	10.00
Suburban	41	1	02.43	9	21.95	3	07.31	23	56.09	5	12.19
Large City	7	1	14.28	1	14.28	3	42.85	0	.00	2	28.57

TABLE M (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>												
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	
High school diploma	19	1	.00	6	31.57	0	.00	10	52.63	2	10.52	
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	4	12.50	18	56.25	0	.00	7	21.87	3	9.37	
Bachelor's degree	57	4	07.01	13	22.80	4	07.01	32	56.14	4	07.01	
Master's degree	19	1	05.26	5	26.31	4	21.05	7	36.84	2	10.52	
Doctoral degree	10	4	40.00	1	10.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	50.00	
Other	7	0	.00	4	57.14	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00	
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>												
Under 5,000	83	11	13.25	32	38.55	4	04.81	25	30.12	11	12.25	
5,001 to 25,000	46	3	06.52	8	17.39	4	08.69	28	60.86	3	06.52	
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	1	11.11	4	44.44	4	44.44	
Over 100,000	9	1	11.11	4	44.44	0	.00	3	33.33	1	11.11	
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>												
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
6 - 10	8	0	.00	3	37.50	0	.00	4	50.00	1	12.50	
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	
16 - 20	3	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	1	33.33	1	33.33	
21 - 25	14	0	.00	5	35.71	0	.00	9	64.28	0	.00	
26 - 30	19	0	.00	9	47.36	0	.00	5	26.31	5	26.31	
More than 30	100	15	15.00	25	25.00	7	07.00	41	41.00	12	12.00	
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>												
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	.00	
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	5	22.72	0	.00	16	72.72	1	04.54	
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	3	10.00	10	33.33	4	13.33	8	16.66	5	16.66	
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	2	09.52	3	14.28	3	14.28	9	42.85	4	19.40	
More than \$32,001	66	10	15.15	25	37.85	1	01.51	21	31.81	9	13.63	

TABLE M (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent	
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	4	26.66	3	20.00	2	13.33	4	26.66	2	13.33
1 - 3 children	96	7	07.29	31	32.29	5	05.20	42	43.75	11	11.45
4 or more children	35	4	11.43	10	28.57	2	05.71	13	37.14	6	17.14
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	.00	1	20.00	1	20.00
2 - 3 years	85	10	11.62	24	28.23	6	07.05	29	34.11	16	18.82
More than 3 years	55	3	05.45	19	34.54	3	05.45	28	50.90	2	02.63
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	2	33.33	0	.00	2	33.33	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	.00	1	20.00	2	40.00
More than 3 years	136	14	10.29	41	30.15	9	06.56	55	40.15	17	12.40

TABLE N

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Community College
Faculty Representation on the Board of Trustees (Statement 14)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	1	06.66	8	53.33	2	13.22	2	13.33	2	13.33
45 - 54	56	3	05.35	40	71.42	2	03.57	10	17.85	1	01.78
55 - 64	50	6	12.00	28	56.00	5	10.00	7	14.00	4	08.00
65 or over	25	10	40.00	6	24.00	3	12.00	3	12.00	3	12.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	18	13.13	77	56.20	12	08.75	21	15.32	9	06.56
Female	10	2	20.00	5	50.00	0	.00	1	10.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	20	13.98	81	56.64	12	08.39	20	13.98	10	06.00
Black	4	0	.00	1	25.00	0	.00	2	50.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	7	11.83	37	62.71	5	08.47	8	13.55	2	03.38
Urban	40	7	17.50	21	52.50	1	02.50	8	15.00	5	12.50
Suburban	41	6	14.63	23	56.09	6	14.63	6	14.63	0	.00
Large City	7	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00	2	28.57	4	57.14

TABLE N (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
High school diploma	19	5	26.31	5	26.31	4	21.05	5	26.31	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	4	12.50	21	65.62	0	.00	5	15.62	2	06.25
Bachelor's degree	57	8	14.04	32	56.14	7	12.28	6	10.52	4	07.01
Master's degree	19	2	10.52	12	63.15	0	.00	2	10.52	3	15.78
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	5	50.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	1	10.00
Other	7	0	.00	6	85.71	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	12	14.45	43	51.80	9	10.84	12	14.45	9	08.43
5,001 to 25,000	46	8	17.39	30	65.21	1	02.17	7	15.21	0	.00
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	2	22.22	0	.00	3	33.33	4	44.44
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	7	77.77	2	22.22	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	2	25.00	2	25.00	4	50.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	2	14.28	12	85.71	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
26 - 30	19	2	10.52	4	21.05	0	.00	5	26.31	8	42.10
More than 30	100	16	16.00	59	59.00	10	10.00	13	13.00	2	02.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	2	09.09	7	31.81	2	09.09	8	36.36	3	13.63
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	6	20.00	17	56.66	3	10.00	4	13.33	0	.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	2	09.52	12	57.14	0	.00	4	19.04	3	14.28
More than \$32,001	66	9	13.63	39	59.09	7	10.60	6	09.09	5	07.57

TABLE N (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	6	40.00	8	53.33	0	.00	0	.00	1	06.66
1 - 3 children	96	11	11.45	54	56.25	8	08.33	17	17.70	6	06.25
4 or more children	35	3	08.57	19	54.28	4	11.42	5	14.28	4	11.42
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	12	14.11	44	51.76	12	14.11	11	12.94	6	07.05
More than 3 years	55	8	14.54	34	61.81	0	.00	8	14.54	5	09.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	0	.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	19	13.97	76	55.88	10	07.35	22	16.17	9	06.66

TABLE O

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Development of
Salary and Working Conditions Through Negotiations (Statement 15)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	4	26.66	3	20.00	0	.00	2	13.33	6	40.00
45 - 54	56	12	21.42	28	50.00	3	05.35	11	19.64	2	03.57
55 - 64	50	11	22.00	29	58.00	0	.00	8	16.00	2	04.00
65 or over	25	6	24.00	10	40.00	1	04.00	8	32.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	31	22.62	68	49.63	4	02.91	26	18.97	8	05.83
Female	10	2	20.00	2	20.00	0	.00	4	40.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	31	21.67	68	47.55	4	02.09	30	15.38	10	06.99
Black	4	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	14	23.72	29	49.15	0	.00	12	20.33	4	06.77
Urban	40	5	12.50	24	60.00	0	.00	8	20.00	3	07.50
Suburban	41	14	34.14	13	31.70	4	09.75	10	24.39	0	.00
Large City	7	0	.00	4	57.14	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85

TABLE O (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	8	42.10	7	36.84	0	.00	4	21.05	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	5	15.62	15	46.87	1	03.12	10	31.25	1	03.12
Bachelor's degree	57	15	26.31	31	54.38	0	.00	10	17.54	1	01.75
Master's degree	19	4	21.05	7	36.84	3	15.78	2	10.52	3	15.78
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	4	40.00	0	.00	2	20.00	3	30.00
Other	7	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00	2	28.57	2	28.57
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	23	27.71	32	38.55	3	03.61	20	24.09	5	06.02
5,001 to 25,000	46	6	13.04	29	63.04	1	02.16	10	21.73	0	.00
25,001 to 100,000	9	4	44.44	2	22.22	0	.00	0	.00	3	33.33
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	7	77.77	0	.00	0	.00	2	22.22
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	5	62.50	0	.00	0	.00	3	37.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	1	33.33	1	33.33	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	5	35.71	9	64.28	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	9	47.36	0	.00	7	36.84	3	15.78
More than 30	100	27	27.00	45	45.00	2	02.00	23	23.00	3	03.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	1	04.54	12	54.54	0	.00	9	40.00	0	.00
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	10	33.33	18	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	06.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	2	09.52	8	38.09	2	09.52	4	19.05	5	23.80
More than \$32,001	66	19	29.69	25	37.87	2	03.03	17	25.75	3	04.54

TABLE O (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	5	33.33	7	46.66	0	.00	2	13.33	1	06.66
1 - 3 children	96	23	23.95	41	42.70	3	03.12	23	17.70	6	06.25
4 or more children	35	4	11.42	22	62.85	1	04.00	5	20.00	3	12.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	2	40.00	1	20.00
2 - 3 years	85	23	27.05	32	37.64	3	03.52	18	21.17	9	10.58
More than 3 years	55	10	18.18	34	61.81	1	01.81	10	18.18	0	.00
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	2	40.00	1	20.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	31	22.79	65	47.79	4	02.94	28	20.58	8	05.88

TABLE P

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Programs to
Develop Vocational or Semi-Technical Skills (Statement 16)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	26.66	11	73.33
45 - 54	56	2	03.57	1	01.78	0	.00	32	57.14	21	37.50
55 - 64	50	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	32	64.00	18	36.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	40.00	15	60.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	2	01.45	1	00.72	0	.00	73	53.78	61	44.52
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	60.00	4	40.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	2	01.39	1	00.69	0	.00	76	53.14	64	44.75
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other											
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	32	54.23	27	45.67
Urban	40	2	07.50	0	.00	0	.00	17	42.50	21	52.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	1	02.43	0	.00	28	68.29	12	29.26
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	28.57	5	71.42

TABLE P (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent	
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	63.15	7	36.84
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	1	03.13	0	.00	17	53.12	14	43.75
Bachelor's degree	57	1	01.75	0	.00	0	.00	25	43.85	31	54.38
Master's degree	19	1	05.26	0	.00	0	.00	12	63.15	6	31.57
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	30.00	7	70.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	1	01.20	0	.00	0	.00	42	50.60	40	48.19
5,001 to 25,000	46	1	02.17	0	.00	0	.00	27	32.53	18	21.68
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	0	.00	4	44.44	4	44.44
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	66.66	3	33.33
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	100.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	28.57	10	71.42
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	42.10	11	57.89
More than 30	100	2	02.00	1	01.00	0	.00	55	55.00	42	42.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17	77.27	5	22.72
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	1	03.33	0	.00	0	.00	17	56.66	12	40.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	1	04.76	0	.00	0	.00	13	61.90	7	33.33
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	35	53.03	30	45.45

TABLE P (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	33.33	10	66.66
1 - 3 children	96	1	01.04	1	01.04	0	.00	49	51.04	43	44.79
4 or more children	35	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	24	68.57	11	31.52
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
2 - 3 years	85	2	02.35	0	.00	0	.00	37	43.52	46	54.11
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	1	01.81	0	.00	38	69.09	16	29.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col.</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
More than 3 years	136	2	01.47	1	00.73	0	.00	73	53.67	60	44.11

TABLE Q

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Involvement
of Instructors in Providing Guidance Services for
Students (Statement 17)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	1	06.66	10	66.66	4	26.66
45 - 54	56	1	01.78	1	01.78	2	03.57	44	78.57	8	14.28
55 - 64	50	0	.00	1	02.00	1	02.00	33	66.00	15	30.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	1	04.00	8	32.00	16	64.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	1	00.72	5	03.64	90	65.69	41	29.99
Female	10	1	10.00	1	10.00	0	.00	5	50.00	3	30.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	1	00.69	2	01.39	5	03.49	92	64.33	43	30.06
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	1	01.69	1	01.69	3	05.08	37	62.71	17	28.81
Urban	40	0	.00	0	.00	2	05.00	23	57.50	15	37.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	35	85.36	6	14.63
Large City	7	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00	0	.00	6	85.71

TABLE Q (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	47.36	10	52.63
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	1	03.12	0	.00	2	06.25	21	65.62	8	25.00
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	2	03.50	1	01.75	40	70.17	14	24.56
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	78.94	4	21.05
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	0	.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	8	80.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	1	14.28	6	85.71	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	1	01.20	0	.00	3	03.61	53	63.85	26	31.32
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	1	02.17	2	04.34	32	69.56	11	23.91
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	44.44	5	55.55
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	0	.00	6	66.66	2	22.22
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	75.00	2	25.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33	1	33.33	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	50.00	7	50.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	63.25	5	36.84
More than 30	100	1	10.00	2	02.00	4	04.00	66	66.00	27	27.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	60.00	2	40.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17	77.27	5	22.72
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	20	66.66	10	33.33
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	16	76.20	5	23.80
More than \$32,001	66	1	01.51	2	03.03	5	07.57	36	54.54	22	33.33

TABLE Q (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	1	06.66	11	73.33	3	26.66
1 - 3 children	96	1	01.04	1	01.04	2	02.08	58	60.41	33	34.37
4 or more children	35	0	.00	1	02.85	2	05.71	25	71.42	7	20.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	3	60.00	1	20.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	2	02.35	3	03.52	56	65.88	24	28.23
More than 3 years	55	1	01.81	0	.00	1	01.81	34	61.81	19	34.54
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year of less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00
More than 3 years	136	1	00.77	2	01.47	4	02.94	89	65.44	40	29.41

TABLE R

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Social Organizations
and Fraternities in North Carolina Community Colleges (Statement 18)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	1	06.66	0	.00	2	13.33	12	80.00	0	.00
45 - 54	56	1	01.78	15	26.78	23	41.07	16	28.57	1	01.78
55 - 64	50	3	06.00	16	32.00	7	14.00	24	48.00	0	.00
65 or over	25	2	08.00	2	08.00	4	16.00	17	68.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	5	03.64	31	22.62	33	24.08	68	47.63	0	.00
Female	10	2	20.00	2	20.00	3	30.00	2	20.00	1	10.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	7	04.89	33	23.07	34	23.77	68	47.55	1	00.69
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	3	05.08	12	20.33	10	16.95	33	55.93	1	01.69
Urban	40	2	05.00	11	27.50	7	12.50	20	50.00	0	.00
Suburban	41	2	04.87	10	24.39	15	36.58	14	34.14	0	.00
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85	0	.00

TABLE R (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent	
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	1	33.33	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	3	15.78	1	05.26	15	78.94	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	1	03.12	8	25.00	7	21.87	15	46.87	1	03.12
Bachelor's degree	57	4	07.01	13	22.80	16	28.07	25	42.10	0	.00
Master's degree	19	0	.00	7	36.84	9	47.36	3	15.78	0	.00
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	1	10.00	3	30.00	5	50.00	0	.00
Other	7	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00	6	85.71	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	6	07.22	20	24.09	20	24.09	36	43.37	1	01.20
5,001 to 25,000	46	1	02.17	10	21.73	6	13.08	29	63.04	0	.00
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	4	44.44	5	55.55	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	3	33.33	6	66.66	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	2	25.00	6	75.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	4	28.57	5	35.71	5	35.71	0	.00
26 - 30	19	2	10.52	3	15.78	2	10.52	12	63.15	0	.00
More than 30	100	5	05.00	26	26.00	21	21.00	47	47.00	1	01.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	1	20.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	1	04.54	1	04.54	1	04.54	19	86.36	0	.00
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	1	03.33	7	23.33	3	10.00	19	63.33	0	.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	5	23.80	9	42.85	7	33.33	0	.00
More than \$32,001	66	4	06.06	20	30.30	23	34.84	18	27.27	1	01.51

TABLE R (Continued)

Characterisitcs	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	3	20.00	4	26.66	3	20.00	5	33.33	0	.00
1 - 3 children	96	2	02.08	21	21.87	17	17.70	55	57.29	1	01.04
4 or more children	35	2	05.71	8	22.85	15	42.85	10	28.57	0	.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	50.00	1	50.00
1 year or less	5	1	20.00	1	20.00	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	4	04.07	19	22.35	24	28.23	38	44.70	0	.00
More than 3 years	55	2	03.63	13	23.63	12	21.81	28	50.90	0	.00
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	1	16.16	0	.00	5	83.33	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	6	04.41	30	22.05	35	25.73	64	47.05	1	00.73

TABLE S

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Equal Emphasis
on Transfer, Terminal and Community Services (Statement 19)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	66.66	5	33.33
45 - 54	56	0	.00	3	05.35	12	21.42	30	53.57	11	19.64
55 - 64	50	0	.00	3	06.00	8	16.00	28	56.00	11	22.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	19	76.00	6	24.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	6	04.37	18	13.13	85	62.04	28	20.43
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	2	20.00	3	30.00	5	50.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	0	.00	6	04.19	20	13.98	85	59.44	32	22.37
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	1	01.69	9	15.25	33	55.93	16	27.11
Urban	40	0	.00	1	05.00	3	07.50	27	67.40	8	20.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	3	07.31	8	19.51	24	58.53	6	14.63
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85

TABLE S (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	3	15.78	12	63.17	4	21.05
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	2	06.25	5	15.62	15	46.87	10	31.25
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	2	03.50	6	10.52	37	64.91	12	21.05
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	3	15.78	12	63.15	4	21.05
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	0	.00	3	30.00	4	40.00	3	30.00
Other	7	0	.00	2	28.57	0	.00	5	71.42	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	0	.00	1	01.28	16	12.25	43	51.80	23	27.71
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	2	04.34	0	.00	37	80.43	7	15.21
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	3	33.33	0	.00	3	33.33	3	33.33
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	4	44.44	5	55.55	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	100.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	1	33.33	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	78.57	3	21.42
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17	89.47	2	10.52
More than 30	100	0	.00	4	04.00	16	16.00	50	50.00	28	28.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	2	09.09	5	22.72	12	54.54	3	13.63
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	0	.00	1	03.33	23	76.66	6	20.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	0	.00	3	14.28	10	47.61	8	38.09
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	4	06.06	11	16.66	35	53.03	16	24.24

TABLE S (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	60.00	6	40.00
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	4	04.16	9	09.37	65	67.70	18	18.75
4 or more children	35	0	.00	2	05.71	11	31.42	13	37.41	9	25.71
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	1	20.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	5	05.88	20	23.52	35	41.17	25	29.41
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	1	01.81	0	.00	47	85.45	3	12.72
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	50.00	3	50.00
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	1	20.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	6	04.41	18	13.23	83	61.02	29	21.32

TABLE T

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Academic Ability
as the Primary Measure for College Admission (Statement 20)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	8	53.33	5	33.33	0	.00	2	13.33	0	.00
45 - 54	56	18	32.14	33	58.92	0	.00	2	03.57	3	05.35
55 - 64	50	11	22.00	25	48.00	3	06.00	8	16.00	3	06.00
65 or over	25	5	20.00	12	48.00	0	.00	8	32.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	37	27.00	72	52.55	3	02.18	19	13.86	2	04.57
Female	10	6	60.00	3	30.00	0	.00	1	10.00	0	.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	43	30.06	72	50.34	3	02.09	20	13.98	6	04.19
Black	4	1	25.00	3	75.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	23	39.98	27	45.76	3	05.08	4	06.77	2	03.38
Urban	40	9	22.55	20	50.00	0	.00	9	22.50	2	05.00
Suburban	41	8	19.51	26	63.41	0	.00	5	12.19	2	04.87
Large City	7	3	42.85	2	28.57	0	.00	2	28.57	0	.00

TABLE T (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	3	15.78	8	42.10	0	.00	7	36.84	1	05.26
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	16	50.00	4	12.50	1	09.37	7	21.87	2	05.25
Bachelor's degree	57	16	28.07	36	63.15	0	.00	4	07.01	1	01.75
Master's degree	19	5	26.31	14	73.68	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	6	60.00	0	.00	1	10.00	2	20.00
Other	7	2	28.57	4	57.14	0	.00	1	14.28	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	28	33.73	39	46.98	3	03.61	10	12.04	3	03.61
5,001 to 25,000	46	10	21.73	27	58.69	0	.00	7	15.81	2	04.34
25,001 to 100,000	9	2	22.22	3	33.33	0	.00	3	33.33	1	11.11
Over 100,000	9	3	33.33	6	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	3	37.50	2	25.00	0	.00	2	25.00	1	12.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	2	66.66	1	33.33	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	5	35.71	3	21.43	0	.00	4	28.57	1	14.28
26 - 30	19	7	36.84	6	31.57	0	.00	4	21.05	2	10.52
More than 30	100	25	25.00	61	61.00	3	03.00	10	10.00	1	01.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	7	31.81	12	54.54	0	.00	3	13.63	0	.00
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	7	13.33	14	46.66	3	10.00	3	10.00	3	10.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	6	28.57	9	42.85	0	.00	5	23.80	1	04.54
More than \$32,001	66	23	34.84	34	53.03	0	.00	7	10.60	2	03.03

TABLE T (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	3	20.00	11	73.33	0	.00	0	.00	1	06.66
1 - 3 children	96	30	31.25	45	46.87	2	03.12	16	16.66	3	03.12
4 or more children	35	6	10.00	18	51.42	1	02.85	4	11.42	2	05.71
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	31	36.47	38	44.70	2	02.35	11	12.94	3	03.52
More than 3 years	55	11	20.00	33	60.00	1	01.81	7	12.72	2	05.45
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	2	33.33	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	41	30.14	66	45.52	3	02.20	20	14.70	6	04.41

TABLE U

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Formal
Education Beyond High School (Statement 21)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	2	13.33	0	.00	5	33.33	8	53.33
45 - 54	56	0	.00	4	07.14	0	.00	35	62.50	17	30.35
55 - 64	50	2	04.00	2	04.00	0	.00	29	58.00	16	32.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	48.00	13	52.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	2	01.45	9	06.56	0	.00	76	55.47	50	36.49
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	50.00	5	50.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	2	01.39	9	06.29	0	.00	79	55.24	53	37.06
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	50.00	2	50.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	2	03.38	0	.00	33	55.93	24	40.67
Urban	40	2	05.00	4	10.00	0	.00	14	35.00	20	50.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	3	07.31	0	.00	29	70.73	9	21.95
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	57.14	2	28.57

TABLE U (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>												
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	33.33	2	66.66	
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13	68.42	6	31.57	
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17	53.12	15	46.87	
Bachelor's degree	57	2	03.50	2	03.50	0	.00	28	49.12	20	35.08	
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	57.89	8	42.10	
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	2	20.00	0	.00	5	50.00	3	30.00	
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	85.71	1	14.28	
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>												
Under 5,000	83	2	03.40	6	07.22	0	.00	41	48.39	34	41.96	
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	29	63.04	17	36.95	
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	55.55	4	44.44	
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	3	33.33	0	.00	6	66.66	0	.00	
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>												
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	75.00	2	25.00	
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	1	33.33	
21 - 25	14	2	14.28	0	.00	0	.00	8	57.14	4	28.57	
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	52.63	9	47.36	
More than 30	100	0	.00	9	09.00	0	.00	52	52.00	55	55.00	
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>												
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	4	80.00	
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	68.18	7	31.71	
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	19	63.33	8	26.66	
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	1	04.76	0	.00	10	47.61	10	47.61	
More than \$32,001	66	2	03.03	8	12.12	0	.00	34	51.51	22	33.34	

TABLE U (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	53.33	7	46.66
1 - 3 children	96	2	02.08	5	05.20	0	.00	49	51.04	40	41.66
4 or more children	35	0	.00	4	11.42	0	.00	23	65.71	8	25.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	9	10.58	0	.00	45	52.94	33	38.82
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	36	50.90	19	34.54
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	50.00	3	50.00
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	4	80.00	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	2	01.47	5	03.67	0	.00	77	56.61	52	38.92

TABLE V

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward
Student Representation on the Board of
Trustees (Statement 22)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	3	20.00	5	33.33	2	13.33	2	13.33	3	20.00
45 - 54	56	14	25.00	31	55.35	1	01.78	9	16.07	1	01.78
55 - 64	50	11	18.00	29	58.00	4	08.00	5	10.00	1	02.00
65 or over	25	5	20.00	10	40.00	2	08.00	6	24.00	2	08.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	27	19.07	73	53.28	11	08.02	21	15.32	5	03.64
Female	10	2	20.00	2	20.00	0	.00	4	40.00	2	20.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	29	20.27	73	51.04	11	07.69	23	16.08	7	04.89
Black	4	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	7	11.86	36	61.01	5	08.47	9	15.25	2	03.38
Urban	40	10	40.00	19	47.50	5	12.50	4	10.00	2	05.00
Suburban	41	12	29.26	18	43.90	1	02.43	7	17.07	0	.00
Large City	7	0	.00	2	28.57	0	.00	2	28.57	3	42.85

TABLE V (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	3	15.78	10	52.63	1	05.26	4	21.05	1	05.26
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	6	18.75	16	50.00	3	09.37	7	21.87	0	.00
Bachelor's degree	57	10	17.54	29	50.87	4	07.01	11	19.19	3	05.26
Master's degree	19	3	15.78	9	47.36	2	10.52	3	15.78	2	10.52
Doctoral degree	10	2	20.00	6	60.00	1	10.00	0	.00	1	10.00
Other	7	5	71.42	2	28.57	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	13	15.66	43	50.60	10	12.04	13	15.66	5	06.02
5,001 to 25,000	46	15	32.60	20	43.47	1	02.17	8	17.39	0	.00
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	5	55.55	0	.00	2	22.22	2	22.22
Over 100,000	9	1	11.11	6	66.66	0	.00	2	22.22	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	4	50.00	1	12.50	3	37.50	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00	1	33.33	1	33.33
21 - 25	14	0	.00	14	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	10	52.63	4	21.05	3	15.78	2	10.52
More than 30	100	28	28.00	44	44.44	6	06.66	18	18.00	4	04.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	1	04.54	13	59.09	1	04.54	7	31.81	0	.00
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	6	20.00	20	66.66	0	.00	4	13.00	0	.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	5	23.80	9	42.85	2	09.52	2	09.52	3	14.28
More than \$32,001	66	16	24.24	26	39.39	8	12.12	9	13.13	4	06.06

TABLE V (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	7	46.66	4	26.66	0	.00	4	26.66	0	.00
1 - 3 children	96	17	17.70	51	53.12	10	10.41	12	12.50	6	06.25
4 or more children	35	4	11.41	20	57.41	1	03.85	9	24.71	1	02.85
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	19	22.35	38	44.70	9	10.58	17	20.00	2	02.35
More than 3 years	55	8	14.54	32	58.18	2	03.63	8	14.54	5	09.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Board:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	50.00	3	50.00
2 - 3 years	5	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	27	19.70	72	53.94	11	08.08	21	15.32	4	02.94

TABLE W

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward the Community
College Attempting to Solve Social Problems (Statement 23)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	7	46.66	1	06.66	2	13.33	5	33.33	0	.00
45 - 54	56	2	03.57	22	39.28	11	19.64	18	32.14	3	05.35
55 - 64	50	3	06.00	19	38.00	11	22.00	24	48.00	3	06.00
65 or over	25	3	12.00	7	28.00	12	48.00	3	12.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	15	10.94	48	35.03	20	14.59	47	34.30	7	05.10
Female	10	0	.00	1	10.00	6	60.00	3	30.00	0	.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	15	10.48	49	32.16	26	18.18	49	32.26	4	02.79
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	25.00	3	75.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	2	03.38	23	38.98	4	06.77	25	42.37	5	08.47
Urban	40	7	17.50	12	30.00	7	17.50	12	30.00	2	05.00
Suburban	41	5	12.19	14	34.14	9	21.95	13	31.70	0	.00
Large City	7	1	14.28	0	.00	6	85.71	0	.00	0	.00

TABLE W (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	1	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
High school diploma	19	3	15.78	3	15.78	8	42.10	5	26.31	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	2	06.25	9	28.12	1	03.12	18	56.25	2	06.25
Bachelor's degree	57	9	15.78	18	31.57	10	17.54	16	28.07	2	03.50
Master's degree	19	0	.00	8	42.10	3	23.31	6	31.57	2	10.52
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	2	20.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	1	10.00
Other	7	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	5	06.02	20	24.09	15	18.07	38	45.78	5	06.02
5,001 to 25,000	46	7	15.12	24	52.17	1	02.17	12	26.08	1	04.34
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	8	88.88	0	.00	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	3	33.33	4	44.44	2	22.22	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	1	12.50	6	75.00	1	12.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
21 - 25	14	1	07.14	5	37.71	4	28.56	3	21.42	1	07.14
26 - 30	19	0	.00	7	36.84	0	.00	12	63.15	0	.00
More than 30	100	13	13.00	35	35.00	19	19.00	28	28.00	5	05.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	4	80.00	1	20.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	5	22.72	2	09.09	11	50.00	4	18.18
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	2	06.66	11	36.66	7	23.33	9	30.00	1	03.33
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	6	28.57	3	14.28	8	38.09	4	19.04	0	.00
More than \$32,001	66	7	10.60	24	36.36	8	12.12	25	37.87	2	03.03

TABLE W (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	2	13.22	0	.00	1	06.66	10	66.66	2	13.33
1 - 3 children	96	12	12.50	35	36.45	20	20.83	25	26.04	4	04.16
4 or more children	35	1	02.85	13	37.14	5	14.28	15	42.85	1	02.85
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	11	12.94	26	30.58	10	11.76	25	29.41	5	05.88
More than 3 years	55	1	01.81	25	45.45	16	29.09	11	20.00	2	03.63
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	3	50.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33	1	16.66
2 - 3 years	5	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	9	06.61	49	36.02	21	15.44	46	33.82	6	04.41

TABLE X

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Curricula
Planned for Students with Different Ability Levels
(Statement 24)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	60.00	6	40.00
45 - 54	56	0	.00	4	07.14	2	03.57	41	73.21	9	16.07
55 - 64	50	0	.00	2	04.00	1	02.00	35	70.00	12	24.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	16	64.00	9	36.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	0	.00	6	04.37	1	00.72	98	71.53	32	23.35
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	2	20.00	3	30.00	5	50.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	0	.00	6	04.19	3	02.09	99	69.23	35	24.47
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	50.00	2	50.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	2	37.28	2	37.28	42	71.18	13	22.03
Urban	40	0	.00	3	07.50	1	02.50	25	62.50	11	27.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	1	02.43	0	.00	31	75.60	9	31.95
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	4	57.15

TABLE X (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	16	84.21	3	15.78
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	2	06.25	1	03.12	23	71.87	6	18.75
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	1	07.54	1	07.54	39	68.42	16	28.07
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	57.89	8	42.10
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	2	20.00	0	.00	8	80.00	0	.00
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	1	14.28	2	28.75	4	57.14
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	0	.00	5	06.02	1	01.20	57	68.67	20	24.09
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	1	02.17	2	04.34	30	65.21	13	28.26
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	77.77	2	22.22
Over 100,000	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	77.77	2	22.22
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	87.50	1	12.50
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13	92.85	1	07.14
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	57.89	8	42.10
More than 30	100	0	.00	6	06.00	3	03.00	67	67.00	24	24.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	1	20.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	68.18	7	36.81
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	2	06.00	0	.00	25	83.33	3	10.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	42.85	12	57.14
More than \$32,001	66	0	.00	4	06.66	3	04.54	45	81.81	14	21.21

TABLE X (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	60.00	6	40.00
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	4	04.16	3	06.25	68	70.83	21	21.87
4 or more children	35	0	.00	2	05.71	0	.00	24	68.57	9	25.71
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	40.00	3	60.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	4	04.70	2	02.35	59	69.41	20	23.52
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	2	03.63	1	01.81	38	69.09	14	25.45
<u>Experience on Com. Col.</u>											
<u>Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	33.33	4	66.66
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	6	04.41	3	02.20	94	69.11	33	24.26

TABLE Y

Board Member Response Indicating Attitude Toward the Similarity Between
Administering a Community College and a Business (Statement 25)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	2	13.33	2	13.33	9	60.00	2	13.33
45 - 54	56	0	.00	3	05.35	4	07.14	40	71.42	9	16.07
55 - 64	50	1	02.00	8	16.00	2	04.00	36	72.00	3	06.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	2	08.00	2	08.00	21	84.00	0	.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	1	00.72	15	10.94	8	05.83	101	73.72	12	08.75
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	2	20.00	5	50.00	3	30.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	1	00.69	14	09.79	10	06.99	104	72.72	14	09.79
Black	4	0	.00	1	25.00	0	.00	2	50.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	1	01.69	9	15.25	1	01.69	40	67.79	8	13.55
Urban	40	0	.00	5	12.50	1	01.69	32	67.79	2	05.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	1	02.43	5	12.19	31	75.60	4	09.75
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	3	42.85	1	14.28

TABLE Y (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>												
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	2	10.52	17	89.47	0	.00	
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	6	18.75	2	06.25	14	43.75	10	31.25	
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	1	01.75	3	03.50	50	87.71	4	07.01	
Master's degree	19	0	.00	4	21.05	4	21.05	10	52.63	1	05.26	
Doctoral degree	10	1	10.00	1	10.00	0	.00	7	70.00	1	10.00	
Other	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00	
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>												
Under 5,000	83	1	01.20	12	14.45	6	07.22	53	63.85	15	13.25	
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	2	04.34	1	02.17	40	86.95	3	06.52	
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	2	22.22	6	66.66	1	11.11	
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	1	11.11	7	77.77	0	.00	
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>												
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	87.50	1	12.50	
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	66.66	1	33.33	
21 - 25	14	0	.00	3	21.42	2	14.28	9	64.28	0	.00	
26 - 30	19	0	.00	2	05.26	2	05.26	15	78.94	0	.00	
More than 30	100	1	01.00	9	09.00	4	04.00	73	73.00	13	13.00	
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>												
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00	
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	3	13.63	0	.00	18	81.81	1	04.54	
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	3	10.00	0	.00	22	73.33	3	06.66	
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	2	09.52	5	23.80	11	52.38	3	14.28	
More than \$32,001	66	1	01.51	5	07.57	2	03.30	49	74.24	9	13.63	

TABLE Y (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent	
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	2	13.33	0	.00	11	73.33	2	13.33
1 - 3 children	96	0	.00	12	12.50	7	07.29	67	69.79	10	10.41
4 or more children	35	1	02.85	1	02.85	3	08.57	27	77.41	3	08.57
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	1	20.00	1	20.00	3	60.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	4	04.70	9	10.58	60	70.58	11	12.94
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	10	18.18	0	.00	26	74.54	4	07.27
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	0	.00	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	0	.00	13	09.55	6	04.41	103	75.73	13	09.55

TABLE Z

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Vacation
Schedule for Community College Instructors (Statement 26)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	2	13.33	5	33.33	5	33.33	3	20.00	0	.00
45 - 54	56	1	01.78	13	23.21	12	21.42	29	51.78	1	01.78
55 - 64	50	2	04.00	22	44.00	5	10.00	20	40.00	1	02.00
65 or over	25	2	08.00	4	16.00	5	20.00	9	36.00	5	20.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	7	05.10	44	32.11	25	18.24	55	40.14	6	04.37
Female	10	0	.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	6	60.00	1	10.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	7	04.89	43	30.00	27	18.88	59	41.29	7	04.89
Black	4	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	1	01.69	25	42.37	3	05.08	27	45.76	3	05.08
Urban	40	3	07.50	13	32.50	3	07.50	19	47.50	2	05.00
Suburban	41	3	07.31	7	17.07	17	41.46	14	34.14	0	.00
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	4	57.14	1	14.28	2	28.57

TABLE Z. (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	5	26.31	6	31.57	6	31.57	2	10.52
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	3	09.37	10	31.25	1	03.12	17	53.12	1	03.12
Bachelor's degree	57	4	07.01	11	19.21	12	21.05	28	49.12	2	03.50
Master's degree	19	0	.00	12	63.15	2	10.52	4	21.05	1	05.26
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	3	30.00	4	40.00	2	20.00	1	10.00
Other	7	0	.00	5	71.42	2	28.57	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	1	01.20	35	42.16	10	12.04	32	38.55	5	06.02
5,001 to 25,000	46	4	08.69	10	21.73	4	08.69	28	60.86	0	.00
25,001 to 100,000	9	1	11.11	0	.00	6	66.66	0	.00	2	22.22
Over 100,000	9	1	11.11	0	.00	7	77.77	1	11.11	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	5	62.50	1	12.50	2	25.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	5	35.71	4	28.57	5	35.71	0	.00
26 - 30	19	3	15.78	7	36.84	4	21.04	5	28.31	0	.00
More than 30	100	3	03.00	26	26.00	15	15.00	49	49.00	7	07.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	2	09.09	7	31.81	1	04.54	11	50.00	1	04.54
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	3	10.00	9	30.00	7	23.33	8	26.66	3	10.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	7	33.33	5	23.80	9	42.85	0	.00
More than \$32,001	66	2	03.03	21	31.81	14	21.21	26	39.39	3	04.54

TABLE Z. (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	6	40.00	0	.00	8	53.33	1	06.66
1 - 3 children	96	6	06.25	30	31.25	16	16.66	38	39.58	6	06.25
4 or more children	35	1	02.85	8	22.85	11	21.42	15	42.85	0	.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	1	20.00	3	60.00	0	.00	1	20.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	2	02.35	25	29.41	16	18.82	39	45.88	3	03.82
More than 3 years	55	4	07.57	16	29.09	11	20.00	20	36.36	4	07.27
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	2	33.33	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	4	02.94	41	30.14	23	16.91	61	44.85	7	05.14

TABLE AA

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Sick
Leave for Community College Staff (Statement 27)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	0	.00	2	20.00	0	.00	8	53.33	4	26.66
45 - 54	56	1	01.78	8	14.28	12	21.42	30	53.57	5	08.92
55 - 64	50	1	02.00	4	08.00	8	16.00	31	62.00	6	12.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	60.00	10	40.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	2	01.45	15	10.94	18	13.13	83	60.58	19	13.96
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	2	20.00	2	20.00	6	60.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	2	01.39	15	10.48	20	13.98	81	56.64	25	17.48
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	0	.00	7	11.86	5	10.16	36	61.10	10	16.94
Urban	40	1	02.50	8	10.61	5	12.50	21	52.50	5	12.50
Suburban	41	1	02.43	0	.00	8	19.51	27	65.85	5	12.19
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	1	14.28	1	14.28	5	71.42

TABLE AA (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	0	.00	1	10.62	15	78.94	1	10.52
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	4	12.50	5	15.62	17	53.12	6	18.75
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	5	08.77	12	21.05	31	54.38	9	15.78
Master's degree	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13	68.42	7	31.57
Doctoral degree	10	2	20.00	2	20.00	1	10.00	3	30.00	2	20.00
Other	7	0	.00	4	57.14	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	2	02.40	8	09.63	7	09.43	55	66.26	11	13.25
5,001 to 25,000	46	0	.00	6	13.04	6	13.04	25	54.34	9	19.56
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	3	33.33	1	11.11	5	55.55
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	1	11.11	4	44.44	4	44.44	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	100.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	0	.00	3	21.42	0	.00	11	78.57	0	.00
26 - 30	19	0	.00	0	.00	4	21.05	5	26.31	10	52.63
More than 30	100	2	02.00	11	11.00	16	16.00	56	56.00	15	15.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	1	04.54	0	.00	15	68.18	6	27.27
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	0	.00	5	16.66	2	06.66	19	63.33	4	13.33
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	0	.00	3	14.28	13	61.09	5	23.80
More than \$32,001	66	2	03.03	9	13.63	15	22.72	31	46.96	9	13.63

TABLE AA (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00
Married, no children	15	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	46.66	8	53.33
1 - 3 children	96	1	01.04	12	12.50	11	11.45	59	61.45	13	13.54
4 or more children	35	1	02.85	3	08.57	9	25.71	19	54.28	3	08.57
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	1	20.00
2 - 3 years	85	1	01.17	12	14.11	9	09.41	50	58.82	13	16.47
More than 3 years	55	1	01.81	3	05.45	12	21.81	29	52.72	10	18.18
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	66.66	2	33.33
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	2	01.47	13	09.55	19	13.97	79	58.08	23	16.91

TABLE BB

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Recruitment of
Future Faculty and Staff Specially Trained for the Community
College Level (Statement 28)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	2	13.33	9	60.00	2	13.33	2	13.33	0	.00
45 - 54	56	4	07.14	30	53.57	6	10.71	11	19.64	5	08.92
55 - 64	50	4	08.00	20	40.00	8	16.00	17	34.00	2	04.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	6	24.00	6	24.00	12	48.00	1	04.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	7	05.10	64	46.71	21	15.32	38	27.73	7	05.10
Female	10	3	30.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	4	40.00	1	10.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	10	06.99	63	44.05	22	15.38	40	27.97	8	05.59
Black	4	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00	2	50.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	2	03.38	31	52.54	9	15.25	13	22.03	4	06.77
Urban	10	2	05.00	9	22.50	5	12.50	22	55.00	2	05.00
Suburban	.	2	04.87	24	58.53	6	14.63	7	17.07	2	07.31
Large City	.	4	57.14	1	14.28	2	28.57	0	.00	0	.00

TABLE BB (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	10	52.63	5	26.31	2	10.52	0	.00
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	0	.00	7	21.87	9	28.12	13	40.62	3	09.37
Bachelor's degree	57	4	07.01	31	54.38	5	08.72	15	26.31	2	03.50
Master's degree	19	2	10.52	10	52.63	0	.00	7	36.84	3	15.77
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	7	70.00	0	.00	3	30.00	0	.00
Other	7	2	28.57	3	42.85	0	.00	2	28.57	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	4	04.81	36	43.37	14	16.86	23	27.71	6	07.22
5,001 to 25,000	46	3	07.31	20	48.78	3	07.31	18	43.90	2	07.31
25,001 to 100,000	9	3	33.33	3	33.33	3	33.33	0	.00	0	.00
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	4	44.44	2	22.22	1	11.11	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	8	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	1	33.33	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	3	21.42	6	42.85	0	.00	6	42.85	0	.00
26 - 30	19	3	15.78	6	31.57	6	31.57	4	21.05	0	.00
More than 30	100	3	03.00	43	43.00	14	14.00	32	32.00	8	08.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	3	60.00	2	40.00	0	.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	9	40.90	3	13.63	8	36.36	2	09.09
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	2	06.66	12	20.00	8	26.66	8	26.66	0	.00
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	2	09.52	9	42.85	3	13.28	7	33.33	0	.00
More than \$32,001	66	6	09.09	30	45.45	6	09.09	18	27.27	6	09.09

TABLE BB (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	2	13.33	3	20.00	1	13.33	9	60.00	0	.00
1 - 3 children	96	6	06.25	44	45.83	14	14.58	28	29.16	4	04.16
4 or more children	35	2	05.71	17	48.57	7	20.00	5	14.28	4	11.42
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	2	40.00	0	.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	7	08.25	39	45.88	12	14.11	24	28.23	3	03.52
More than 3 years	55	1	01.81	26	47.27	9	16.36	14	25.45	5	09.09
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	2	33.33	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	2	40.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	8	05.88	59	43.38	21	15.44	40	29.41	8	05.88

TABLE CC

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward Community
Colleges Receiving an Increased Percentage of the Total
Education Budget (Statement 29)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	2	13.33	9	60.00	3	20.00	0	.00	1	06.66
45 - 54	56	3	05.35	25	44.64	7	12.50	13	23.21	8	14.28
55 - 64	50	4	08.00	23	46.00	8	16.00	13	26.00	2	04.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	9	35.00	3	12.00	4	24.00	7	28.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	9	06.56	62	45.25	16	11.67	32	23.35	18	13.13
Female	10	1	10.00	4	40.00	5	50.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	10	06.99	65	45.45	21	14.68	31	21.67	18	12.58
Black	4	2	50.00	1	25.00	0	.00	1	25.00	0	.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	6	10.16	31	53.54	8	13.55	12	20.33	2	03.38
Urban	40	4	10.00	15	37.50	6	15.00	8	19.54	7	12.50
Suburban	41	0	.00	20	48.78	4	09.75	12	29.26	5	12.19
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00	4	57.14

TABLE CC (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	12	63.15	1	05.26	1	05.26	5	26.31
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	4	12.50	11	34.37	8	25.00	5	15.62	4	12.50
Bachelor's degree	57	0	.00	26	45.61	6	10.52	20	35.08	5	08.77
Master's degree	19	6	31.57	7	36.84	3	15.76	0	.00	3	15.76
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	6	60.00	0	.00	3	30.00	1	10.00
Other	7	0	.00	4	57.14	3	42.85	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	7	08.43	41	49.39	13	15.66	13	15.66	9	10.84
5,001 to 25,000	46	3	06.52	23	50.00	6	13.04	10	21.73	4	08.69
25,001 to 100,000*	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	44.44	5	55.55
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	2	22.22	2	22.22	5	55.55	0	.00
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	6	75.00	0	.00	0	.00	2	25.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	2	66.66	0	.00	1	33.33	0	.00
21 - 25	14	1	07.14	9	64.28	0	.00	4	28.57	0	.00
26 - 30	19	2	10.52	8	42.10	6	31.57	3	15.78	0	.00
More than 30	100	6	06.00	39	39.00	15	15.00	24	24.00	16	16.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	3	60.00	0	.00	2	40.00	0	.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	4	18.18	6	27.27	4	18.18	5	22.72	3	13.63
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	2	06.66	23	76.66	0	.00	0	.00	5	16.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	7	33.33	4	19.04	7	33.33	3	14.28
More than \$32,001	66	4	06.06	21	37.87	13	19.69	17	25.75	7	10.60

TABLE CC (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	4	26.66	4	26.66	2	13.33	3	20.00	2	13.33
1 - 3 children	96	6	06.25	47	48.95	13	13.54	14	14.58	16	16.66
4 or more children	35	0	.00	15	42.85	5	14.28	15	42.85	0	.00
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00	1	50.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	2	40.00	3	60.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	43	50.58	11	12.95	19	22.35	12	14.11
More than 3 years	55	8	14.54	19	34.54	10	18.18	12	21.81	6	10.90
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	2	33.33	4	66.66	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	1	20.00	4	80.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	7	05.14	42	42.64	21	15.44	32	23.52	18	13.23

TABLE DD

Board Member Responses Indicating Attitude Toward an Extensive
Orientation Program for Board Members (Statement 30)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis- agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Age:</u>											
34 or under	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	100.00	0	.00
35 - 44	15	2	13.33	3	20.00	0	.00	9	60.00	1	13.33
45 - 54	56	0	.00	10	17.85	4	07.14	33	58.92	9	16.07
55 - 64	50	3	06.00	7	14.00	6	12.00	22	44.00	12	24.00
65 or over	25	0	.00	1	04.00	4	16.00	16	64.00	4	16.00
<u>Sex:</u>											
Male	137	5	03.64	21	15.32	11	08.02	78	56.93	22	16.05
Female	10	0	.00	0	.00	3	30.00	3	30.00	4	40.00
<u>Race:</u>											
White	143	5	03.49	21	14.68	14	09.79	78	54.54	25	17.48
Black	4	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	75.00	1	25.00
Other	0	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
<u>Place of Residence:</u>											
Rural	59	2	03.38	9	15.25	9	15.25	22	37.28	17	28.81
Urban	40	3	07.50	3	07.50	2	05.00	30	75.00	2	05.00
Suburban	41	0	.00	9	21.95	3	07.31	22	53.65	7	17.07
Large City	7	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	100.00	0	.00

TABLE DD (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Dis-agree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Educational Background:</u>											
Less than H. S. diploma	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
High school diploma	19	0	.00	2	10.52	0	.00	10	52.63	7	36.84
Coll. attend., no deg.	32	2	06.25	4	12.50	4	12.50	13	40.62	9	28.12
Bachelor's degree	57	3	05.26	4	07.01	4	07.01	39	68.42	7	12.28
Master's degree	19	0	.00	5	26.31	3	15.78	9	47.36	2	10.53
Doctoral degree	10	0	.00	2	20.00	0	.00	7	70.00	1	10.00
Other	7	0	.00	4	57.14	0	.00	3	42.85	0	.00
<u>Childhood Residence:</u>											
Under 5,000	83	3	03.61	14	16.96	6	07.22	46	55.42	14	16.86
5,001 to 25,000	46	2	04.34	7	15.21	8	17.39	22	47.82	7	14.21
25,001 to 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	66.66	3	33.33
Over 100,000	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	7	77.77	2	22.22
<u>Residence in Com. Col. area:</u>											
0 - 5 years	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
6 - 10	8	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	75.00	2	25.00
11 - 15	2	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
16 - 20	3	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	3	100.00	0	.00
21 - 25	14	3	21.42	3	21.42	0	.00	4	28.57	4	28.57
26 - 30	19	0	.00	2	10.52	6	31.57	11	57.89	0	.00
More than 30	100	2	02.00	14	14.00	8	08.00	56	56.00	20	20.00
<u>Approximate Family Income:</u>											
Less than \$10,000	5	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00
\$10,001 to \$18,000	22	0	.00	0	.00	2	09.09	15	68.18	5	22.72
\$18,001 to \$25,000	30	2	06.06	4	13.33	0	.00	14	63.33	5	16.66
\$25,001 to \$32,000	21	0	.00	4	19.04	0	.00	12	57.14	5	23.80
More than \$32,001	66	3	04.54	13	19.69	11	16.66	30	45.45	9	13.63

TABLE DD (Continued)

Characteristics	Total Cases	Strongly Disagree	Per Cent	Disagree	Per Cent	No Opinion	Per Cent	Agree	Per Cent	Strongly Agree	Per Cent
<u>Marital - Parental Status:</u>											
Not married	1	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	100.00	0	.00
Married, no children	15	2	13.33	0	.00	2	13.33	5	33.33	6	40.00
1 - 3 children	96	3	03.12	14	14.58	8	08.33	55	57.59	16	16.66
4 or more children	35	0	.00	7	20.00	4	11.42	20	57.14	4	11.42
<u>Experience on School Boards:</u>											
None	2	0	.00	0	.00	2	100.00	0	.00	0	.00
1 year or less	5	5	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	85	0	.00	14	16.47	7	08.23	42	49.41	22	25.88
More than 3 years	55	0	.00	7	12.72	5	09.09	39	70.90	4	07.27
<u>Experience on Com. Col. Boards:</u>											
1 year or less	6	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	100.00	0	.00
2 - 3 years	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	100.00	0	.00
More than 3 years	136	5	03.64	21	15.32	14	10.29	70	51.47	26	19.11

TABLE EE

Significance of Relationships Between Personal Characteristics of Board Members
and Their Attitudes Toward Selected Community College Functions

Characteristic	State- ment No. 1	State- ment No. 2	State- ment No. 3	State- ment No. 4	State- ment No. 5	State- ment No. 6	State- ment No. 7	State- ment No. 8	State- ment No. 9
Age	.11	.11	1.01	.92	1.67	2.44	.81	.81	.75
Race	1.26	.25	1.87	2.83	1.82	.08	2.27	.13	.22
Sex	.01	2.81	.65	.81	.94	.19	.51	.30	.27
Residence	.00	1.07	2.67	7.75**	22.91**	2.07	.28	.00	4.21*
Experience, Comm.Col. Boards	.76	.01	.09	2.10	.89	2.65	1.39	1.81	.52
Education	10.24**	1.39	1.20	1.60	1.08	.05	16.39**	.25	3.39
Income	6.43*	.02	6.19	.71	6.07*	.97	7.91**	.97	.69

*Significant at the .05 level; **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE EE (Continued)

Characteristics	State- ment No. 10	State- ment No. 11	State- ment No. 12	State- ment No. 13	State- ment No. 14	State- ment No. 15	State- ment No. 16	State- ment No. 17	State- ment No. 18
Age	1.29	1.03	.74	1.32	1.56	8.40**	.41	.35	5.89*
Race	1.16	1.36	.24	3.10	2.34	2.15	.08	.84	.78
Sex	.04	5.73*	.49	.71	.17	5.49*	.22	16.74**	1.44
Residence	.03	.96	5.89*	.07	1.71	.02	2.05	.95	1.11
Experience, Comm.Col. Boards	18.85**	.72	.55	.20	.00	2.90	.24	.23	.45
Education	2.12	12.92**	5.11*	2.88	.02	.25	.12	.01	2.04
Income	9.22**	.69	2.23	9.28**	7.44**	.37	.91	1.05	11.00**

*Significant at the .05 level; **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE EE (Continued)

Characteristics	State- ment No. 19	State- ment No. 20	State- ment No. 21	State- ment No. 22	State- ment No. 23	State- ment No. 24	State- ment No. 25	State- ment No. 26
Age	.79	.52	1.23	4.08*	.28	.77	.03	4.66*
Race	.18	.89	.31	1.22	4.65*	.16	.47	.07
Sex	.41	.46	.86	5.94*	1.27	.36	1.12	3.31
Residence	1.36	3.33	2.38	.10	1.23	.07	2.36	.04
Experience, Comm.Col. Boards	.55	4.44*	14.38**	6.43*	.01	.51	2.40	9.16*
Education	.30	13.80**	5.69*	.01	3.73	.02	7.70**	.62
Income	2.75	1.07	2.73	1.48	.30	1.09	2.90	.22

*Significant at the .05 level; **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE EE (Continued)

Characteristics	State- ment No. 27	State- ment No. 28	State- ment No. 29	State- ment No. 30
Age	.45	4.66*	6.17**	1.81
Race	.63	.17	.34	1.00
Sex	1.32	.96	3.43	1.78
Residence	.00	1.43	5.03*	.07
Experience, Comm. Col. Boards	.41	1.81	7.93**	2.91
Education	.09	2.48	.00	.29
Income	2.90	.22	.15	11.81**

*Significant at the .05 level; **Significant at the .01 level.