

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 113

JC 730 188

AUTHOR Fenske, Robert H.; Scott, Craig S.
 TITLE A Comparative Study of Recent Trends and Characteristics of Students Entering American Junior Colleges, 1968-72.

PUB DATE 13 Jul 72

NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at midwest regional meeting of American Educational Research Association, Special Interest Group on Research in Junior Colleges (Ann Arbor, Michigan, July 13, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *College Freshmen; Colleges; *Comparative Analysis; Data Analysis; Enrollment Trends; Higher Education; *Junior Colleges; Post Secondary Education; Speeches; *Student Characteristics; Tables (Data); Technical Reports; Universities

ABSTRACT

Recent changes in the background characteristics and attributes of students entering American junior colleges are compared with those of students entering colleges offering baccalaureate and graduate degrees. Comparisons are also made between students entering private and public junior colleges. The characteristics and attributes are: Level of Educational Aspiration, College Choice Factors, Family Income, Racial/Ethnic Background, Type of Anticipated Housing During the First Year of College, Planned Extra Curricular Activities. The samples used were drawn from ACT Class Profile tapes containing information supplied by students who took the American College Testing Program's Assessment during the 1967-68, 1969-70, and 1971-72 test years. A total of 546,006 students (283,352 males and 258,654 females) from 275 institutions, including 69 two-year colleges (58 public and 11 private), comprised the study population. The breakdown as to college type was: 2-year colleges 72,451, 4-year colleges 49,406, master's-level colleges 195,627, and doctoral-level universities 224,522. The study results are provided in two sections--an analysis of the percentage distribution of each variable by year for all four institution types, and a comparison of the distribution for each of the variables between students in public and private junior colleges for all years combined. The study data are provided in 14 tables. The results of the study show that, in general, substantial differences exist between the distribution of characteristics of students entering junior colleges and those entering other colleges and universities. The implications of the findings are discussed. (DB)

ED 080113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RECENT TRENDS AND CHARACTERISTICS
OF STUDENTS ENTERING AMERICAN JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1968-72.

Robert H. Fenske and Craig S. Scott

The American College Testing Program

The major purpose of this study was to investigate and report on recent changes in the background characteristics and attributes of students entering American junior colleges. Comparisons were made between students entering junior colleges and those entering colleges offering baccalaureate and graduate degrees. A comparison was also made between students entering private and public junior colleges. The need for the study arose from the lack of timely data on the effects of open admissions, nonresident student policy changes, the constantly increasing diversity of background and attributes, removal of the draft as a possible influence on college enrollment, and other recent events. Current information on the characteristics of entering students is necessary for college administrators, faculty, governing boards, and legislators.

Review of Literature

In a recent review, Trent (H. E. W., 1970) noted that the determination to enter college is ". . . not generally a spontaneous decision. Rather, it is the result of numerous complex factors that have occurred over a long period of time. . . ." He also noted that the distribution of nearly all the

*Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association -- Special Interest Group on Research in Junior Colleges Midwest Regional Meeting, Ann Arbor, Michigan, July 13, 1972.

JC 730 188



numerous background factors differs among types of colleges, e. g., universities with graduate schools versus junior colleges, high-cost privately controlled institutions versus public colleges, etc. A number of recent publications have dealt with the differentiation of entering students by type of college, for example, Astin (1965) and Harris (1972) present generalized data relating to this phenomenon. Cross (H. E. W., 1970) discussed the role of the junior college in the increasing universality of postsecondary education. She emphasized the importance, as shown by research, of the removal of geographic, financial, and other barriers in college attendance. She found that to a large extent the junior college sector was growing more rapidly than other parts of higher education due to its success in removing these barriers to students who would not otherwise have attended more traditional types of institutions. However, she also indicated that the high degree of success of junior colleges in removal of geographic and financial barriers are tempered somewhat by the continuation of lower than average proportions of minority groups and women who seek higher education.

In an extensive review of the available literature, McClung (1972) found that "research comparing the academic abilities of junior college students to their four year college counterparts has usually found the junior college student less able." For example, Seashore (1959) noted that about three fourths of his sample of senior college students scored higher than the junior college median on scholastic aptitude tests. Similar

differences were reported by Raines (1968) and Cross (1968). Raines (1968) and Cross (1968) also reviewed research comparing junior and senior college students on noncognitive variables. Differences were seen to exist on nearly every variable studied. Compared with their senior college counterparts, junior college students rated themselves less academically able with considerably less confidence in their mathematical writing skill and leadership ability. Junior college students were seen to have taken part in cultural activities to a lesser extent and also perceived their environment as less intellectual and lacking in pressure to make good grades compared to senior colleges. In terms of background characteristics, these researchers pointed out that the junior college students generally ranked below senior college students on such socioeconomic variables as mothers and fathers education, number of books in the home, etc.

Medsker and Trent (1972) comparing ability and high school rank found striking differences between students entering two year versus four year colleges. For example, 25% of students entering colleges ranked in the top 20% of academic ability compared with 65% entering private universities and 46% entering public universities. Differences of a similar magnitude were recorded for high school rank in this sample.

In an empirical study of the heterogeneity/homogeneity of certain personality measures among junior college students versus senior college students Cohen and Brawer (1970) found that junior college students were

more homogeneous than senior college students on the Omnibus Personality Inventory and on the Adaptive-Flexibility Inventory. This finding indicates that while junior college students come from much more diverse backgrounds of ability and socioeconomic status, they seem to be more similar in terms of personality measures than four year college students.

Wisgoski (1971) found that many junior college students aspired to an unrealistically high level of educational achievement. "Many studies have shown that a majority of the college freshmen in all ranges of ability and prior achievement expressed their intentions to work for a baccalaureate degree. Seventy-five percent of all students enrolled in public junior colleges label themselves as transfer students, but only one third actually enroll in senior colleges and universities." He noted that this discrepancy is often due to lack of financial resources, indecision and poor social adjustment.

There are relatively few studies which compare private versus public junior college students directly. Medsker and Trent (1972) found only small differences in ability and high school performance between private and public junior college students. However, they found substantial differences in other factors such as education of fathers, religious affiliation, mean scores on Omnibus Personality Inventory scales and other factors. Medsker and Tillery (1971) reporting on the SCOPE project found that there were substantial differences in socioeconomic and intellectual predisposition factors. However, they stressed that it would be preferable to examine

5

data from different types of junior colleges separately since they vary among themselves and the clientele they serve, for example private non-denominational versus denominational private junior colleges.

Finally, Bushnell (1973) reported on the American Association of Junior College's Project Focus which gathered a wealth of data from a national sample of 92 junior colleges. He concluded that "public and private 2-year colleges do not serve the same constituencies as 4-year colleges and universities. The backgrounds and characteristics that shaped the interests, career goals, and values of community junior colleges are diverse, and there is heavy emphasis on the disadvantaged, the minority, and the home-based students. While these characteristics cannot be changed during a student's college career, they do serve as appropriate background information upon which faculty and administrators can build their strategies for helping students learn." This last statement is also the purpose for which the present study was conducted.

Sample

The data for this study were obtained during regular nationwide administrations of the ACT Assessment and include responses to the Student Profile Section (SPS). The SPS is a short biographical inventory administered as part of the ACT Assessment. The SPS asks prospective college students about their home backgrounds, educational and vocational plans, grades achieved in high school, goals in attending college, and interests and achievements in out-of-class areas.

The samples used in this study were drawn from ACT Class Profile tapes containing information furnished by students who took The American College Testing Program's Assessment during the 1967-68, 1969-70 and 1971-72 test years. The Class Profile tapes comprise the data bank for an ACT Research Service which lists all of the students who took the ACT Assessment during a given test year and who subsequently were certified as enrolled the following fall at one of the colleges participating in the Class Profile Service. Thus, these data represent national samples for students enrolling as first-time freshmen in fall, 1968, fall, 1970, and fall, 1972. For this study, a total of 275 separate colleges and universities were selected on the following basis (a) having at least 50% of their entering freshmen class included in the Class Profile history tapes, (b) participating in the Class Profile Service for all three of the years studied, (c) representative of the national distribution of institutional control (public versus private), and (d) wide geographic distribution across the country. The 275 institutions included 69 two-year colleges (58 public and 11 private), 70 baccalaureate-granting colleges, 86 colleges and universities which granted the masters degree as well as the baccalaureate degree, and 50 universities which offered doctoral degrees in addition to masters and baccalaureate degrees. In tables following, these types are referred to as types I, II, III, and IV, respectively. The total number of students in each of these four levels was as follows: (I) 2-year colleges: 72, 451; (II) 4-year colleges: 49, 406; (III) masters-level

colleges: 195,627; and, (IV) doctoral level universities: 224,522, for a total of 542,006. Of this total, 283,352 were males and 258,654 were females.

Each of the 542,006 records contain information on a wide variety of student characteristics. Included for consideration in the present study was level of educational aspiration, type of housing anticipated, factors influential on college choice, racial/ethnic background, planned extra curricular activities and family income.

Results

The following results are presented in two main sections: the first is an analysis of the percentage distribution of each variable by year for all four institution types, the second is a comparison of the distribution for each of the variables between students in public and private junior colleges for all years combined. All of the tables are appended to the text.

Level of Educational Aspiration

Table 1 shows several interesting trends over the period studied. An increasing percentage of students in level I (2-year colleges) plan to complete junior college degrees, and decreasing percentages of students plan to complete bachelors and masters degrees. There is also a slight increase in 2-year college students who plan to complete doctoral degrees. For the entire sample, increasing percentages of students plan to complete junior college and doctoral level degrees. But, for every institutional level

there are decreasing percentages of students who plan to complete only bachelors degrees. No such clear cut pattern is shown for completion of masters degrees, however there is a very sharp increase in the percentage of students in level II (bachelors degree granting) institutions who plan to complete masters degrees rather than stop at completion of the baccalaureate.

College Choice Factors

Tables 2 and 3 show percentages for males and females, respectively, of those who indicated major consideration was given to (a) high scholastic standards, (b) low cost, and (c) campus tours as a major factor in their choice of college. Two-year college respondents showed a sharp increase over the period studied in the importance given to low cost as a major factor in their choice of college. A decrease was shown in the consideration given to high scholastic standards. These patterns were true for both males and females. Campus tours as a college choice factor was included in the SPS only in 1970 and 1972, and showed an increase over that period of time for 2-year respondents. In contrast, students at all of the other three levels of institutions showed a decrease in low cost as a major consideration in college choice over the period studied. The general pattern for levels II, III, and IV students shows a decrease in consideration given to high scholastic standards from 1968 to 1970 and then a slight increase from 1970 to 1972. Both males and females in all four types of institutions indicated that campus tours were an increasingly important factor from 1970 to 1972.

Family Income

Each student was asked on the SPS to estimate his family's total income before taxes from a list of eight alternatives ranging from "less than \$3,000 per year" to "\$25,000 and over." Two additional options were "I consider this information confidential" and "I don't know." For purposes of the present analysis, responses to the last 2 options (about one-fourth of the total in the sample) were excluded. Table 4 shows the percentage distribution for all income categories. For 2-year college students, the general trend over the period studied was for increasingly higher percentages in the higher family income categories. For these students decreases were shown for the two lowest income categories (except in the lowest category for 1972), contrasted with generally increasing percentages in the highest three income categories over the period studied. The same general pattern was shown for respondents in the other three types of institutions. In particular, the "\$3,000 to \$7,499" family income category showed sharp decreases for students in all institutional types. Inflationary increases in family income may account for much of the general pattern shown, however, it is also quite possible that the increasing costs of attending college could account for at least part of the sharp decreases in percentages of students attending college from low-income families.

Racial/Ethnic Background

Table 5 presents the percentage distributions for responses to an item on the SPS which asks students to indicate their racial/ethnic background.

Responses were available for only 1970 and 1972. The four minorities for which data are presented are (a) Afro-American, (b) American Indian, (c) Oriental American, and (d) Spanish American. Remaining percentages (not shown) of responses for each institution type were for Caucasian American/white. Students were informed on the SPS that they were not required to provide this information, however, nonresponse was less than 10% for both of the years studied. Table 4 shows that 2-year colleges enrolled an increasing percentage of both male and female minority students for all four minorities listed. This was also true for all of the other three institutional types. The sharpest increases were shown for Afro-American (particularly for females) and Spanish American. Consistent but slight increases were shown for American Indians and Oriental Americans.

Type of Anticipated Housing During the First Year of College

Tables 6 and 7 show an interesting trend over the period studied for 2-year college students. The percentage of students who anticipate living at home while attending a junior or community college decreased for both males and females, while an increase was shown in percentage of students who planned to live off-campus. The percentage of students who planned to live on-campus (primarily those attending private junior colleges) remained fairly constant over this period. Decreasing percentages of males in all of other three institutional types planned to live at home during their first year of college. However, an increasing percentage of females at

level II institutions plan to live at home, while the pattern for females in III and IV level institutions were the same as for males. No consistent trends or changes were shown in either on-campus or off-campus anticipated housing for institutional levels II, III, and IV. Note, however, that substantially higher percentages of females planned to live on-campus versus off campus as compared with males.

Planned Extra Curricular Activities

The SPS asked each student to indicate activities in which he may be interested in participating in during college. Table 8 shows the responses for males and females for two types of such activities (a) writing for campus yearbook, newspapers, etc., and (b) student government. Extremely sharp declines from 1968 to 1970 were shown in the percentage of students planning to participate in either of these activities for all institutional types. There is some increase in planned participation between 1970 and 1972, but in no case is the increase anywhere near sufficient to offset the sharp decline from the previous period. In general, the overall picture is for the average planned participation in both activities overall institutional levels to decline from slightly over half for males and females combined to about 25% in 1970, and a slight recovery to about one-third in 1972.

The final part of this section presents a comparison of the distribution for each of the above variables for students enrolled in public versus private junior colleges for all years combined.

Level of Educational Aspirations

Table 9 shows that the level of educational attainment aspired to by this sample of 2-year college students differs markedly by sex and type of institutional control. Males in both types of junior colleges aspired to a much higher level of educational attainment than females. This difference is accentuated for males attending private junior colleges. Slightly over 40% of males attending private junior colleges aspired to a masters or doctoral degree; less than half this percentage for females in either type of junior college aspired to these graduate degrees.

College Choice Factors

As might be expected, higher percentages of students attending public colleges indicated that low cost was of major importance in their choice of college compared to students attending private junior colleges. The percentage distributions were remarkably uniform for males and females; about one-half of males and females attending public colleges indicated low cost was an important factor compared with about one-third of the males and females attending private junior colleges. A different pattern was shown for "high scholastic standards" as a college choice factor; more females than males regarded this factor as a major importance regardless of type of college. Campus tours were more important for females than males, particularly for females attending private colleges.

Family Income

As shown in Table 11 there is a somewhat surprising similarity in the distribution of family income between students attending public and private junior colleges. What is particularly surprising is that the slight differences show in fact that the distribution of family income for public junior college students is slightly higher than that of private junior college students.

Racial/Ethnic Background

The substantial differences shown in Table 12 in percentages of minority groups attending public versus private colleges are largely an artifact of the types of colleges included. The private junior college sample includes a denominational junior college attended principally by American Indians, and another private junior college attended almost entirely by male Afro-Americans. Discounting these differences, the junior colleges enroll uniformly low percentages of minorities. It will be recalled from Table 5 that in general the percentages for junior colleges are lower than for all other institutional types.

Type of Anticipated Housing During the First Year of College

As would be expected from traditional institutional practices, students in private junior colleges indicated that a majority of both males and females plan to live on-campus. Very few of the private junior college students plan to live off-campus compared with students in public junior colleges; quite possibly such arrangements are not allowed by most of the private junior colleges in this sample. Table 13 also shows that about one fourth of the

private junior college students (both males and females) plan to live at home while attending college.

Planned Extra Curricular Activities

As can be seen in Table 14, private junior college students, both male and female, anticipated a high level of participation in both activities studied. This pattern may well be an artifact of both the residential arrangements noted previously and institutional policies encouraging such participation compared with public junior colleges.

Summary and Discussion

This study investigated and reported on recent changes in the background characteristics and attributes of students entering American junior colleges compared with those entering colleges offering baccalaureate and graduate degrees. Comparisons were also made between students entering private and public junior colleges.

In general, it was found that substantial differences existed between the distribution of characteristics of students entering junior colleges compared with those entering colleges offering baccalaureate degrees only, or colleges offering both baccalaureate and graduate degrees. For some of the variables (e. g., level of educational aspirations, importance of certain college choice factors, and family income) these differences were widening over the period studied. For other variables, the differences were decreasing and junior college students are becoming more like their senior college counterparts, e. g., type of housing anticipated and extent of planned extracurricular activities. In terms

of racial/ethnic background, junior colleges seem to be keeping pace with senior colleges in gradually increasing the percentage of minority students.

Data were not available to determine trends over time in differences between public and private junior college student characteristics, however, it was evident that when data for the three years studied were aggregated, major and significant differences exist between student characteristics in these two types of junior colleges. Such differences are most marked in level of educational aspiration, consideration given to college choice factors (especially low cost), type of housing anticipated and planned extra curricular activities. Very little difference was shown in distribution of family income between students in these two types of colleges. There are also more similarities than differences in distribution of minority students between the two types of student bodies.

These data are not intended to make a case for either heterogeneity or homogeneity among institutions of higher education. There is much to be said for either pattern. For example, it would be much easier to plan and offer academic programs for a student body that is quite homogeneous in academic ability than for groups of students widely diverse in ability. Conversely, there is also much to be said for heterogeneity in, for example, social and racial/ethnic backgrounds, for it is a truism of higher education that students probably learn more from each other than they do in formal academic programs. However, data such as these analyzed in the present study provide a basis for some concern that

factors extraneous to the process of education, such as financial cost of attending college, are causing polarities and widening gaps among the different types of colleges. As legislators and private college trustees have seen fit to shift more and more of the proportionate financial burden of college attendance to the student, residential senior colleges and universities may come to be restricted only to those from families with relatively high incomes. Should that happen, junior colleges would by default have student bodies comprised almost entirely of lower income students but of quite wide diversity in other factors such as academic ability. Data such as these provide benchmark information against which to measure such possible changes.

References

- Astin, A. W. Who Goes Where to College? Science Research Associates, 1965.
- Bushnell, D. S. Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. Student Characteristics: Personality and Dropout Propensity, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.
- Cross, K. P. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Educational Testing Service, 1968.
- Harris, S. E. A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education. McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of. Trends in Postsecondary Education, OE-50063, 1970.
- Cross, K. P. "The Role of the Junior College in Providing Postsecondary Education for All", Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE-50063, 1970.
- Trent, J. W. "The Decision to go to College: An Accumulative Multivariate Process", Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE-50063, 1970.

McClung, R. O. Differences in Student Characteristics and Perceptions of the College Environment between Junior College Students Classified by Level of Satisfaction with Environment, Educational Classification and Sex. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1970.

Medsker, L. L. & Tillery, D. Breaking the Access Barriers. McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Medsker, L. L. & Trent, J. W. "Factors related to type of college attendance". College and Student: Selected reading in the Social Psychology of Higher Education. Ed. K. A. Feldman, Pergamon Press, 1972.

Raines, Max R. "Characteristics of Junior College Students." National Business Education Quarterly, 36, Winter, 1967-68.

Seashore, H. "Academic Abilities of Junior College Students." Junior College Journal, 29, September, 1959.

Wisgoski, A. "Characteristics of Junior College Students: Implications for Faculty and Student Personnel Specialists." Perspectives on the Community-Junior College. Ogilvie, W. K. & Raines, M. R., eds., Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Table 1
Level of Aspiration by Year by Institution Type*

| Year | Institution type | N | Level of Aspiration | | | |
|------|---------------------|--------|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | | Junior college degree | Bachelor's degree | Master's degree | Doctoral degree |
| 1968 | I | 21,770 | 26.4% | 43.1% | 17.3% | 6.8% |
| | II | 16,804 | 7.1 | 53.1 | 22.6 | 10.2 |
| | III | 69,117 | 6.0 | 54.5 | 24.2 | 9.8 |
| | IV | 73,496 | 3.8 | 49.2 | 27.1 | 14.6 |
| 1970 | I | 26,334 | 28.8 | 40.0 | 16.2 | 7.1 |
| | II | 17,235 | 8.7 | 50.4 | 21.6 | 10.8 |
| | III | 67,313 | 7.2 | 51.8 | 23.3 | 11.1 |
| | IV | 78,673 | 5.3 | 46.5 | 25.7 | 16.1 |
| 1972 | I | 24,347 | 32.8 | 36.2 | 13.9 | 8.3 |
| | II | 15,367 | 10.1 | 49.1 | 30.1 | 13.4 |
| | III | 59,197 | 8.1 | 49.9 | 21.2 | 13.7 |
| | IV | 72,362 | 6.4 | 44.6 | 22.8 | 19.6 |

*I = Junior College, II = Bachelor granting, III = Master granting, IV = Doctoral granting.

Table 2

Major Consideration Given to College Choice Factors
by Institutional Type, by Males

| Year | Institution type | N | Choice factor | | | |
|------|---------------------|--------|------------------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| | | | High scholastic standards | Low-cost | Campus tours | |
| 1968 | I | 13,064 | 41.5% | 42.9% | a | |
| | II | 8,709 | 51.7 | 27.2 | a | |
| | III | 35,018 | 49.8 | 30.3 | a | |
| | IV | 40,787 | 57.2 | 25.6 | a | |
| 1970 | I | 15,212 | 32.0 | 48.6 | 25.1% | |
| | II | 8,680 | 42.7 | 30.3 | 36.3 | |
| | III | 32,340 | 44.6 | 38.6 | 38.5 | |
| | IV | 42,926 | 48.7 | 29.0 | 38.4 | |
| 1972 | I | 12,798 | 34.1 | 54.3 | 30.7 | |
| | II | 7,464 | 46.9 | 34.6 | 43.4 | |
| | III | 28,023 | 45.5 | 39.4 | 42.4 | |
| | IV | 38,340 | 54.0 | 33.5 | 44.0 | |

^aNot reported in 1968.

Table 3

Major Consideration Given to College Choice Factors
by Institutional Type, by Females

| Year | Institution type | N | Choice factor | | | |
|------|---------------------|--------|------------------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| | | | High scholastic standards | Low-cost | Campus tours | |
| 1968 | I | 8,706 | 52.3% | 43.8% | a | |
| | II | 8,095 | 62.0 | 26.9 | a | |
| | III | 34,099 | 60.7 | 32.7 | a | |
| | IV | 32,709 | 65.8 | 26.9 | a | |
| 1970 | I | 11,122 | 39.1 | 47.4 | 31.3% | |
| | II | 8,555 | 51.2 | 29.5 | 46.3 | |
| | III | 34,973 | 51.9 | 37.8 | 47.2 | |
| | IV | 35,747 | 53.5 | 29.3 | 47.2 | |
| 1972 | I | 11,594 | 42.2 | 54.8 | 37.8 | |
| | II | 7,903 | 57.4 | 34.0 | 53.9 | |
| | III | 31,174 | 54.3 | 39.1 | 53.0 | |
| | IV | 34,022 | 60.1 | 33.9 | 55.3 | |

^aNot reported in 1968.

Table 4
Family Income by Year, by Institution Type

| Year | Institution type | N* | Income category | | | | |
|------|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | | | less than \$3,000 | \$3,000 to \$7,499 | \$7,500 to \$14,999 | \$15,000 to \$19,999 | \$20,000 and over |
| 1968 | I | 15,943 | 6.0% | 40.6% | 43.9% | 6.0% | 3.6% |
| | II | 12,000 | 8.6 | 42.8 | 38.8 | 5.3 | 4.5 |
| | III | 50,037 | 6.5 | 40.2 | 42.3 | 6.2 | 4.8 |
| | IV | 52,360 | 3.6 | 32.3 | 48.1 | 8.2 | 7.8 |
| 1970 | I | 18,506 | 4.6 | 28.7 | 50.5 | 9.8 | 6.4 |
| | II | 12,300 | 6.6 | 31.3 | 47.2 | 8.6 | 6.3 |
| | III | 47,324 | 4.4 | 28.1 | 49.2 | 10.5 | 7.8 |
| | IV | 55,138 | 2.6 | 21.4 | 51.0 | 13.1 | 12.0 |
| 1972 | I | 13,107 | 7.5 | 25.1 | 51.8 | 9.2 | 6.4 |
| | II | 8,276 | 7.0 | 27.5 | 48.8 | 9.0 | 7.7 |
| | III | 33,158 | 5.6 | 23.2 | 50.2 | 11.1 | 10.0 |
| | IV | 38,125 | 3.9 | 17.9 | 51.7 | 13.0 | 13.5 |

*N = number responding to family income item, males and females combined. Excludes responses to "I don't know" and "consider this matter confidential."

Table 5

Racial/Ethnic Background by Institution Type

| Year | Institution type | Male N | Female N | Ethnic background | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------------------|--------|----------|-------------------|------|-----------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|------|------|------|
| | | | | Afro-American | | American Indian | | Oriental American | | Spanish American | | | |
| | | | | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | | |
| 1970 | I | 15,212 | 11,212 | 1.7% | 1.9% | 0.8% | 0.9% | 1.1% | 1.1% | 0.7% | 1.1% | 0.7% | 0.4% |
| | II | 8,680 | 8,555 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| | III | 32,340 | 34,973 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| | IV | 42,926 | 35,747 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 1972 | I | 12,798 | 11,549 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| | II | 7,464 | 7,903 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.7 |
| | III | 28,023 | 31,174 | 5.0 | 6.2 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| | IV | 38,340 | 34,022 | 2.8 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |

Table 6
Type of Housing Anticipated by Males, by Year,
and by Institution Type

| Year | Institution type | N | Type of housing anticipated | | |
|------|---------------------|--------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
| | | | On-campus | Off-campus | At home |
| 1968 | I | 13,064 | 21.6% | 14.3% | 63.1% |
| | II | 8,709 | 65.9 | 7.8 | 25.6 |
| | III | 35,018 | 60.1 | 9.1 | 30.3 |
| | IV | 40,787 | 65.3 | 7.6 | 25.8 |
| 1970 | I | 15,212 | 20.5 | 16.0 | 61.3 |
| | II | 8,680 | 66.7 | 7.7 | 24.2 |
| | III | 32,340 | 58.8 | 10.0 | 29.8 |
| | IV | 42,926 | 64.1 | 9.9 | 24.2 |
| 1972 | I | 12,798 | 22.8 | 17.2 | 57.5 |
| | II | 7,464 | 67.5 | 7.8 | 22.8 |
| | III | 28,023 | 59.8 | 11.3 | 26.8 |
| | IV | 38,340 | 61.1 | 12.5 | 24.2 |

Table 7

Type of Housing Anticipated by Females, by Year,
and by Institution Type

| Year | Institution type | N | Type of housing anticipated | | |
|------|---------------------|--------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
| | | | On-campus | Off-campus | At home |
| 1968 | I | 8,706 | 27.8% | 7.7% | 64.1% |
| | II | 8,095 | 80.9 | 1.4 | 17.3 |
| | III | 34,099 | 70.0 | 2.6 | 26.6 |
| | IV | 32,709 | 73.5 | 1.9 | 23.7 |
| 1970 | I | 11,222 | 26.2 | 9.5 | 63.2 |
| | II | 8,555 | 78.4 | 2.1 | 18.6 |
| | III | 34,973 | 71.1 | 3.2 | 24.8 |
| | IV | 35,747 | 73.2 | 3.2 | 22.6 |
| 1972 | I | 11,549 | 26.6 | 11.2 | 60.8 |
| | II | 7,903 | 76.4 | 2.9 | 20.0 |
| | III | 59,197 | 70.1 | 4.7 | 24.3 |
| | IV | 34,022 | 71.5 | 5.4 | 22.1 |

Table 8

Planned Extracurricular Activities by Year,
by Institution Type

| Year | Institution type | Male N | Female N | Plan participation in | | | |
|------|---------------------|-----------|-------------|--|-------|--------------------|-------|
| | | | | Writing for campus yearbook, newspapers, etc. | | Student government | |
| | | | | M | F | M | F |
| 1968 | I | 13,064 | 8,706 | 33.2% | 53.0% | 45.8% | 50.1% |
| | II | 8,709 | 8,095 | 40.9 | 59.9 | 56.0 | 62.4 |
| | III | 35,018 | 34,099 | 35.2 | 55.5 | 51.4 | 56.4 |
| | IV | 40,787 | 32,709 | 36.9 | 55.6 | 55.2 | 61.1 |
| 1970 | I | 15,212 | 11,122 | 12.8 | 26.6 | 21.5 | 24.1 |
| | II | 8,680 | 8,555 | 15.6 | 31.0 | 29.4 | 33.3 |
| | III | 32,340 | 34,973 | 15.7 | 29.1 | 29.5 | 31.9 |
| | IV | 42,926 | 35,747 | 13.7 | 25.3 | 27.6 | 31.3 |
| 1972 | I | 12,798 | 11,549 | 14.7 | 28.5 | 23.2 | 25.4 |
| | II | 7,464 | 7,903 | 19.1 | 35.6 | 32.9 | 36.9 |
| | III | 28,023 | 31,174 | 16.9 | 31.0 | 30.3 | 32.8 |
| | IV | 38,340 | 34,022 | 16.7 | 29.5 | 31.2 | 34.9 |

TABLE 9

LEVEL OF EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION OF PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC JUNIOR
COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1968, 1970, AND 1972 COMBINED

| Sex and Type of Control | Level of Aspiration | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | Junior College Degree | Bachelor's Degree | Master's Degree Doctoral Degree |
| Males: | | | |
| Public (N = 38,764) | 23.7% | 42.4% | 16.5% 9.3% |
| Private (N = 2,310) | 14.9 | 37.8 | 19.3 20.6 |
| Females: | | | |
| Public (N = 28,214) | 38.1 | 35.8 | 14.5 4.1 |
| Private (N = 3,163) | 32.4 | 42.2 | 15.0 3.6 |

TABLE 10

MAJOR CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO COLLEGE CHOICE FACTORS BY PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC
JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1968, 1970, AND 1972 COMBINED

| Sex and Type of Control | Choice Factor | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|--------------------|
| | High Scholastic Standards | Low-Cost | Campus Tours |
| Males: | | | |
| Public (N = 38,764) | 35.4% | 49.5% | 18.3% ^a |
| Private (N = 2,310) | 39.2 | 32.6 | 28.4 ^a |
| Females: | | | |
| Public (N = 28,214) | 43.6 | 51.0 | 24.1 ^a |
| Private (N = 3,163) | 46.3 | 32.2 | 33.1 ^a |

^aIncludes only 1970 and 1972.

TABLE 11
FAMILY INCOME OF PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC JUNIOR
COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1968, 1970 AND 1972 COMBINED

| Sex and Type of Control | Income Category | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Less Than \$3,000 | \$3,000 to \$7,499 | \$7,500 to \$14,999 | \$15,000 to \$19,999 | \$20,000 and Over |
| Public | 5.6% | 31.3% | 49.1% | 8.4% | 5.6% |
| M = 38,764 | | | | | |
| F = 28,214 | | | | | |
| Private | 8.8 | 36.5 | 44.1 | 6.6 | 4.0 |
| M = 2,310 | | | | | |
| F = 3,163 | | | | | |

TABLE 12

RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC JUNIOR
COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1970 AND 1972 COMBINED

| Sex and Type of Control | Ethnic Background | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|------|
| | Afro-American | | American Indian | | Oriental American | | Spanish American | |
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Public M = 24,513 F = 19,707 | 1.5% | 2.1% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 1.0% | 1.2% | 0.7% | 0.7% |
| Private M = 1,608 F = 2,111 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 |

TABLE 13

TYPE OF HOUSING ANTICIPATED BY PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC JUNIOR
COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1968, 1970, AND 1972 COMBINED

| Sex and Type of Control | Type of Housing Anticipated | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
| | On-Campus | Off-Campus | At Home |
| Males: | | | |
| Public (N = 38,764) | 18.7% | 16.5% | 62.8% |
| Private (N = 2,310) | 69.0 | 4.9 | 24.8 |
| Females: | | | |
| Public (N = 28,214) | 21.8 | 10.3 | 66.9 |
| Private (N = 3,163) | 7.19 | 3.3 | 24.2 |

TABLE 14

PLANNED EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES OF PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC
JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1968, 1970, AND 1972 COMBINED

| Sex and Type of Control | Plan Participation In | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------|--------------------|-------|
| | Writing for Campus Yearbook, Newspaper, etc. | | Student Government | |
| | M | F | M | F |
| Public | 19.6% | 34.2% | 29.2% | 31.6% |
| M = 38,764 | | | | |
| F = 28,214 | | | | |
| Private | 25.1 | 38.6 | 39.5 | 36.7 |
| M = 2,310 | | | | |
| F = 3,163 | | | | |

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 6 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION