DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 718 JC 030 698

AUTHOR	Outcalt, Charles L.; Kisker, Carrie B.
TITLE	The Nexus of Access and Curriculum, Analyzing the Teaching of Developmental and Honors Courses within Community Colleges.
PUB DATE	2003-11-00
NOTE	36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (28th, Portland, OR, November 12-16, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Faculty; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Publishing; Faculty Workload; *Honors Curriculum; *Remedial Instruction; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This document addresses the fact that community colleges have received little attention in research literature. The biggest gap in research is about community college instructors who teach the most and least prepared students through honors and developmental courses. Data was gathered from a national survey the professional practices and attitudes of community college faculty. Out of 1,993 surveys, 1,531 were returned for a response rate of 76.8%. The results showed that 8.6% had taught at least one honors course within the two years before they completed the survey and that 26.4% had taught at least one developmental course within the same time frame. The authors used logistic regressions to better understand the relationship between variables considered. The results indicate that professors that teach honors courses are characterized by an attachment to the four year university model of instruction and research and engages in traditional scholarly/research activities. Developmental instructors are characterized by an attachment to secondary school teachers, ideas, and methods, rely upon their colleagues in high schools for advice, and often have prior experience teaching in a high school. The document concludes with a recommendation for further research of the topic. (Contains 31 references.) (MZ)

The Nexus of Access and Curriculum: Analyzing the Teaching of Developmental and Honors Courses within Community Colleges

Paper to Accompany ASHE Presentation

November 2003

Charles L. Outcalt, Ph.D.
Southern New Hampshire University; coutcalt@mac.com

Carrie B. Kisker
University of California, Los Angeles; ckisker@ucla.edu

Context: Under-researched Colleges and Curricula

Community colleges enroll approximately 5.5 million students, or nearly half of all first-time college students. In addition, they serve a disproportionately high percentage of students of color (Cohen and Brawer, 1996). Accordingly, their importance for higher education in general and educational access for students of color in particular cannot be over-emphasized.

Despite the importance of community colleges for millions of students, they receive scant attention in the research literature. For example, there have been very few studies of their curricula (Schuyler, 1999 stands as a major exception to this generalization). This gap in the literature is especially serious at the margins of the community college educational mission: We know almost nothing about the instructors who teach the most and least prepared students through community college honors programs (Bulakowski and Townsend, 1995) and developmental courses (Boylan, Bonham, Jackson, and Saxon, 1995).

Honors and developmental courses are significant for two reasons. First, they represent the "bookends" of the community college curriculum, and as such provide an understanding of the range of courses offered at community colleges. Perhaps even more importantly, developmental and honors programs form highly important links between community colleges and other types of educational institutions. Developmental courses can bridge the gap between secondary education and higher education for less academically prepared students. For their part, honors courses can act as a stepping-stone to four-year schools not only through course content, but also through their ability to enhance students' chances of acceptance at baccalaureate institutions.

Field Analysis as a Conceptual Foundation

Our understanding of the ways in which educational institutions interact draws upon the theoretical work of Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992). As these authors' notion of field analysis suggests, it is much more illuminating to understand higher education as a field within which actors (in this case, institutions of higher education) work within the context of one another than to attempt to analyze the role of individual institutions in isolation. While this concept has been applied to studies of higher education in an explicit manner only rarely (McDonough, Ventresca, and Outcalt, 2000), we have found Bourdieu's field analysis very useful in conceptualizing higher education as an integrated system in which students make, or attempt to make, transitions from one segment to another. In particular, and perhaps paradoxically, field analysis has allowed us to retain a focus on the movement of students throughout the system of higher education at the same time it has prompted us to examine those mechanisms, especially honors and remedial courses, that can impede or facilitate that movement.

The Educational Literature

Honors Programs

Although community college honors programs serve an essential function by providing educational challenges for an often-overlooked portion of the two-year college student body—the educationally well-prepared—they have received scant attention in the research literature (Bulakowski and Townsend, 1995). Those researchers who have considered honors programs have, by and large, confined themselves to single institution studies, sometimes with a special emphasis on the role of honors courses in the transfer process. In addition, several researchers have attempted to gain a national perspective on

the incidence and characteristics of honors of programs across community colleges. Finally, a few scholars have considered the implications of these courses for educational access.

Draper, Hazelton, McNamara, and Kahn's (1999) work represents a fine, if unusually broad, example of a single-institution study of a community college honors program. The authors trace the history of the honors program at SUNY Rockland, offer a discussion of the faculty's role in the program, provide an (unusual) student perspective, and conclude with a discussion of the program's benefit for other institutions. Another example of a single-institution study comes from Itawamba Community College (1999). This document, which is more forward-looking than historical in nature, outlines the plans by which Itawamba Community College (MS) hoped to create its honors program. Finally, some researchers (Laanan, 1996; Lucas, 1995) have analyzed the effectiveness of honors programs in preparing students for transfer to senior institutions.

While the educational literature contains numerous single-institution studies, they all share the limitations of the studies mentioned above. Because they focus on just one institution, they usually lack a wider, cross-institutional perspective. Further, they are very rarely concerned with outcome measures related to participation in honors programs. Finally, and most troublingly for this study, they almost never consider the characteristics of faculty who teach in honors programs.

A few authors have attempted broader studies of honors programs. While these efforts have lacked the richness of description of more narrowly focused studies, they provide a useful national perspective on program incidence and characteristics. For example, Cohen and Brawer (1996) noted that about 10% of North Central community

colleges in a 1975 study offered honors programs, with this number growing to approximately 25% by 1995 (according to Cohen and Brawer's review of *Peterson's Guide to Two-Year Colleges*). However, the 1975 study was confined to a particular region, and the *Peterson's Guide* does not contain readily accessible information on the relationship of the incidence of honors programs to other community college characteristics. Byrne (1998) conducted a comprehensive review of the educational literature on honors programs in community colleges, examining 38 honors programs in 19 states and discussing a wide range of issues relevant to honors programs, including their origins, goals, structure and course offerings. More recently, Outcalt (1999b) found that 35.8% of the community colleges in his national sample offered honors programs.

Despite the lack of strong empirical evidence regarding their availability and effectiveness, honors programs have been criticized for seeming to introduce a note of elitism into the egalitarian goals of community colleges, institutions that are supposed to provide education for everyone (Olivas, 1975). These charges have been exacerbated by limited studies showing that honors program participants are more likely to be White and female than non-honors students. Outcalt's (1999) national analysis of honors programs found a negative correlation between the incidence of honors programs and the proportion of African Americans and Native Americans and honors programs, suggesting that these programs are less available to students from these racial/ethnic backgrounds. He found further positive correlations between honors programs and the proportion of Asian American and Latino/a students in community colleges, between honors programs and institutional size, and between honors programs and the incidence of transfer courses.

Finally, he found that honors programs were negatively correlated with the incidence of developmental courses.

In short, despite the availability of a few indications of the overall presence of honors programs in community colleges, conclusions on both the incidence and effectiveness of honors programs must remain tentative, because, as Bulakowski and Townsend (1995) state, the majority of honors program research tends to be single-institution studies demonstrating elements of successful individual programs, often focusing either on student satisfaction with the program, on the demographic characteristics of student participants, or on anecdotal evidence of program effectiveness.

Remedial Programs

Remedial programs in community colleges have similarly received limited attention in the literature. Most of the studies that have been done either describe the demographic makeup of students in developmental classes, criticize or defend the existence of developmental education in general, or examine the outcomes of such programs. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (1996), 41 percent of first-time freshmen in community colleges enroll in remedial reading, writing, or mathematics courses. The majority of these students express intent to complete either an associates or a bachelors degree (Knopp, 1996). Unfortunately, however, Adelman (1996) found that students who need remediation are less likely to reach their degree objectives than are more academically-prepared students; in his words, "the extent of a student's need for remediation is inversely related to his or her eventual completion of a degree" (p. 2).

This inverse relationship between remediation and degree obtainment is especially important to consider in light of the many underrepresented minority students who enroll in remedial classes. Boylan (1999) reports that roughly one-third of developmental students across the nation are African American, and that Hispanic students also make up a significant percentage of those in need of remediation. In urban areas, the percentage of minority students enrolled in developmental classes may be even higher. For example, the Borough of Manhattan Community College reports a remedial student population that is 52 percent Black and 30 percent Hispanic (Kappner, 1991). The high numbers of underrepresented minority students in remedial courses, combined with the fact that 85.3 percent of community college faculty are white (National Center for Education Statistics, 2002), alarms some scholars who believe that minority students have a lower chance of succeeding in part because they have fewer minority role models (Kappner, 1991). Despite these concerns, however, the literature tells us almost nothing about the racial or ethnic demographics of developmental instructors.

Several other critiques of remedial programs -- and associated defenses -- are evident in the literature. For example, Boylan and Bonham (1994) note that even though the majority of remedial students are White, such programs are often accused of primarily benefiting minority students. The same researchers report that there is a common misconception that developmental programs are not cost effective. However, Boylan and Bonham (1994) argue that because the vast majority of developmental courses are taught be faculty (usually part-timers) who are already on the payroll, the cost of teaching remedial classes is actually much less than teaching in any other academic discipline.

Misconceptions about remedial courses and students often have severe repercussions. Several researchers have reported that legislators are reluctant to fund developmental or remedial programs because they believe that such courses limit access to senior institutions (Haeuser, 1993), and waste money by teaching material that should have been taught in high school (Boylan, Bonham, and Rodriguez, 2000). In order to debunk these myths, many community college scholars and practitioners have pointed out that remedial programs actually improve retention rates and increase transfer for minority and full-time students (Boylan, Bohnam, and Rodriquez, 2000; Hauser, 1993; Schoenecker et al, 1996). Boylan's (1999) research shows the same outcomes, leading him to the conclusion that "participating in developmental education at a community college equalizes the opportunity for underprepared students to be successful" (p. 3).

Who Teaches in Honors and Remedial Programs?

Despite the clear importance of honors and remedial programs courses, there have been few comprehensive studies of the instructors who actually teach in the margins of the community college curriculum; we still know almost nothing about those who choose (or are asked) to teach honors and remedial courses. (Boylan, Bonham, Jackson and Saxon, 1995; Bulakowski and Townsend, 1995). Of the studies that do exist, most focus on the preparation and employment status of remedial instructors. In 1989, the National Center for Education Statistics reported that roughly 20 percent of faculty in two-year colleges taught remedial courses, but that only 12 percent were specifically hired for this purpose. In addition, only five percent held degree credentials specific to remedial education (Mansfied et al, 1991).

Several researchers have attempted to measure whether full-time or part-time faculty are more likely to teach remedial courses (Michigan State Board of Education, 1990; Schults, 2000), but results have varied. For example, the Michigan State Board of Education (1990) reports that part-time faculty teach developmental courses much more frequently than do full-time faculty. Schults (2000), on the other hand, states that in his national study, "the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty teaching remedial courses among respondent institutions did not deviate greatly from the overall ratio found in community colleges... 60 percent of faculty teaching remedial education were full-time" (p. 4). Definitive studies that measure whether part-timers or full-timers are more likely to teach remedial courses are essential, as research has shown that full-time faculty who teach developmental courses have much more experience teaching remedial education (an average of 16+ years) than do part-time faculty (an average of 0-3 years) (Michigan State Board of Education, 1990, pp. 57-58). In addition, the turnover rate for full-timers is much lower than it is for part-timers (*ibid*).

Further and more comprehensive studies of developmental faculty are essential to our understanding of this important, albeit marginalized segment of the two-year institutional community (Boylan, Bonham and Rodriquez, 2000). Such studies of honors faculty are also necessary, as the literature on this topic is almost non-existent (Bulakowski and Townsend, 1995). This study will remedy the gap in the literature by using a national study of community college faculty practices and attitudes to investigate the relationship between teaching in honors and remedial programs and other personal and professional characteristics of faculty.

Research Questions

With the above lacunae in the literature in mind, we developed the following research questions:

1. Who teaches developmental courses within the community colleges?
2. Who teaches honors courses within the community colleges?
3. Are there any significant relationships between the teaching of remedial and/or honors courses and instructors' *personal* characteristics?
4. Are there any significant relationships between the teaching of remedial and/or honors courses and instructors' *professional* characteristics?

Methods

Obtaining the Data

Data in this study were drawn from a national survey of the professional practices and attitudes of community college faculty. The study used a survey instrument consisting of approximately 200 questions in eight pages. These surveys were mailed to 2,292 randomly selected faculty at 114 randomly selected United States community colleges in fall 2000. By January 2001, vigorous follow-up and the use of local facilitators on each campus led to the return of 1,531 of the 1,993 surveys, for a response rate of 76.8 percent. (More information on the institutional and faculty selection and distribution method is available in Outcalt, 2002).

Most survey questions were designed to illuminate one or more of several analytical categories. These questions included a wide range of measures of faculty practices and attitudes, as well as background characteristics. Respondents were asked to describe their teaching practices, the level and type of professional experience, their professional involvement in both their campus and their discipline, and opinions on their working environment, colleagues and students. Most useful for this study, they were

asked whether they had taught honors or developmental courses within the two years prior to completing the survey.

Analyzing the Data

Due to the dearth of data describing the characteristics and attributes of those who teach at the margins of the community college curriculum, our approach to data analysis was largely inductive in nature. To answer our research questions, we performed a variety of descriptive and inferential analyses, each structured so that it built upon information gained from the previous analysis. Taken together, the analyses provided multiple ways of understanding the characteristics, beliefs, attitudes, and professional associations of those who teach honors and remedial courses in community colleges. In addition, our comparative analyses helped us understand the ways in which those who taught honors and/or remedial courses differed from one another and from their counterparts.

To gain a better understanding of the background characteristics of honors and remedial instructors, and to answer our first two research questions, we performed several descriptive statistical analyses. First, we ran cross-tabulations on the data to assess whether instructors were more or less likely to report having taught honors or remedial courses when categorized by racial/ethnic group. Similar cross-tabs were performed to see if teaching honors and remedial classes was associated with holding a doctoral degree, teaching full-time, or with an instructor's years of experience.

Because the literature tells us almost nothing about the personal or professional characteristics of honors and remedial instructors in community colleges, our next step

was to run correlations to see which variables were most strongly and significantly related to teaching these courses. We performed further cross-tab analyses on the variables that showed the strongest relationships, to better understand how honors and remedial instructors differ in their characteristics, beliefs, attitudes and professional associations from those who do not teach the most and least-prepared community college students.

Our correlations and cross-tab analyses painted a very interesting picture of who teaches honors and remedial courses in our nation's two-year colleges. However, a more sophisticated statistical analysis was necessary to answer our third and fourth research questions. Thus, in our final step of data analysis, we employed binary logistic regression analyses. Binary logistic regression was the most appropriate research technique for our study, as we were working with dichotomous dependent variables (Long, 1997). This statistical procedure allowed us to isolate and analyze the effects of certain variables -- such as affiliation with a four-year university or previous experience as a high school teacher – on that person's likelihood of having taught honors or remedial courses. We used a stepwise likelihood ratio logistic regression, in which covariates entered the equation if their significance level was greater than $p <= .05$, and left the equation if that significance level exceeded $p >= .10$. Ultimately, logistic regression allowed us to analyze the predictive powers of instructor characteristics, beliefs, and professional practices on teaching at the margins of the community college curriculum.

Limitations

Because our approach to analyzing the data was largely inductive, further studies are needed to confirm and support our findings. In addition, small sample sizes for some groups, such as faculty belonging certain ethnic groups, do not allow us to draw as many firm conclusions as we would like. As well, the data are now a bit dated (fall 2000), and further studies with a newer data set would helpful in confirming or challenging our findings. Finally, we must keep in mind that honors courses are structured differently in different colleges – some treat them as extended versions of regular courses, and others offer separate classes (Outcalt, 1999b).

Results

Our results showed that 131 of 1531 respondents, or 8.6%, reported that they had taught at least one honors course within the two years before they completed the survey. In addition, 404 of 1531 respondents, or 26.4%, reported that they had taught at least one developmental course within the same time frame. Of the 1531 respondents, 479, or 31.3%, had taught either developmental or honors, and 56, or 3.7%, had taught both developmental and honors. To bring the characteristics of those who taught *only* honors or developmental courses into better focus, we also analyzed instructors who reported that they taught one or the other type of course, but not both (which heretofore will be referred to as honors only and developmental only). We found that 73, or 4.8%, of respondents taught honors but not developmental, while 336, or 21.9%, had taught developmental but not honors. Further results are shown in the tables and graphs below:

Honors Results

Table 1: Number and Percent Teaching Honors, by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number Taught Honors	Percent Taught Honors	Number Taught Honors Only	Percent Taught Honors Only
African American	6 of 74	8.1%	3 of 74	4.0%
American Indian	0 of 22	0.0%	0 of 22	0.0%
Asian American	5 of 27	18.5%	3 of 27	11.1%
Latina/o	2 of 30	6.7%	1 of 30	3.3%
White	105 of 1290	8.1%	59 of 1290	4.6%
Other	8 of 30	26.7%	5 of 30	16.7%
Total	131 of 1531	8.6%	73 of 1531	4.8%

Note: Shifts in Ns are attributable to missing data for some cells

As Table 1 demonstrates, this study uncovered interesting patterns in regard to the racial/ethnic background of those who teach honors courses. Asian Americans are far more likely than members of other (identified) groups to teach honors courses; members of other groups did not differ greatly in their teaching of honors courses. These differences persisted when we examined the characteristics of those who taught honors courses but did not teach developmental classes. However, as will be demonstrated in our logistic regression results (reported below), none of these racial/ethnic differences were statistically significant after we controlled for other instructor characteristics.

Table 2: Number and Percent Teaching Honors, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Number Taught Honors	Percent Taught Honors	Number Taught Honors Only	Percent Taught Honors Only
Doctoral Holders	41 of 232	17.7%	28 of 239	11.7%
Non-Doctoral Holders	90 of 1253	7.2%	45 of 1292	3.5%
Part-Timers	25 of 448	5.6%	10 of 467	2.1%
Full-Timers	106 of 1037	10.2%	296 of 1292	22.9%
Total	131 of 1531	8.6%	73 of 1531	4.8%

Note: Shifts in Ns are attributable to missing data for some cells

As demonstrated in Table 2, those instructors who held the doctorate were much more likely to teach honors than those without this degree. In addition, full-timers were slightly more likely than part-timers to teach honors. Interestingly, these effects were magnified considerably when we examined results for those who taught honors, but not developmental: Full-timers were ten times as likely to fall into this group as part-timers, while doctoral holders were three times as likely to be in this group as non-doctoral holders. This finding will be discussed further in our logistic regression results.

Developmental Results

Table 3: Number and Percent Teaching Developmental, by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number Taught Remedial	Percent Taught Remedial	Number Taught Remedial Only	Percent Taught Remedial Only
African American	30 of 72	41.7%	27 of 74	36.5%
American Indian	10 of 22	45.5%	10 of 22	45.5%
Asian American	9 of 26	34.6%	7 of 28	25.0%
Latina/o	9 of 29	31.0%	8 of 30	26.7%
White	339 of 1298	26.1%	283 of 1327	21.3%
Other	7 of 31	26.2%	4 of 32	12.5%
Total	404 of 1531	26.4%	336 of 1531	21.9%

Note: Shifts in Ns are attributable to missing data for some cells

As Table 3 illustrates, interesting racial/ethnic patterns emerge among those who teach developmental classes. While Whites, Asian Americans, and Latina/os did not greatly differ in the teaching of developmental classes, African Americans and Native Americans are far more likely than members of other groups to teach remedial courses in general, and are much more likely than other groups to teach remedial courses only. In contrast, professors who identify as "Other" teach developmental courses with much less frequency than any other group. Our logistic regression results (reported below) further examine these racial/ethnic patterns.

Table 4: Number and Percent Teaching Developmental, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Number Taught Remedial	Percent Taught Remedial	Number Taught Remedial Only	Percent Taught Remedial Only
Doctoral Holders	54 of 232	23.3%	40 of 239	16.7%
Non-Doctoral Holders	350 of 1257	27.8%	296 of 1292	22.9%
Part-Timers	117 of 446	26.2%	100 of 467	21.4%
Full-Timers	287 of 1043	27.6%	236 of 1064	22.2%
Total	404 of 1531	26.4%	336 of 1531	21.9%

Note: Shifts in Ns are attributable to missing data for some cells

As demonstrated in Table 4, doctoral holders, non-doctoral holders, full-timers and part-timers teach remedial courses at similar frequencies. However, very few doctoral holders only teach remedial courses. Perhaps this occurs because community college professors with the doctoral degree are more likely to teach specialized subjects or to teach more advanced students. This pattern is evident in our logistic regression results as well, and thus will be discussed in further detail below.

Honors and Developmental Results

Table 5: Number and Percent Teaching Honors and Developmental, by Length of Service as Faculty

Length of Service	Number Taught Honors	Percent Taught Honors	Number Taught Honors Only	Percent Taught Honors Only	Number Taught Dev't	Percent Taught Dev't	Number Taught Dev't Only	Percent Taught Dev't Only
Less than 1 Year	7 of 102	6.9	3 of 104	2.9	23 of 101	22.8	19 of 104	18.3
1 to 4 Years	17 of 280	6.1	10 of 289	3.5	81 of 285	28.4	71 of 289	24.6
5 to 10 Years	40 of 356	11.2	18 of 362	5.0	113 of 351	32.2	89 of 362	24.6
11 to 20 Years	43 of 398	11.0	30 of 402	7.5	98 of 292	25.0	81 of 402	20.2
Over 20 Years	23 of 311	7.4	12 of 326	3.7	83 of 316	26.3	70 of 326	21.5
Total	131 of 1531	8.6	73 of 1531	4.8	404 of 1531	26.4	336 of 1531	21.9

Note: Shifts in ns attributable to missing data for some cells.

Table 5 demonstrates the number and percentage of faculty who have taught honors and developmental, categorized by length of service. As this table shows, faculty in the mid-point of their careers are most likely to teach honors or honors only. Faculty with less experience, as well as faculty with the most teaching experience, are less likely to teach these courses. The same pattern holds for faculty who teach developmental and developmental only: Those with middling years of experience are more likely to be teaching remedial courses. This finding, however, might be a reflection of the time periods in which most honors and developmental programs were created at community colleges.

To better understand the relationships between teaching honors courses and the practices and attitudes that were shown to have a statistically significant relationship to this variable, we devised a series of cross-tabulations. Simply put, these cross-tabulations allowed us to compare, in a straightforward fashion, the number and percent of those who taught in honors and responded in a particular manner with those who did not teach in honors and responded in the same manner.

Table 6: Selected Practices and Attitudes, by Teaching of Honors

	N and percent of those teaching honors who did so N=131	N and percent of those teaching ***only*** honors who did so N=73	N and percent of those ***not*** teaching honors who did so N=1,400
Published an article	71 (54.2%)**	40 (54.8%)**	390 (27.9%)**
Received a formal teaching award	73 (55.7%)**	35 (48.0%)**	433 (31.0%)**
Authored a book	32 (24.4%)**	20 (27.4%)**	145 (10.4%)**
TA'd in a 4-year course	77 (58.8%)**	46 (63.0%)**	507 (36.2%)**

Taught remedial courses	56 (42.8%)**	N/A	336 (24.0%)**
Somewhat or strongly believes important ideas in discipline come from university	50 (38.2%)**	25 (34.3%)**	325 (23.2%)**
Subscribes to community college journals	24 (18.3%)**	10 (13.7%)**	154 (11.0%)**
Average time reading student papers	2.86**	2.63**	1.84**
Developed extra-curricular activities for students	104 (79.4%)**	57 (78.1%)*	913 (65.2%)**
Applied for a grant	30 (22.9%)	20 (27.4%)	175 (12.5%)
Read community college journals	31 (23.7%)**	13 (17.8%)	190 (13.6%)**
Employed in a non-teaching job	24 (18.3%)**	14 (19.2%)	415 (29.6%)**
Prefers more time in professional association work	30 (22.9%)	16 (22.0%)	268 (19.1%)
Somewhat strongly agrees that career education and occupational training should be the major emphasis in today's community college	33 (25.2%)**	21 (28.8%)**	665 (47.5%)**
Somewhat or strongly agrees that making use of entrepreneurial activities an important element of professional life	30 (22.9%)**	13 (17.8%)**	497 (35.5%)**
Acted as a consultant	53 (40.5%)**	31 (42.5%)**	805 (57.5%)**
Believes pre-baccalaureate transfer is most important function of community college	73 (55.7%)**	44 (60.3%)**	490 (35.0%)**
Believes preparation for further formal education is most important quality students should gain from two-year college	54 (41.2%)*	37 (50.7%)**	329 (23.5%)*
Would take teaching methods classes if were to begin college	13 (9.9%)**	6 (8.2%)**	316 (22.6%)**

education again			
Somewhat strongly agrees that this college should direct more programs to the requirements of local industries and businesses	37 (28.4%)*	19 (26.0%)	551 (39.4%)**
Average number of occupational courses students in arts and sciences should take	3.42**	3.38*	3.95**
Somewhat or strongly agrees that honors programs discriminate against minority students	12 (9.2%)*	7 (9.6%)	128 (9.1%)*

* $p > .05$; ** $p > .01$

As Table 6 shows, instructors in honors differed significantly—in both statistical and practical terms—from their non-honors teaching counterparts. Honors instructors were much more likely than their non-honors colleagues to engage in activities related to research and scholarship such as publishing articles, authoring books, applying for grants, and subscribing to community college journals. Overall, honors instructors seemed more oriented toward four-year institutions, as revealed in their belief that university professors are good sources of teaching advice, and their strong views that important ideas in their discipline originate in the university. This orientation toward the university is especially evident in their high prioritization of pre-baccalaureate transfer and preparation for further formal education as important functions of the community college. Most, but not all of these differences were magnified in examinations of those who taught honors only. Interestingly, there were no substantial differences among instructors on the question of whether honors programs discriminate against minority students: teaching honors had no real relationship to instructors' attitudes regarding this measure.

Table 7: Selected Practices and Attitudes, by Teaching of Remedial

	N and percent of those teaching remedial who did so N=404	N and percent of those teaching ***only*** remedial who did so N=336	N and percent of those ***not*** teaching remedial who did so N=1127
Talks with industry-related committees or practitioners	151 (37.4%)**	124(36.9%)**	713 (63.3%)**
Taught in high school	215 (53.2%)**	169 (50.3%)**	346 (30.7%)**
Somewhat or strongly agrees that institutions place too much emphasis on remedial education	61 (15.1%)**	47 (14.0%)**	182 (16.2%)**
Finds high school teachers to be good sources of advice	222 (55.0%)**	279 (83.0%)**	462 (41.0%)**
Somewhat or strongly agrees that career education and occupational training should be major emphasis in community colleges	129 (31.9%)**	132 (39.3%)**	553 (49.1%)**
Somewhat or strongly agrees that entrepreneurial activities are an important part of professional life	103 (25.5%)**	82 (24.4%)**	420 (37.3%)**
Believes that new job entry skills are the first or second most important function of community colleges	283 (70.0)**	164 (48.8%)**	840 (74.5%)**
Attended a community college-specific meeting	108 (26.7)**	91 (27.1%)**	180 (16.0%)**
Recruited high school students	123 (30.4)**	98 (29.2%)**	470 (41.7%)**
Member of a community college-specific association	125 (31.0)**	105 (31.3%)**	223 (19.8%)**

* $p > .05$; ** $p > .01$

As Table 7 shows, instructors in developmental courses differed significantly from their non-developmental teaching counterparts. Remedial instructors were much more likely to have taught in a high school setting, and much more likely to believe that secondary school teachers are useful sources of advice. Remedial instructors are also more involved in community college-specific organizations than are their non-remedial counterparts; more developmental professors are members of community college associations and attend association meetings than non-developmental faculty. In contrast, remedial instructors are less likely to have recruited high school students for their programs, to believe that the institution places too much emphasis on remedial education, and to argue that job entry skills are the most important function of community colleges. As with the honors cross-tabulations above, these results will be explored in more detail in our regression discussion below.

Logistic Regression Results

As was discussed above, we chose to perform logistic regressions for the final portion of our analysis to understand better the relationship between the variables considered above and the teaching of honors and/or developmental courses. Logistic regression was the best choice in this instance, because our dependent variable was dichotomous, and because we wanted to assess the degree to which changes in our covariates affected the likelihood of respondents reporting that they had taught honors or remedial. In addition to the log odds ratios (under the exp(B) column) and significance levels, Table 9 and following tables show the significance of the covariate, the Wald statistic, and the degrees of freedom for each covariate.

Table 9
Logistic Regression Predicting Teaching Honors Classes at Community Colleges
N = 1106

Variable	*Exp(B)*	*Wald*	*Degrees of Freedom*	*Sig*
Authored or co-authord a published book	2.460	9.878	1	0.002
Developed extracurricular activities for students related to field of study	1.921	4.863	1	0.027
Taught courses jointly with faculty members outside department	1.719	4.336	1	0.037
Holds a doctoral degree	1.693	3.565	1	0.059
Received a formal award for outstanding teaching	1.632	3.904	1	0.048
Believes pre-baccalaureate transfer is the most important function of the community college	1.281	6.554	1	0.010
Amount of time per day spent in professional association worl	1.175	6.071	1	0.014
Number of community college specific journals read regularly	1.126	0.917	1	0.338
Talks often with industry-related advisory committees or with practitioners in field of study (negatively related)	0.342	17.044	1	0.000
If had to start career again, would take more teaching methods courses (negatively related)	0.472	3.986	1	0.046
Model chi square			90.8	
Degrees of freedom			10	

Classification Table for Dependent Variable

		Predicted		*Percent Correct*
	Observed	0	1	
	0	963	3	99.7
	1	84	4	4.5
	Overall			91.7

Table 9 presents results from our first logistic regression, in which we set teaching honors as the dependent variable, and the measures discussed above (i.e., those variables with statistically significant relationships to the dependent variable) as covariates. Most of the covariates with significant predictive power for the dependent variable were related

to traditional scholarly and research activity: authoring or co-authoring a published book, holding a doctoral degree, believing that pre-baccalaureate transfer is the most important function of the community college, and time in professional association work were all strong and significant predictors for having taught honors, as evidenced by their log odds ratios. In addition, several other variables that seemed to indicate a more general predisposition toward teaching were significant predictors of having taught honors as well, such as receiving a teaching award, and teaching jointly with faculty from other divisions. Reporting contact with practitioners and/or industry-related advisory committees and the desire to take more teaching methods courses were negative predictors for having taught honors, with log odds ratios under 1.00. Table 9 demonstrates a limitation of logistic regression: although the individual covariates presented were significant, the model was not very effective at predicting who would teach honors, most likely because so few instructors actually did so. As will be seen below, Table 10 reveals this same limitation.

Table 10, which presents results for our second logistic regression, shows the results of our equation to predict the likelihood of having taught honors, but not developmental courses. As this table shows, seven covariates proved to have significant predictive power for the likelihood of having taught honors only. Several of these variables reinforced the trend that became apparent in the cross-tabulation and regression results discussed above: They were related to engagement in traditional scholarly activities. For example, those who had authored or co-authored a published book were almost three times as likely to have taught honors but not developmental, while those who believed that pre-baccalaureate transfer is the most important function of the

community college were nearly twice as likely to have taught honors only. Interestingly, being employed full-time was a significant predictor for teaching only honors courses, but was not a predictor for having taught honors and/or developmental courses, indicating

Table 10
Logistic Regression Predicting Teaching Honors Classes Only at Community Colleges
N = 1114

Variable	*Exp(B)*	*Wald*	*Degrees of Freedom*	*Sig*
Is employed full-time	3.050	5.431	1	0.020
Authored or co-authored a published book	2.779	7.674	1	0.006
Holds a doctoral degree	2.203	5.132	1	0.023
Believes pre-baccalaureate transfer is the most important function of the community college	1.818	10.774	1	0.001
Disagrees that making use of entrepreneurial opportunities, such as partnerships with the private sector, is an important element of professional life	1.322	4.276	1	0.039
Amount of time per day spent in professional association work	1.298	10.681	1	0.001
Believes it is most important that students gain knowledge and skills directly applicable to their careers from a two-year college education (negatively related)	0.767	4.822	1	0.028

Model chi square	74.7
Degrees of freedom	7

Classification Table for Dependent Variable

		Predicted		*Percent Correct*
	Observed	0	1	
	0	997	0	100.0
	1	44	3	6.4
	Overall			95.8

that full-time employment status was more strongly related to teaching honors only.

Table 11
Logistic Regression Predicting Teaching Remedial Classes at Community Colleges
N = 1106

Variable	*Exp(B)*	*Wald*	*Degrees of Freedom*	*Sig*
Has attended a community college-specific meeting within the past three years	1.841	10.106	1	0.001
Rates high school teachers as useful sources of advice	1.409	7.667	1	0.006
Believes remedial education is the most important function of the community college	1.322	30.116	1	0.000
Talks often with industry-related advisory committees or with practitioners in field of study (negatively related)	0.312	50.997	1	0.000
Disagrees that institution places too much emphasis on remedial education	1.261	8.171	1	0.004
Number of years teaching in secondary school	1.230	17.348	1	0.000
Amount of time per day spent reading student papers or tests	1.092	5.136	1	0.023
Devotes a large percentage of class time to discussion	1.029	17.275	1	0.000
Devotes a large percentage of class time to quizzes and exams	1.028	5.214	1	0.022
Identifies as White/Caucasian (negatively related)	0.506	8.101	1	0.004
Devotes a large percentage of class time to field trips (negatively related)	0.868	7.355	1	0.007
Devotes a large percentage of class time to viewing or listening to films or taped media (negatively related)	0.942	10.659	1	0.001
Model chi square			271.3	
Degrees of freedom			12	

Classification Table for Dependent Variable

		Predicted		*Percent Correct*
	Observed	0	1	
	0	694	67	91.2
	1	165	123	42.7
	Overall			77.9

Our logistic regression results relating to the teaching of developmental courses clarify and support many of our earlier findings (see Table 11). For example, we can see that those who teach remedial classes are very engaged in community college associations; instructors who have attended a community college-specific meeting within the past three years are 1.8 times more likely to teach remedial than those who did not

attend such meetings. Similarly, the connection identified earlier between high school and two-year college teachers is also evident in the regression results. Instructors who believe that secondary school teachers are good sources of advice are 1.4 times more likely to teach remedial courses, and the more years of secondary school teaching experience a professor has, the more likely he or she is to be teaching remedial courses.

Regression results show also that those who teach developmental courses strongly believe in remedial education. Professors who believe that remedial instruction is the most important function of a community college are 1.3 times more likely to be teaching those courses. Similarly, those who disagree strongly that their institution places too much emphasis on remedial education are twenty percent more likely to be teaching developmental courses. Our results also show that remedial instructors are very committed to their work, and spend more time in instructional activities than do other professors. For example, professors who spend more time per day reading student papers or tests are almost ten percent more likely to be teaching developmental. Similarly, remedial instructors devote larger percentages of class time to discussion, quizzes, and exams.

Similar to the regressions for honors classes, results for teaching developmental courses did not show many significant effects with respect to racial or ethnic categories. There is one exception, however: White professors are almost fifty percent less likely to be teaching remedial courses than are other racial or ethnic groups. This result and its implications will be discussed further in the next section of the paper.

Table 12
Logistic Regression Predicting Teaching Remedial Classes Only at Community Colleges
N = 1114

Variable	*Exp(B)*	*Wald*	*Degrees of Freedom*	*Sig*
Identifies as Native American	5.136	7.694	1	0.006
Identifies as African American	2.543	7.286	1	0.007
Has attended a community college-specific meeting within the past three years	2.062	13.631	1	0.000
Rates high school teachers as useful sources of advice	1.409	7.314	1	0.007
Believes remedial education is the most important function of the community college	1.302	25.088	1	0.000
Disagrees that institution places too much emphasis on remedial education	1.294	9.338	1	0.002
Number of years teaching in secondary school	1.117	4.664	1	0.031
Amount of time per day spent reading student papers or tests	1.103	6.337	1	0.012
Devotes a large percentage of class time to discussion	1.026	13.810	1	0.000
Identifies racialy or ethnically as Other (negatively related)	0.144	3.894	1	0.048
Talks often with industry-related advisory committees or with practitioners in field of study (negatively related)	0.319	45.227	1	0.000
Holds a doctoral degree (negatively related)	0.586	3.949	1	0.047
Devotes a large percentage of class time to field trips (negatively related)	0.846	8.267	1	0.004
Devotes a large percentage of class time to viewing or listening to films or taped media (negatively related)	0.937	11.193	1	0.001
	Model chi square	235.8		
	Degrees of freedom	14		

Classification Table for Dependent Variable

		Predicted		*Percent Correct*
	Observed	0	1	
	0	770	45	94.5
	1	161	85	34.6
	Overall			80.6

Although racial or ethnic patterns are not clearly apparent in the remedial regression, an examination of those who teach developmental but not honors courses

uncovers a few significant racial/ethnic differences (see Table 12). For example, Native Americans are over five times more likely than any other group to teach only remedial classes. African Americans are more than twice more likely to teach developmental courses but not honors classes. In contrast, faculty who identify as "Other" are much less likely to participate only in developmental education. As well, professors who have earned a doctoral degree are almost half as likely to teach remedial but not honors courses. Finally, as Tables 11 and 12 show, our regressions for developmental instruction were slightly more powerful overall predictors of who would teach these courses.

With the exception of racial/ethnic as well as educational attainment patterns, regression results for those who teach remedial but not honors courses are very similar to those for developmental instructors in general. Remedial instructors are just as engaged in community college-specific organizations; they have equivalent years of experience teaching in secondary school; they also believe high school teachers are good sources of advice; and they are as committed to their work and to remedial education as are faculty who teach both developmental and other classes. In short, other than their racial, ethnic, and educational characteristics, those who teach remedial but not honors courses do not differ significantly from their colleagues who also teach a non-remedial class.

Discussion

Toward a Typology of Instructors

Our results clearly demonstrate that there exists a significant "type" of professor who teaches honors and remedial courses. The honors instructor is characterized by an attachment to the four-year college or university model of instruction and research, as

evidenced by the higher valuations those who teach honors place on teaching advice from university professors, and their belief that important ideas in their discipline originate in the university. In addition, honors instructors engage in traditional scholarly/research activities, such as publishing and grant-writing, significantly more than their non-honors counterparts.

In contrast, the developmental instructor is characterized by his or her attachment to secondary school teachers, ideas, and methods. Remedial faculty often rely upon their colleagues in high schools for advice, and frequently have prior experience teaching in a high school. As we will discuss below, these results suggest that there exist real differences between instructors who teach honors and developmental courses.

Racial/Ethnic Considerations

As can be seen in the regression results, significant racial and ethnic patterns exist in the teaching of developmental courses, but they are not significant factors in considering those who teach honors classes. While the good news is that our results do not seem to add to fears of discriminatory practices regarding the selection of those who teach honors courses, the patterns evident among remedial instructors must not be taken lightly, and could be a cause for concern. However, while we know that African Americans and Native Americans are much more likely to be teaching remedial but not honors courses, we can only speculate as to what has caused this pattern. It could signify discriminatory hiring practices and show that African and Native Americans are being employed to perform what historically have been the least desirable jobs (Cohen, 1998). However, this pattern could also signify a concerted effort on the part of community

college administrators to have their developmental faculty mirror their remedial student population in terms of race and ethnicity. Finally these racial and ethnic patterns might simply reflect a greater respect for and commitment to remedial education among minority faculty, causing them to choose to work in this area. Regardless of the reasons why these racial and ethnic patterns exist, they are important findings in and of themselves. Further research delving more deeply into why these patterns exist would be extremely valuable.

Significance for Remedial Education

Several findings are significant in relation to remedial instruction in community colleges. Happily, we have found that developmental instructors demonstrate strong commitments to and beliefs in remedial education. They believe that remedial education is central to the community college mission, and spend more time per day reading student papers and facilitating learning through class discussions and quizzes than non-developmental faculty. The commitment to remedial education shown by those who teach it is impressive in itself, but is all the more important given developmental education's unique role in facilitating access to the transfer curricula for millions of students, especially those who might fall into groups under-represented within four-year higher education..

Significance for Honors Education

While our results are encouraging for those who enroll in honors courses, because they indicate that honors instructors tend to be involved in their classrooms and their professions, our findings do little to address concerns that honors courses perpetuate the division between "haves" and "have nots" on community college campuses. To the extent to which honors instructors create a richer academic climate within their classrooms than is available in non-honors courses, those students who do not participate in honors classes are further disenfranchised from the educational process. While this paper is not the place to re-open the debate over the appropriateness of honors and other enrichment programs within community colleges, it is significant for that debate that our findings revealed greater levels of engagement in traditional scholarly and research activity among honors instructors.

Implications for Future Research

Research into the relationship between instructor characteristics and teaching practice at the community colleges is only just beginning. We hope that this study's findings will be the basis for future research, both with the dataset we have employed here, and with other national datasets. Although we have uncovered a few significant findings with respect to racial and ethnic patterns among developmental instructors, future analyses utilizing datasets with larger numbers of minority faculty will be extremely valuable and may help to explain why these patterns exist. Second, further research that investigates the confounding effects of employment status will be useful. For example, we found that full-time employment status is a positive predictor of

teaching honors but not developmental courses, but this finding should be contextualized by research into which types of instructors are given the opportunity to teach honors. In other words, do some institutions reserve honors courses for full-timers? In addition, deeper analyses of how honors and remedial courses can function as bridges between community colleges and other types of educational institution would be very valuable. Such research would allow us to explore further the inquiries suggested by Bourdieu's notions of field analysis and, at the same time, would allow us to probe the role of honors and developmental courses in educational access—both to community colleges, and to baccalaureate institutions. Qualitative methods might be very helpful in elucidating these processes. Finally, in-depth qualitative studies of the teaching practices utilized in honors and remedial courses would also be valuable additions to the literature.

In conclusion, this study uncovered significant differences between those who teach honors and those who teach developmental courses. Some of these differences are merely interesting from an academic perspective, but others have real implications for pedagogical styles, and educational equity and deserve further consideration and research.

The attachments honors and developmental instructors demonstrate to pre- and post- community college institutions (i.e., to high schools and baccalaureate granting colleges and universities) demonstrate the extent to which the community college curriculum is intertwined with the educational system as a whole. Fro those students who take them, honors and remedial courses can effectively function as bridges between different levels of education and, subsequently, play important roles in ensuring access and success in higher education

Works Cited

Adelman, C. (1996, October 4). The truth about remedial work. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* A56.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boylan, H. R., & Bonham, B. S. (1994). Seven myths about developmental education. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 10*(2), 5-12.

Boylan, H. R., Bonham, B. S., Jackson, J., & Saxon, D. P. (1995). Staffing patterns in developmental education programs: Faculty salaries, tenure, funding, and class size. *Research in Developmental Education, 12*(1). Boone, N.C.: Appalachian State University.

Boylan, H. R. (1999). Harvard symposium 2000: Developmental education. Demographics, outcomes, and activities. *Journal of Developmental Education, 23*(2), 2-8.

Boylan, H. R., Bonham, B. S., & Rodriguez, L. M. (2000). What are remedial courses and do they work: Results of national and local studies. *The Learning Assistance Review, 5*(1), 5-14.

Bulakowski, C., & Townsend, B. K. (1995). Evaluation of a community college honors program: Problems and possibilities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 19*(6), 485-499.

Byrne, J. P. (1998). Honors programs in community colleges: A review of recent issues and literature. *Community College Review, 26*(2), 67-81.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F.B. (1996). *The American community college* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A. M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Draper, S., Hazelton, N., McNamara, J., & Kahn, R. (1999, April). *The mentor/talented students honors program at SUNY Rockland.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Community Colleges, Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED436214)

Hauser, P. N. (1993). *Public accountability and developmental (remedial) education.* Arnold, MD: Anne Arundel Community College, Office of Planning and Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED356003)

Itawamba Community College (1999). *Honors 21st Century.* Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED432348)

Kappner, A. S. (1991, April). *The role of leadership in planning and implementing diversity.* Paper presented at the 71st annual National Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Kansas City, Missouri. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED333910)

Knopp, L. (1996). Remedial education: An undergraduate student profile. *American Council on Education: Research Briefs, 6*(8), 1-11.

Laanan, F. S. (1996, November). *Building bridges between the segments: A study of community college transfers.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the California Association for Institutional Research, Costa Mesa, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED400889)

Long, J. S. (1997). *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables. Advanced quantitative techniques in the social sciences, volume 7.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lucas, J. A., et al. (1995). *Follow-up study of students taking honors courses, 1990-1995, Volume XXIV, Number 10.* Palatine, IL: William Rainey Harper College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397904)

Mansfield, W., et al. (1991). *College level remediation in the fall of 1989. Contractor report. Survey report.* U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED332630)

Michigan State Board of Education. (1990). *A survey of student assessment and developmental education in Michigan's public community colleges. Executive summary. Second state survey.* Lansing, MI: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED320624)

McDonough, P. M., Ventresca, M. V., & Outcalt, C. L. (2000). Field of dreams: Understanding sociohistorical changes in college access, 1965-1995. In J. C. Smart and W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XV, pp. 371-405). New York: Agathon Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). *Remedial education in higher education institutions in the fall 1995.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Digest of education statistics, 2002.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Olivas, M. A. (1975). A statistical portrait of honors programs in two-year colleges. Unpublished manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED221257)

Outcalt, C. L. (1999a). *The role of community college honors programs in student transfer to a senior institution.* Unpublished manuscript.

Outcalt., C. L. (1999b). The importance of community college honors programs. In G. Schuyler (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges: Trends in community college curriculum, 108* (pp. 59-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Outcalt, C. L. (2002). *A Profile of the Community College Professoriate, 1975-2000.* New York: Routledge.

Phillippe, K., & Patton, M. (2000). *National profile of community colleges: trends and statistics.* 3rd ed. Washington DC: Community College Press, American Association of Community Colleges.

Schoenecker, C., et al. (1996, May). *Developmental education outcomes at Minnesota community colleges.* Paper presented at the 36th annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Albuquerque, NM.

Schults, C. (2000). *Remedial education: Practices and policies in community colleges.* (Research Brief No. AACC-RB-00-2). Washington DC: American Association of Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED448811)

Schuyler, G. (Ed.). (1999). *New directions for community colleges: trends in community college curriculum, 108.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Nexus of Access + Curriculum: Analyzing the Teaching of Developmental + Honors Courses w/in Com. Colleges	
Author(s): Charles L. Outcalt & Carrie B. Kisker	
Corporate Source: N/A	Publication Date: Nov. 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Carrie B. Kisker	
Organization/Address: Graduate Student UCLA; 405 Hilgard Ave. #3051 Los Angeles, CA 90049	Telephone: 310-951-3565	FAX: 310-206-8095
	E-Mail Address: CKisker@ucla.edu	Date: 11/18/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org