

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE OF FIRST-TIME  
STUDENTS IN DEVELOPMENTAL AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL  
COURSES IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

by

Lois Martin Fears

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of  
the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
in  
Community College Education

APPROVED:

---

D.A. Clowes, Chairman

---

C.A. Atwell

---

L. McCluskey

---

D.G. Creamer

---

S.E. Massenberg

---

W.R. Sullins

August, 1982

Blacksburg, Virginia

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An extensive effort is not complete without the assistance of many persons. The researcher wishes to express her sincere appreciation to the many individuals whose cooperation and interest made this study possible. Although it would be impossible to recognize the contributions of each individual, the efforts of some do deserve special recognition.

To Dr. Darrel A. Clowes, the researcher's major advisor and graduate committee chairman, special gratitude is expressed for his guidance, support and constructive review throughout the conduct of this study.

To each of the researcher's doctoral committee, Dr. Charles Atwell, Dr. Don Creamer, Dr. Samuel Massenberg, Dr. Larry McCluskey, and Dr. Robert Sullins, appreciation is expressed for their advice and support.

To the Administrators, Faculty members, and students at Hampton Institute, Old Dominion University and the two-year college, appreciation is expressed for their participation in phases of the study.

To members of the Hampton Institute family who provided assistance and encouragement throughout this investigation, appreciation is expressed.

Finally, this study is dedicated to my husband, Freddie, and our sons, Ayron and Brett, for their deep love, prayers, understanding support, and confidence in her which made possible the completion of this dissertation. The researcher is grateful for and will always remember their many sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	4
Significance of the Study . . . . .	5
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	7
Definitions . . . . .	8
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	11
Motivational Factors for College	
Attendance of Students . . . . .	11
Demographic Variables Related to Attending	
College . . . . .	27
Sex . . . . .	27
Age . . . . .	29
Racial Background . . . . .	30
Income Level . . . . .	32
Year Graduated from High School . . . . .	34
Average Grades in High School . . . . .	35
Motivational Factors For College Attendance	
of Developmental Students . . . . .	36
Motivational Factors for Attending	
College of Adult Students . . . . .	36
Motivational Factors for Attending College	
Using the <u>Education Participation</u>	
<u>Scale (EPS)</u> . . . . .	39
Chapter Summary . . . . .	45
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	47
Population . . . . .	47
Location . . . . .	50
Collection of Data . . . . .	52
Instrumentation . . . . .	55
Data Analysis Procedure . . . . .	57

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
CHAPTER	
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	58
Description of the Subjects . . . . .	58
Analysis of the <u>EPS</u> . . . . .	60
Factor 1: Social Relationships . . . . .	62
Factor 2: Social Welfare . . . . .	63
Factor 3: External Expectations . . . . .	63
Factor 4: Occupational Advancement . . . . .	64
Factor 5: Cognitive Interest . . . . .	64
Factor 6: Escape/Stimulation . . . . .	65
Findings From Testing of Hypotheses . . . . .	73
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	73
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	
Factor One - Social Relationships . . . . .	78
Factor Two - Social Welfare . . . . .	82
Factor Three - External Expectations . . . . .	83
Factor Four - Occupational Advancement . . . . .	84
Factor Five - Cognitive Interest . . . . .	84
Factor Six - Escape/Stimulation . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	86
Hampton Institute . . . . .	86
Old Dominion University . . . . .	86
Two-Year College . . . . .	86
Summary of Findings from Testing of Hypotheses . . . . .	101
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	105
Summary . . . . .	105
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	106
Research Procedures . . . . .	107
Findings Related to the Purpose and Conclusions . . . . .	108
Recommendations Resulting From the Study . . . . .	120
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . .	120
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	122
APPENDICES . . . . .	127
A. Enrollment Survey . . . . .	128
B. Correspondence from Dr. Boshier . . . . .	133
C. Directions for Administering the <u>EPS</u> . . . . .	135

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

APPENDICES (Continued)

D. Distribution of Subjects by Sex and Age . . . . .	137
E. Distribution of Subjects by Race/Ethnic Background . . .	139
F. Distribution of Subjects by Family or Personal Income if Single . . . . .	141
G. Distribution of Subjects by When They Graduated From High School . . . . .	143
H. Distribution of Subjects by High School Grade Average . . . . .	145
I. Principal Component Factor Analysis: Unrotated Factor Pattern Matrix . . . . .	147
J. Factor Responses From Study by Governanti and Findings for all Students, Developmental Students and Non-Developmental Students . . . . .	149

VITA . . . . .	151
----------------	-----

ABSTRACT

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Sample, Record of Responses, and Institutional Enrollments . . . . .	1
2 Principal Component Factor Analysis: Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix . . . . .	61
3 Summary of t-tests Comparing Developmental Students at Three Institutions on Six <u>EPS</u> Factors . . . . .	74
4 Summary of <u>EPS</u> Mean Factor Scores for Developmental and Non-Developmental Students Within Three Types of Institutions . . . . .	75
5 One Way Analysis of Variance for the Six <u>EPS</u> Factors Within Groups Across the Three Types of Institutions . . . . .	79
6 The Scheffé Post Hoc Contrast With Raw Factor Scores and Standard Deviation Scores on Six Motivational Factors . . . . .	80
7 Summary of Combined <u>EPS</u> Mean Factor Scores for Developmental and Non-Developmental Students Within the Three Types of Institutions . . . . .	81
8 Summary of t-tests Comparing Developmental and Non-Developmental Students at Three Institutions on Two Demographic Variables . . . . .	87
9 Summary of One-Way Analysis for Institutional Contrast on Demographic Factors . . . . .	89
10 The Scheffé Post Hoc Contrast With Raw Variable Scores and Standard Deviation Scores on Demographic Variables . . . . .	90
11 Frequency Distribution of Sex for Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	91
12 Frequency Distribution of Sex for Non-Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	93

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE	Page
13 Frequency Distribution of Race for Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	94
14 Frequency Distribution of Race for Non-Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	95
15 Frequency Distribution of Data on Date of Graduation From High School for Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	96
16 Frequency Distribution of Data on Date of Graduation From High School for Non-Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	98
17 Frequency Distribution of Data on High School Grade Average for Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	99
18 Frequency Distribution of Data on High School Grade Averages for Non-Developmental Students Within and Across Institutions . . . . .	100
D.1 Distribution of Subjects by Sex and Age . . . . .	138
E.1 Distribution of Subjects by Race/Ethnic Background . . . . .	140
F.1 Distribution of Subjects by Family or Personal Income if Single . . . . .	142
G.1 Distribution of Subjects by When They Graduated From High School . . . . .	144
H.1 Distribution of Subjects by High School Grade Averages . . . . .	146
I.1 Principal Component Factor Analysis: Unrotated Factor Pattern Matrix . . . . .	148
J.1 Factor Responses From Study by Governanti and Findings For All Students, Developmental Students and Non-Developmental Students . . . . .	150

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the motivation of developmental and non-developmental students as they perceived their reasons for college attendance. Higher education has been viewed from different perspectives over the years. Some authors suggest that education should lead to a culmination of utilitarian skills in a narrow area of expertise which will enable one to pursue a trade and earn a living. However, there are those who contend that education ought to be general or liberal in contrast to those who believe education should be committed to the transmission of specialized skills and knowledge (Feldman, 1972). According to Whitehead (1929) education should be useful, should involve the art of utilizing knowledge, and should encompass self-development. Similarly, Bowen (1977) states the task of education is to change students in both the cognitive and affective aspects of their personalities and to prepare them for practical affairs.

Institutions of higher education may be better able to meet students' needs if they know why students enroll in and attend college. It seems reasonable to suggest that a clear idea of why students are in attendance would enable institutions to provide programs which would encourage goal directedness and commitment on the part of students.



The egalitarian philosophy behind much of higher education today encourages college attendance but produces a diverse student population. Increasing numbers of our nation's high school graduates are college-bound: with an increase from four percent in 1900 to 40% in 1970 to a projection of 50% by the year 2,000 (Carnegie Commission, 1971). The fact that more students are now in college is apparent; their reasons for attending may vary, depending on the type of institution they are attending.

Since the early 1950's much research has focused on why students attended college. Most of these efforts centered around socioeconomic rewards (Kahl, 1953) and sex and intelligence (Sewell & Shah, 1968). Such factors as family pressure, peer approval, greater employment opportunities, and acceptable grades or test score results represented major motivational factors. Subsequent studies explored more traditional factors associated with college attendance such as family economic status (Nelson, 1975; Sewell & Shah, 1968; Sherif & Sherif, 1969) and ability to finance a college education. The work of Croake, Keller and Catlin (1973) indicated that vocational preparation of some sort is often the strongest motivation for attending college. Advanced education for vocational purposes has traditionally been strongly encouraged for males, while lesser importance has been placed on education for the female. Greenshields (1957) found that a higher percentage of male than female high school seniors indicated preparation for a job or training for a specified vocation as the reason for their college-going decision. Female college seniors gave

academic reasons the highest rating for motivating college attendance (Iffert, 1958) while male college seniors gave top rating to occupational reasons. National studies explored why entering college freshmen decided to go to college (Astin, King & Richardson, 1979). These studies provided much useful information about the characteristics and motivations of entering freshmen. However, they did not identify motivational factors specifically related to low ability students who are entering higher education.

According to Moore (1976) high risk or developmental students are different from traditional or non-developmental students. The conditions of developmental students upbringing were said to have depressed their intelligence and motivation. Yet there is no research that has addressed the issue of motivation and the relationship of motivation to college attendance. To illustrate the fact that data are missing, even in a major work by Maxwell (1979) no reference was made regarding the motivation of developmental students for attending college. However, there is little doubt of the relevance of motivation for attending college to understanding the success or failure of the developmental students or any student. Higher education is playing an increasingly significant role in students' development and education. There is too little understanding of the motivational factors associated with developmental students who pursue post-secondary education. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to identify motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students and to compare the motivational and

demographic factors of developmental students with non-developmental students attending different types of institutions.

### Purpose of the Study

This study sought to identify the motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students and to compare the motivational and demographic factors of developmental students with non-developmental students at different types of institutions. The specific purposes were:

1. To identify the motivational factors as defined by the Education Participation Scale (EPS) of samples of the developmental and non-developmental students attending two- and four year institutions. According to Morstain and Smart (1974) the motivational factors are Social Relationships, External Expectations, Social Welfare, Professional Advancement, Escape/Stimulation, and Cognitive Interest. A copy of the forty-eight item inventory is included as Appendix A.
2. To compare the motivational factors of developmental and non-developmental students within an institution.
3. To compare the motivational factors of developmental and non-developmental students attending different types of institutions.
4. To identify selected demographic variables (sex, age, race, family or personal income, year graduated from high school, high school grade average) of developmental and non-developmental students attending two- and four-year institutions.
5. To compare selected demographic variables of developmental and non-developmental students within an institution.
6. To compare selected demographic variables of developmental and non-developmental students attending different types of institutions.

Responses to the EPS were factor analyzed to determine what cluster of reasons or factors constituted the underlying structure of reasons for attending four-year and two-year institutions. Purposes two, three, five and six were addressed by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.
2. There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.
3. There are no differences in the demographic variables of developmental students and non-developmental students within different types of institutions.
4. There is no difference in the demographic variables of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

#### Significance of the Study

Despite the trend toward increasing numbers of developmental students in higher education, little is known about their motivations for attending college. Extensive studies have been made regarding traditional college students with emphasis on their values, attitudes, aspirations, behavior patterns, social qualities, academic potential, and personality characteristics (Astin, 1979; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Sanford, 1962). Research has not been conducted on developmental students to determine their reasons for attending college. For college students in general, some studies explored influences affecting their decisions about applying to or attending different types of colleges (Medsker & Trent, 1965; Richards & Holland, 1965).

Other studies explored freshmen students' expectations of college (Carlsmith & Aronson, 1963; Pervin, 1966). Studies by McDill and Coleman (1965), Nelson (1975) and Sewell and Shah (1968) described the influence of socioeconomic status on educational aspirations of students.

To this point, the data on students' motivational orientation to college attendance have been limited and little reference has been made specifically to developmental students. Further, previous research has presented only the status of students' responses to variables related to motivation and/or students' aspirations. In the 80's there will be a shift towards a greater proportion of older but less well prepared students in college (Spence, 1977). Thus, this study will provide useful information to higher education regarding developmental students and their motivational orientation to college.

The need for this study was revealed by Pantages and Creedon (1978) who cited the importance and influence of different types of institutional environments on student motivation and student attrition. They urged that these factors be given more emphasis in research studies. Hence, this study will provide data regarding students attending three different types of colleges. They are: (a) a four-year private residential college, (b) a four-year public primarily commuter college, and (c) a two-year public commuter community college.

Additionally, this study will provide needed knowledge about the motivational and demographic characteristics of developmental students across different types of institutions. The findings will be of

assistance to decision-makers in higher education concerned with the necessity of maintaining standards and enrollments at their institutions with a larger mix of low-achieving students. In addition, this study will contribute to the motivational orientation literature and should serve as a baseline for future research on the motivation of low-achieving students entering institutions of higher education.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to three colleges in the Southeastern Coastal area of Virginia. The basis for selection of these colleges was the inclusion of institutions with different academic and social characteristics in order to identify and compare the motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students.

More specifically, additional delimiting factors were:

1. The study focused on first-time freshmen students at the institutions included in the population.
2. The definition of the term "developmental students" varied among the three different types of institutions.
3. The study was limited to selected institutions in Southeastern Coastal Virginia and therefore its generalizability is limited.
4. The cooperation of faculty at the three institutions in administering the questionnaire varied.
5. Conclusions were based on varying response rates at the three institutions.
6. Part-time and full-time developmental and non-developmental students were combined in this study.

## Definitions

In order to clarify the meanings of terms associated with this study, the following definitions are provided:

Developmental Students. Those students enrolled in special courses designed to develop their basic skills to a level that will assist them to succeed in regular college courses.

Developmental Students as Defined by Hampton Institute. Those students registered for 12 hours or less, enrolled in the basic skills courses who failed to meet the minimum admission requirements in one or more categories -- SAT scores and high school grades. These are students whose composite SAT score was less than 800 and high school grade average was less than C or 2.0.

Developmental Students as Defined by Old Dominion University. Those students on a reduced load, taking basic skills courses and admitted to the university under special conditions relative to SAT scores, class rank, and letters of recommendation. These students' composite SAT score was below 850 and high school rank was in the lower half of their graduation class.

Developmental Students as Defined by the Two-Year College. Those students enrolled in one or more courses in developmental studies. Placement in developmental studies courses was based upon the following: Developmental Reading -- a standard score of less than 15 on the McGraw-Hill Reading Test; Developmental English -- a standard score of less than 20 on the Comparative Guidance and Placement English Expression Test; and Developmental Mathematics -- a standard score of less than 14 on the Developmental Mathematics Test.

Non-Developmental Students. Those students who had been admitted to and were matriculated at an institution in a program and were taking regular college credit courses.

Developmental Programs. Special courses and programs designed for developmental students to bring their basic skills to a level that will permit them to enter regular college curriculum programs (Roueche & Kirk, 1973).

First-Time Students. Those students who were freshmen and enrolled for the first time at a two-year or four-year college.

Part-Time Students. Those students who were enrolled for less than 12 course credits in one quarter or semester at a two-year or four-year college.

Full-Time Student. Those students who were enrolled for 12 course credits or more in one quarter or semester.

Motivational Orientations. Were operationally defined by scores on the EPS factor scale (Morstain & Smart, 1977, p. 669).

Social Relationship (SR). High scorers indicate a need for personal association, participation in group activities and a desire to make new friends. They also indicate a concern for gaining insight into their personal problems, being accepted by others, and sharing an interest with acquaintances.

External Expectations (EE). High scorers indicate a need to pursue part-time study due to conditions related to instructions, suggestions and/or requirements from individuals or agencies with which they are associated. They appear to be seeking to fulfill the expectations of others as opposed to their own intrinsic interests.

Social Welfare (SW). The items comprising this scale reflect a general humanitarian concern. High scorers tend to regard their education as preparation for participation in community affairs and service to mankind.

Professional Advancement (PA). High scorers on this scale tend to perceive their educational preparation as being very vocationally oriented, leading to greater competence and higher status in their chosen occupation. They tend to be highly motivated in relation to their occupation and to possess a strong competitive desire.

Escape/Stimulation (ES). This scale reflects a need for stimulation or a desire to escape from what might be considered a dull or boring environment. High scorers on this scale tend to regard their coursework as a means of relief from everyday boredom and responsibilities, providing a contrast to their daily routine, and overcoming the frustration of everyday life.

Cognitive Interest (CI). The items comprising this scale reflect a basic inquiry motivation. High scorers tend to report that learning and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake are important reasons for their decision to undertake further education.



Sex. A self-reported demographic variable selected by the subjects from two categories, (male, female).

Age. A self-reported demographic variable selected by the subjects from six categories of ages, (under 17, 18 - 24, 25 - 34, 35 - 44, 45 - 54, and 55 or older).

Race/Ethnic. A self-reported demographic variable selected by the subjects from six categories of ethnic origin, (Black/Negro, White/Caucasian, Asian American, Hispanic, Native American, and Other).

Income Level. A self-reported demographic variable selected by the subjects from six categories of total family income or the subject's income before taxes for the last year, (\$0 - 5,999; 6,000 - 7,999; 8,000 - 12,999; 13,000 - 21,999; 22,000 - 34,999; and 35,000 +).

Year Graduated From High School. A self-reported demographic variable selected by the subjects from four categories, (This year, Last year, Did not graduate, and Other).

High School Average. A self-reported demographic variable selected by the subjects from six categories, (A, A and B, B, B and C, C, and C and D).

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This study sought to identify motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students and to compare the motivational and demographic factors of developmental students with non-developmental students at different types of institutions. The literature reviewed included selected relevant findings from two ERIC searches on motivation for attending college and findings from major national surveys describing the characteristics of freshman students and their motivational orientations to college.

This chapter consists of four discussion areas. The first area presents information relative to identifying motivational factors of students for college attendance. The second area focuses on motivational factors of developmental students for attending college. The third area focuses on reasons given for the decision to attend college by adults; the fourth area discusses the Education Participation Scale.

#### Motivational Factors for College Attendance of Students

This section of the review of literature focuses on motivational factors for attending college of freshman students in general. Studies related to selected demographic variables will be reviewed in this section also.

Dole and Digman (1967) conducted a study to identify factors determining the decision to attend college of 214 male and 306 female

freshman students from a state university. Data were obtained from a self-report inventory distributed with freshman registration material. The instrument used, "Reasons for Going to College," was developed through a series of pilot studies. Respondents were asked to show the degree of importance each of 75 reasons had in influencing their decision to attend college. Each item was rated on a four-step scale ranging from "very important" to "of no importance." Product-moment correlations were completed among 70 variables selected for analysis. Analyses and matching procedures yielded 13 major factors: Social Reasons, Conformity, Curiosity, Vocational Reasons, Academic Values, Material Values, Altruistic Values, School Influences, Experience, Avocational Influence, Science Interest, Humanities Interest and Verbal Interest (p. 249). Additional factor analysis of a dismissed college group and three diverse public school samples suggested that these major factors had considerable generality.

Sewell and Shah (1968) studied the relationship of socioeconomic status, intelligence, and parental encouragement on college plans of male and female graduating high school seniors attending public, private and parochial schools in Wisconsin. Their study revealed that "parental encouragement" was the most powerful intervening variable between socioeconomic class background and intelligence of children's educational aspirations (p. 571). Parental encouragement seemed to have its strongest effect on the college plans of males and females who scored relatively high on intelligence and who came from families occupying relatively high socioeconomic positions. For males,

socioeconomic status explained about 18% of the variance in college plans. For females, socioeconomic status explained 22.9% of the variance in college plans. Parental encouragement explained about one-fourth of the variance in the college plans of boys and about one-third of the variance in college plans for girls. The stronger relationship of socioeconomic status and parental encouragement to the college plans of females seemed to reflect the differential patterns of role expectations from adult males and females in society. College education was considered desirable and increasingly necessary for fulfilling male occupational roles, but for females, the situation was perhaps complicated by marital roles and economic considerations.

Aspects of the research conducted by Dole (1970) regarding the major purposes for going to college have implications for this study. One of the major purposes of his study was to identify the most frequently cited reasons for going to college as reported by the same students as freshmen, and in retrospect, as seniors. The freshman survey consisted of 520 subjects located at a state university who responded to the opinionnaire "Reasons for Going to College" during the freshman group testing administered by the Office of Student Personnel. The sample consisted of 206 males and 314 females. On the 78-item opinionnaire, respondents rated each item for degree of importance on a four-point scale: "0 - of no importance or does not apply; 1 - of slight importance; 2 - moderate importance; and 3 - of great importance," (p. 377).

Findings from the survey for both sexes as measured by percent of greatest importance indicated that the most frequently cited items

were (a) degree necessary for the kind of work I want to do, (b) hoped to prepare to be a success in life, and (c) a college degree means a great deal to me. In addition, "aptitude" and "opportunity for advancement" were ranked among the top ten items of great importance by the male students (p. 374). In contrast, "self-improvement," "security of employment," "most practical thing to do," and "independence" were stressed by the females. Freshmen stressed "vocational preparation," "success" and "intrinsic satisfaction" as major reasons for attending college. Males emphasized "advancement" and females emphasized "values of economic security," "self-improvement," "independence," and practicality probably as a function of perceive differences in sex role in the American culture (pp. 377-378). As cited by Digman and Dole (1967) various distinctive motivational patterns were identified that were representative of males as well as females.

Croake, Keller and Catlin (1973), in a study of 797 college students majoring in home economics from the freshman through senior year at nine universities, found that females were becoming more vocationally oriented and males less so than in the past. Subjects consisted of 55 males and 742 females. Respondents checked only one of the following six reasons for college attendance: "acquiring vocational training," "developing skills or techniques directly related to my career," "developing my knowledge and interest in community/world problems," "helping me develop high ethical standards and moral capacities," "getting a general education and appreciating ideas," and "helping me to better myself for and insure a happy married and family

life" (p. 19). This study showed that "preparation for career" was the strongest motivation for college attendance, with 52% of the students indicating this reason. "Getting a general education" was the next most frequently reported reason; it was selected by 20% of the students. "Developing high ethical standards" and "moral capacities" received the lowest percentage of responses (p. 24). Significant differences in college motivation were found between males and females. Males were more concerned than females with community and world problems, a general education, and ethical standards. Almost no difference was found in career motivation, but women reported more motivation for vocational preparation than men. Preparation for marriage and family life was more important to females than to males. Although significant yet unexplained differences were found among the universities' samples, no consistent differences were apparent.

The Chronicle of Higher Education (January, 1975) included a report of findings from a study of why students went to college that was conducted by the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. The sample consisted of more than 2,500 students at 188 institutions plus 300 students who participated in 15 regional meetings. Students were asked to name the single most important reason for their enrollment. Findings revealed that self-development and employability were the top reason given by 35% and 25% of the students respectively. Other reasons were income, sociability, and general skill development reported by 16%, 14% and 9% of the students respectively. Thirty-three percent of the students stated that the curriculum should be designed to

make college graduates more employable and that on-the-job or internships would make education more valuable (p. 17).

Some major national studies have ongoing longitudinal studies with similar objectives and findings related to selected demographic characteristics of first-time students and their reasons for college attendance. The most comprehensive longitudinal studies of freshman students are the annual reports of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The series was initiated in 1966 and was designed to determine the effects of college on students (earlier reports were under the auspices of the American Council on Education). An indepth analysis of data pertinent to this study was cited from the 1979 CIRP report.

The CIRP report which was edited by Astin, King, and Richardson (1979) identified characteristics of students entering college as first-time, full-time freshmen. The national freshman student profile was based on usable responses from 190,151 freshmen entering 362 institutions (p. 2). Information was collected by administering the 1978 Student Information Form to participants during registration, freshman orientation, or the first few weeks of class. The normative data were reported separately for men and women, as well as a composite report for all freshmen. In addition, information was presented by type of institution: public, private and predominantly black two-year and four-year colleges and universities; and a composite of all institutions. Only student characteristics pertinent to this study will be discussed.

The study included motivational factors in two categories that related to reasons for attending college. Twelve factors were listed under the first category: Reasons noted as Very Important in Deciding to go to College. They were:

1. parents wanted me to go,
2. could not find a job,
3. get away from home,
4. get a better job,
5. gain general education,
6. improve reading-study skills,
7. nothing better to do,
8. become a more cultured person,
9. make more money,
10. learn more about things,
11. meet new and interesting people, and
12. prepare for graduate school, (Astin, et al., 1979, p. 50).

For each factor, participants had to mark one of three answers: Very important, somewhat important, or not important as a possible reason for college attendance. It is noted here that some subjects gave multiple responses to a category, therefore percentages add to more than 100. The results of the study indicated that the majority (77.7%) of the freshmen in all institutions reported that they wanted to attend college "to get a better job." Of the other variables listed, 73.7% "wanted to learn more about things," 68.5% wanted to "gain general information," 63.9% wanted to "make more money," and 56.3% wanted to "meet new and



interesting people." "Nothing better to do" was given lowest priority with two percent of the students responding to this factor. All other factors received less than 50% rating from students (Astin, et al., 1979, p. 50).

Findings from predominantly black private colleges indicated that the majority (84.2%) of the students reported that they decided to go to college "to gain general education." Next of importance was "to get a better job," with 83.8% of the students in this category. Among the other variables listed, 83.2% indicated that they wanted "to learn more about things," 78.3% indicated that they wanted "to make more money," 77.6% indicated that they wanted "to prepare for graduate school," 66% wanted to "improve reading-study skills," and 62.4% indicated that they wanted to "meet new and interesting people." At predominantly black colleges more than half (60.9%) of the students reported that they wanted to "become more cultured persons." Only five percent had "nothing better to do" and 11.5% went to college because their parents wanted them to do so (Astin, et al., 1979, p. 50).

Research conducted by Astin et al., (1979) revealed that at four-year public colleges, the majority (98.2%) of the students reported that they decided to go to college "to get better jobs." The desire "to learn more about things" was the next highest category with 74.2% of the students responding to this item. Of the other factors listed, 70.1% of the students wanted "to gain a general education," 64.4% wanted to "make more money" and 57.2% wanted to "meet new and interesting people." The number preparing for graduate school (45.2%) was considerably lower than

responses indicated by respondents from predominantly black private colleges (77.6%). Of least importance to students at four-year public colleges was "nothing better to do," with only 2.3% of the responses indicated for this category (p. 50).

The majority (80%) of the students at two-year public colleges reported that also very important in deciding to go to college was "to get a better job." Of the other factors listed, 71.2% wanted "to learn more about things," 67.1% indicated to "make more money," 63.9% indicated "to gain general education" and 48.3% indicated to "meet new and interesting people." "Preparation for graduate school" received the lowest (42.5%) responses as compared with students at four-year public and four-year predominantly black, private colleges. Only two percent indicated that "they had nothing better to do" (Astin, et al., 1979, p. 50).

Differences between students at different types of institutions were reported in the priority given to the reasons noted as very important in deciding to go to college. At two-and four-year public institutions the highest priority was to "get a better job", whereas at predominantly four-year, black institutions students reported "to gain general education" as highest priority and "to get a better job" as second in importance. Students at two-and four-year public colleges reported "to learn more about things" as second in importance and students at predominantly black four-year private colleges reported "to learn about things" third. The factor, "nothing better to do," received the lowest percentage of responses at all three colleges. Two-and

four-year public college students were more similar to each other than students in predominantly black private colleges in reasons noted as very important in deciding to go to college.

The second category, Reasons Noted as Very Important in Selecting This College included the following twelve factors:

1. relative wanted me to come here,
2. teacher advised me,
3. has a good academic reputation,
4. offered financial assistance,
5. not accepted anywhere else,
6. advice of someone who attended,
7. offers special education program,
8. has low tuition,
9. advice of guidance counselor,
10. wanted to live at home,
11. friend suggested attending, and
12. college representative recruited me (Astin, et al., 1979. p. 50).

Approximately half of the students (49.1%) at all institutions indicated "has a good academic reputation" as the primary reason for selecting that college; "offers special education programs," "financial assistance," and "advice of someone who attended" ranked next. The factor "teacher advised me" was of least importance with four percent response. The majority of the students at two-and four-year public colleges and at predominantly black private colleges reported that their major reason for selecting that college was "has a good academic

reputation," However, the percentage of students responding varied at each institution with 70.5% responding at predominantly black private colleges, 44.5% at four-year public colleges and 36.3% at two-year public colleges. A similar response pattern existed for "offers special education programs" which was listed second in importance by students at all three institutions. The largest percentage was by students at predominantly black private colleges (38.3%), with a slight decline for students at four-year (29.8%), and two-year public colleges (23.1%) (Astin, et al., 1979, p. 50). Students at all three institutions reported factors related to finance third in importance. At two- and four-year public colleges students indicated "has low tuition," whereas students at predominantly black colleges reported "offered financial assistance." Of least importance to students at four-year public and predominantly black colleges was "not accepted anywhere else," whereas "college representative recruited me" was least important to students at two-year public colleges. There appeared to be no significant difference in major factors selected by students attending different types of institutions as to their reasons noted as very important in selecting a college. The differences that exist were primarily in the percentage response rate to factors from students at the different institutions.

To provide additional information from an historical perspective, a comparison of selected data from CIRP reports from 1967 through 1977 was conducted. Trends in motivational orientations of first-time students attending different types of institutions emerged.

During the late sixties, the primary motivational factor for deciding to attend college reported by students at four-year, predominantly black colleges and two-year, public colleges was the influence of "parents or other relatives." Students at two-year, public colleges ranked "low tuition" as their second influence, whereas a "good academic program" was ranked second by students at four-year, predominantly black colleges. A reverse pattern existed at four-year, public institutions. The major influence for deciding to attend college reported by students was first, a "good academic program" and second, the influence of "parents or other relatives." During the early seventies, a slight change in motivational factors for attending college occurred with students attending different types of institutions. At four-year predominantly black colleges and at two-year public colleges, a larger percentage of the students reported "to get a better job" as their primary influence for college attendance. A "good academic program" remained the second factor for students at four-year, predominantly black institutions, whereas "offer special education programs" ranked second for students at two-year, private colleges. Two factors, a "good academic program" and "to get a better job," were major influences reported by students at four-year public institutions. This pattern of responses continued for students at all three types of institutions into the late seventies. The largest percentage of students at all three types of institutions gave major consideration to a "good academic program," "get a better job," "make more money," and "learn more about things." The rank order of factors reported by students varied somewhat

at the different types of institutions. The factor "special education programs offered" was reported more by students at two-year public colleges and four-year predominantly black colleges than by students at four-year public colleges. A majority of students at two-and four-year public colleges considered "low tuition" more important in college attendance than students at four-year predominantly black colleges (CIRP, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1976, 1977). The differences in factors reported by students from 1967 to 1977 might reflect the changes made in the items on the instrument during the ten year period of time. However, the shift from "family influence" as a primary motivator for college attendance in the late sixties to "vocationally oriented reasons" in the late seventies was apparent with students attending the three types of institutions.

The American College Testing Program (ACT) conducts longitudinal studies and provides information on the diversity among students entering colleges of different types. Data was gathered on The ACT Interest Inventory and Student Profile Section instrument administered to freshmen in the enrolled-student reports sent to the institutions participating in the ACT Class Profile Service.

A comparison of data affecting college choice for the fall 1970 freshmen with the fall 1979 freshmen revealed that in 1970 students attending four-year private and public colleges and two-year public colleges rated "high scholastic standards" as the most important factor affecting their choice of college with the following percentages reported respectively, 54%, 64% and 55%. A majority of students (over

30%) considered "social opportunities" second in importance in all three institutions (students gave multiple responses to the items, therefore percentages add to more than 100). However, a larger percentage of students considered "social opportunities" more important at private colleges than at public colleges. Two factors, "low cost" and "financial aid offers" were the third set of college-choice influences reported by 39% of the students at four-year private colleges, 37% of the students at four-year public colleges, and 39% of the students at two-year public colleges. The respondents at the two-year colleges had a larger percent of students who considered "location" important than did students at four-year private schools (ACT, 1966, pp. 190-191).

In 1979, the majority of the students (54%) reported "field of study" as the most important factor affecting their choice of college. "Field of study" was rated most important most frequently by students at the three types of institutions. "Location" was rated most important by 16% of the overall group and second in importance by 25%. This factor was more important to respondents at the two-year public colleges than for students at the four-year private colleges. The third factor "tuition and cost" was rated second in importance by 25% of the students at the four-year private college, second in importance by 30% of the students at the four-year public college, and second in importance by 33% of the students at the two-year public college (ACT, 1979, pp. 104-105). Tuition and cost tended to be more important to students at the two-year public college than for students at the four-year private

college. The pattern of responses remained similar for the primary motivational factor in college attendance as reported by students at different types of institutions in the fall 1970 and fall 1979. Academic related reasons (high scholastic standards, field of study) remained the most frequently cited reasons. In 1970, "social opportunities" ranked second in importance at all three type institutions, whereas in 1979, the "location" of the college ranked second in importance. Financially related reasons remained consistent. They were ranked third in importance by respondents at all three types of institutions in the fall 1970 and in the fall 1979.

A more recent resource for gathering data on student-outcomes assessment studies at two- and four-year colleges and universities was developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) and the College Board. The Student-Outcomes Information Services (SOIS) questionnaires provide institutions with information about students' characteristics, backgrounds, goals, attitudes, satisfaction, activities, educational plans, occupational choices, and reasons for making certain decisions (Gray, Jacobson, Micek, Patrick, Renkiewicz, & Dusen, 1979). The NCHEMS - College Board SOIS questionnaires were field tested by two- and four-year institutions during 1977 and 1978. As part of the field test, the SOIS Entering Student Questionnaires were mailed during the spring and summer to 2,048 students offered admissions to a four-year institution. The final sample included 1,569 entering students (76.6%) admitted for the fall 1978 term. A portion of the information collected from the entering



students related to factors influencing their decision to enroll at that college. The findings indicated that the most frequently reported factor influencing their enrollment decision was, "range of courses available" cited by 78.6% of the entering students. The next most important reasons for attending was "convenient to attend," reported by 72% of the entering students. The third reason cited was "low cost" with 69.6% of the students citing that as an influence. Three additional reasons were reported by more than half of the entering students as influencing their decision to attend: (a) academic reputation (66.6%), (b) can work while attending (61.6%), and (c) can live at home while attending was reported by (50.9%) of the students (Gray, et al., 1979, p. 127).

In addition to citing factors influencing decisions to attend college, data was collected on the goals of entering students. The three most frequently cited goals were "prepare for a new career," "obtain a degree or certificate," and "long-range career development," reported by the entering students with the following percentages respectively, 60.2%, 56.2%, and 49.2% (Gray, et al., 1979 p. 126). The findings revealed that the largest percentage of entering students were motivated to attend college for reasons related to the academic program, location, and cost. The most frequently cited goals were job and career oriented. Participating in social and cultural activities appeared to be less important to entering students because of the smaller percentage of students citing such reasons.

Although there were differences in sampling, methodology, and instrumentation among the national surveys, the findings were similar

for the motivational factors affecting college attendance of first time students. In all three studies (CIRP, ACT, and NCHEMS) academic related reasons, job related reasons, financial reasons, and reasons related to location ranked in the top four factors as motivators in their decision to attend college.

In examining motivational factors for college attendance of freshman students in general, it was evident that reasons for attending college varied but included socially oriented factors, vocationally oriented factors, and intellectually oriented factors (ACT, 1972, 1979; Astin et al., 1967, 1979; Croake et al., 1973; Digman and Dole, 1967; Dole, 1970; Gray et al., 1979). Studies using instruments developed to measure motivational influences in college attendance yielded similar factors. Slight variations in factors existed; however, the major motivational factors appeared to be occupationally related, academically related, financially related, and related to the location of the college. It is noted that a shift in the position of the factor frequently occurred especially with the occupationally related factors and the academically related factors.

#### Demographic Variables Related to Attending College

Selected demographic variables were a part of numerous research studies that investigated motivational orientations of students. Findings from studies that included information about sex, age, race, income, year graduated from high school, and high school grade average will be summarized.

Sex. An early study by Greenshields (1957) revealed that a higher percentage of male than female high school seniors indicated

"preparation for a job" or "training for a specific vocation" as the reason for attending college (p. 218). Similarly, Iffert (1958) found that male students gave top rating to occupational reasons, whereas female students gave academic reasons the highest rating for motivating college attendance.

More recent research appeared to reflect changing sex roles and women's striving for equality. Croake, et al., (1973) reported the results of research conducted by Hartman which revealed that male and female freshmen attending the same university gave the same rank order to five reasons for college attendance, with vocational reasons receiving the highest rank. "Preparation for career" or "vocation" were the most frequent reasons given for college attendance by both male and female students (Harris, 1969, p. 17). Jones (1970) found that both male and female college students indicated "vocational preparation" as the predominant reason for college attendance. "Obtaining a higher income" was ranked second by males; however, females rated "social services" and "getting along with people" as second in importance (p. 78).

The CIRP data reported by Astin et al., (1979) stated that in all institutions the major reason noted as very important in deciding to go to college for women was "to learn more about things" which was selected by 78.4% of the students. "To get a better job" ranked second for females at all institutions with 78% of the students reporting this reason. "To make more money" ranked second for males of all institutions; it was selected by 68.9% of the males. The strongest motivator for college attendance of females at predominately black

private colleges was "to gain a general education." In contrast, the strongest motivation for males was "to get a better job." The majority of the males (79.3%) and females (80.6%) at two-year public colleges reported "to get a better job" as their top reason for attending college. Females at four-year public colleges reported the strongest motivation for college attendance was "to learn more about things," with 79.1% of the students indicating this, whereas 77.4% of the male students indicated "to get a better job" as their major priority for attendance (pp. 18, 34). Vocational preparation of some sort appeared to be the strongest motivation for college attendance. However, only negligible differences have been found to exist between males and females regarding reasons for attending college in recent studies.

Age. The rising mean age of students in universities reported by the Carnegie Commission (1971) has provided an indication of the increasing numbers of adults attending colleges and universities. As the proportion of 18 to 24-year olds declines, the average age of college student population will shift upward.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics which conducts an annual higher education general information survey (HEGIS), colleges are enrolling more persons 35 years of age and older. In comparing data on age obtained from the October 1974 Current Population Reports with data from the October 1979 survey, it was found that students 35 years of age and over represented 10.4% of the total enrollment in 1974 compared to 12.3% in 1979. The total college enrollment increased from 9.9 to 11.4 millions students, or by about

15.5% between October 1974 and October 1979 (Grant & Eiden, 1981, p. 102). Spence (1977) found that older, minority, and working people are choosing to attend higher education in larger proportions because of increased disposable income, greater educational attainment, and heightened occupational, cultural and personal needs for further education. However, research by Astin et al., (1979) did not support the predicted increase in adult students. Their findings from a national survey of college freshmen indicated that the majority of freshmen (74.2%) were 18 years old throughout all institutions. Four-year public colleges had the highest (74.9%) number of 18-year olds with predominantly black private colleges enrolling 74% and two-year public colleges enrolling 70.7%. Students in the 23 to 25 year age category had the highest (1.4%) attendance at two-year public colleges with only 0.6% in attendance at four-year public colleges and predominantly black private colleges. Even though some studies predicted an influx of older students in colleges, an analysis of data from 1978 through 1981 from the Digest of Education Statistics on the characteristics of college students 14 to 34 years of age, it revealed that the largest percentage of students enrolled in college were between 18 and 19 years of age (Grant & Eiden, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981). From an analyses of CIRP data on the age of freshmen students from 1967 through 1977 and a comparison of the fall 1970 ACT data on age, with the fall 1979 data, a consistent pattern emerged. A larger percentage of freshmen students in all studies were 18 years of age than were any other age when they enrolled in college.

Racial Background. Harris (1969) reported the results of research conducted with a sample of 660 college students as to their reasons for

attending college. A survey method was used to collect data from students attending predominantly black and predominantly white colleges. Results indicated that black students reported occupationally related reasons for attending college more frequently than whites. Black students also indicated that college attendance was important in relation to knowledge of community and world problems more frequently than white students. Whites and blacks did not differ markedly with respect to ethical and moral reasons. In general, there were only minor variations reported by black and white students regarding their instrumental and personal reasons for attending college. Studies by Gist and Bennett (1963) and Levin and Clowes (1980) found no differences between Negroes and whites with respect to educational aspiration. However, Harris (1969) contends that education may be more important for upward mobility for those who come from a low socioeconomic origin.

CIRP data on the racial background of freshmen students from 1967 through 1977 attending four-year, predominantly black private colleges, and four- and two-year public colleges were summarized. Findings revealed that the majority of all the students (94% - 97%) attending four-year predominantly black institutions were black/Afro-American. However, the proportion of black students decreased three percent from 1967 to 1977. At four-year public institutions the majority of the students (92% - 95%) identified themselves as white/Caucasian. The proportion of white students decreased about (3%) at four-year public colleges from 1967 to 1977 while the percentage of black students increased from 1.8% in 1967 to 6.1% in 1977. At two-year public

institutions the majority of the students (83% - 87%) reported that they were white. The percentage of black students at two-year public colleges increased from 3.4% in 1967 to 6.7% in 1977 (CIRP, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1976, 1977). According to the 1980 ACT report, overall, 75% of the student population identified themselves as white/Caucasian and 7% identified themselves as Afro-American/black. A profile of racial background by type of institution revealed that four-year public institutions had a slightly higher percentage of white and black students than did two-year institutions: 76% and 8%; 68% and 6% respectively (pp. 110-111).

Income Level. Sewell and Shah (1968) included the approximate wealth and income status of student's family as an index of socioeconomic status when they examined the relationship between socioeconomic status and college plans. Findings indicated that socioeconomic status explained about 18% of the variance in college plans of males but about 22.9% of the variance in the plans of women. When socioeconomic status is seen as the major factor associated with college attendance, it was more influential for females than for males (Schwartzweller & Lyson, 1974; Sewell & Shah, 1968). Higher socioeconomic status youth often go to college as an expected part of their life style (McDill & Coleman, 1965, Schwartzweller & Lyson, 1974) while lower status students may go when their families socialize them to the idea (Kandel & Lesser, 1970; Sewell & Shah, 1968).

A more recent study by Astin et al., (1979) established a profile of estimated parental income of freshman college students. Findings

pertinent to this study indicated that at all institutions, the largest percentage (16.6%) of students reported that parents' income was between \$20,000 and \$24,999. There was only a slight difference in parents' income reported by students enrolled at two-year public colleges (17.3% between \$20,000 and \$24,999) and four-year public colleges (16.5% between \$20,000 and \$24,999), whereas only 7.7% of the freshman students enrolled in predominantly black private colleges reported parents' income between \$20,000 and \$24,999. The largest percentage (13.7% higher than any other category) of students attending predominantly black private colleges reported that their parents' income was less than \$4,000 (Astin et al., 1979, p. 48).

A review of CIRP data on income for freshmen students from 1967 through 1977 who attended four-year, predominantly black colleges, and four- and two-year public colleges was conducted. The analysis of data revealed that the largest percentage of students at four-year predominantly black colleges reported that their estimated parental income was \$4,000 or less. The proportion of black students who reported \$4,000 decreased from 24.4% in 1967 to 13.6% in 1977. In 1967, nine percent reported incomes between \$10,000 - \$12,999, whereas in 1977, 10.8% reported incomes between \$10,000 - \$12,999.

At the four- and two-year public colleges, students' responses were similar. The largest percentage of the subjects at the two public colleges reported that their average parental income was between \$10,000 - \$12,999. This pattern on income existed from 1967 to the mid-seventies when the largest percentage of the students at four- and two-year public



colleges reported that their average family income was between \$15,000 - \$19,999 (CIRP, 1967, 1968, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1976, 1977).

Students in two- and four-year public colleges had larger family incomes than students in four-year predominantly black colleges. In comparing the income reported by students in the ACT survey in 1972 with data reported in 1980, it was found that at all institutions in 1972 a larger percentage of the students reported yearly incomes between \$10,000 - \$14,999, whereas in 1980 the highest percentage of students reported their average yearly income was \$20,000 and over. Twenty percent of the students reported \$10,000 - \$14,999; however, 30% reported \$20,000 and over (ACT, 1972, 1980).

Year Graduated from High School. According to Astin et al., (1979) the majority (92.8%) of the freshman students at all institutions in 1979 graduated from high school in 1979. This percentage was higher in predominantly black private colleges (94.7%) and four-year public colleges (93.8%). However, in two-year public colleges the number was slightly lower (88.2%). It was found that at two-year public colleges 3.4% reported that they graduated from high school in 1976 or earlier. The number was lower for the same year at four-year public colleges (1.3%) and predominantly black private colleges (1.2%). In comparing the date on "year graduated from high school" reported by students in the CIRP survey in 1972 with 1977, only a one percent difference was found in the students' responses. In 1972, 91.6% of the students reported that they graduated from high school this year (1972) compared

to 92.6% in 1977. These findings indicated that the majority of the freshmen entering colleges were recent high school graduates.

Average Grade in High School. Students' grades or class rank in high school is generally accepted as a primary determinant of who goes to college (Thomas, Alexander, & Eckland, 1979). The Norwegian-American cross cultural research of Schwartzweller and Lyson (1974) pointed out the importance of academic status in decision-making regarding college attendance of youth. Thomas, et al., (1979) found that collectively, class-rank, curriculum placement, and scholastic aptitude were more important in affecting college access than social class. A national study conducted by Astin, et al., (1979) reported that in all institutions, a majority of students (27%) acquired a "B" average or better in high school. In two-year public colleges 30% of the students reported a "B" average, whereas 28% reported a "B" average at four-year public colleges. The percentage of students attending predominantly black private colleges who reported a "B" average was somewhat lower (26.5%). This pattern of responses for students at different types of institutions existed for the majority of the CIRP reports. However, in the mid-sixties, the largest percentage of the students at two-year public colleges reported that their average grades in high school was a "C." By the early seventies the average grade moved to a "B" and remained there through 1979 for the largest percentage of the students attending two-year public colleges (p. 47). Thus, in all types of institutions the largest percentage of students reported that their high school grade average was "B" or better. According to Thomas et al.,

(1979), a high academic performance makes college attendance more accessible; however, major universities and "better" liberal arts colleges have become increasingly selective through the college admission process.

#### Motivational Factors for College Attendance of Developmental Students

Although studies have been conducted on the developmental student, there has been little research to test motivational parameters (Moore, 1979, p. 17). Numerous studies have focused on developmental students' past experiences, needs, interests, attitudes, abilities, aspirations and motivations (Cross, 1971). However, these have not dealt with aspects of motivation in relationship to reasons for attending college. Cross (1971) reported that the motivation for college attendance of "new students" many of whom are developmental students, does not arise from anticipation of interest in learning the things they will learn in college, but from the recognition that education is the way to a better job and a better life than that of their parents. This researcher was unable to locate research studies that examined motivational factors for college attendance of developmental students.

#### Motivational Factors for Attending College of Adult Students

This review of motivational orientation literature which tells why adults participate in higher education was undertaken because the instrument used in this study was used primarily with adult students.

Houle (1961) used the indepth interview technique to determine why twenty-two adults pursued further education. Findings from the study revealed that adult learners' reasons for pursuing further educational activity could be categorized into three basic motivational types: goal-oriented, learning-oriented, and activity-oriented. The goal-oriented learner seeks education because of a definite interest or need. These persons may be pursuing a certificate, or specific well defined knowledge or skill. Learning-oriented persons engage in learning continuously. They seek knowledge for its own sake and demonstrate this through constant reading and choice of serious television programs, as well as through becoming involved in formal learning activities. The third type of learner is the activity-oriented person who seeks primarily social contact. The educational experience for these participants is viewed as a means of meeting others.

A national survey conducted by Johnstone and Rivera (1965) explored reasons for participating in educational activity. The educational activities of a random sample of adults from about 12,000 households and a smaller random sample of recent adult education participants comprised the study. Data were gathered through interviews where respondents checked reasons for participation in educational activity in a checklist format. The survey revealed that adult education participants were primarily middle class, better educated than the average citizen, and attained higher levels of formal education and had a positive attitude toward education when their parents had formal education. Differential participation patterns were found across sex, age, and socioeconomic

groups. Younger persons were motivated by vocational considerations, whereas older persons and higher income groups reported as goals "general information," "social contact," and "spare time enjoyment." Low income persons were interested in job preparation activities whereas high income persons were pursuing job advancement goals. Women more often than men enrolled for reasons related to home-centered tasks and spare time enjoyment. Men more frequently enrolled for vocationally oriented reasons than women did.

More recently, Cross (1979) reported the results of research conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), which surveyed adult participants in some form of organized learning activity, including both college and non-college learnings. Colleges were found to be the leading providers of adult education. Again, in the NCES study participants in adult education were shown to be better educated and to have higher income than non-participants. Those who participated to "achieve practical goals" could be subdivided into two groups similar to those described by Johnstone and Rivera. The results of the study indicated that women factory workers and the disadvantaged were more likely to be pursuing education for "new jobs," whereas men, professional and college graduates, were more likely to be "seeking advancement in present jobs." Cross also reported that in a California study, women gave the following as most important reasons for participation: (a) to be better informed, (b) to gain cultural enrichment, (c) to gain personal satisfaction, (d) to meet new people, (e) to get away from routine, and (f) to be a better parent or spouse, whereas important

reasons for men were: (a) to improve income, (b) to satisfy a job requirement, and (c) to perform the job better. Thus, reasons for adults participating in educational activity were described according to level of education, income level, and sex differences.

Findings from these studies indicated that males recorded job-related reasons for participating more than women, and women recorded personal, family, and recreational reasons more than men. However, younger persons were more vocationally "goal-oriented," whereas older persons were more socially "activity-oriented." There appears to be a positive relationship between income and participation and previous education and participation.

#### Motivational Factors for Attending College Using the Education Participation Scale (EPS)

Boshier (1977) contends that there has been some well executed research in the motivational area. However, the EPS has created noticeable activity among researchers in adult education who are attempting to measure motives using instruments with known psychometric properties based on coherent theoretical formulations. This section of the review of literature will discuss studies investigated using the Education Participation Scale since the EPS is the instrument used in this study.

In the early 1960s, a series of research efforts focused on developing a conceptual model for understanding influences that lead adults to participate in higher education. The body of research has been referred to as motivational orientation research (Boshier, 1977).

Houle's (1961) three-factor typology model which classified continuing learnings as learning-oriented, goal-oriented, and activity-oriented appeared to have provided baseline data for further research related to motivational orientations. Boshier (1971) sought to explore the applicability of Houle's typology by developing an instrument to measure motives for attendance. After close examination of Houle's research and the highest loading items reported by Sheffield, Boshier developed a 48-item measure of motivational orientation called the Education Participation Scale (EPS). The EPS was administered to 233 randomly selected participants in a wide variety of non-credit continuing education courses provided by a high school and a university extension program. Factor analysis of the data yielded 14 factors before rotation. These were composed of six socially oriented, two vocationally oriented, four learning oriented, and two minor factors. The 14 factors were analyzed by principle component method and rotated to achieve oblique structure. Seven factors emerged:

1. Interpersonal improvement/escape,
2. Inner versus other directed advancement,
3. Social sharing,
4. Artifact,
5. Self-centered versus altruism,
6. Professional future orientedness, and
7. Cognitive interest.

Boshier noted that factor scoring the EPS would reveal differential motivation among different age, sex, and occupation segments of the participant population.

Morstain and Smart (1974) used the EPS to determine if adults grouped by sex and age would demonstrate differences in reason for participation. The EPS was administered to adult students enrolled in evening courses at Glassboro State College. The sample was drawn from students attending evening classes on certain evenings and was not random. Participants were asked to respond to each of the 48 EPS items on a nine-point scale (1 - very little influence and 9 - very much influence) in terms of its influence on their decision to enroll for college work. Responses were factor analyzed and the following six factors were obtained: Social Relationships, External Expectations, Social Welfare, Professional Advancement, Escape/Stimulation, and Cognitive Interest. Noticeable variations across age-sex groupings were reported. Younger adults (21-40 year) scored higher on the External Expectation scale; women scored higher on the Cognitive Interest scale; and women's scores on the Social Welfare scale declined as women became older. Further analysis of scale means for the separate age-sex groups indicated that the Social Relationships scores were the most powerful discriminators among the women's groups with the desire for developing relationships decreasing in importance as age increased. Scores on the Social Relationship scale were also the most powerful discriminators among men with younger men (21-40 years) holding much greater importance for this dimension than the older age group.

Boshier (1977) used the EPS to identify the motivational factors of adults participating in adult education classes in Canada to test hypothesized relationships between demographic variables (age,



occupation, income, education, and previous participation in adult education) and the EPS factor scores. EPS data from 242 respondents was factor analyzed. The following five factors were obtained: Escape/Stimulation, Professional Advancement, Social Welfare, External Expectations, and Cognitive Interests. The resultant factor structure was similar to findings by Morstain and Smart (1974). Findings between EPS scores and demographic variables indicated several significant correlations. The young participants were more inclined to be enrolled for "Cognitive Interest" than older participants. Older participants enrolled for "Professional Advancement," whereas younger participants enrolled for job-related reasons. Participants with less formal education and from low socioeconomic status participate more for "Professional Advancement" than those with more education and from a higher socioeconomic status. Participants with less formal education and from a low socioeconomic background were more inclined to enroll because of "External Expectations" and "Cognitive Interests," whereas those with more education and from a higher status enrolled more for "Escape/Stimulation" and "Social Welfare." No significant differences were found between four mean factor scores of participants and place of residence. However, participants who lived in their community ten years or more or less than one year were less likely to be enrolled for "Professional Advancement" than participants who lived in their community five to nine years or one to four years. No significant differences were found between mean factor scores of men and women; however, women scored slightly higher on the "Escape/Stimulation,"

"Social Welfare," and "Cognitive Interest" factors than men, and men scored slightly higher on the "Professional Advancement" factor than women.

Wolfgang (1979) studied the motivational reasons given by adults and traditional aged students for participation at the Ohio State University. Selected demographic variables (age, sex, income level, and level of parental education) were analyzed against the EPS factor scores. The six motivational factors indentified by Morstain and Smart (1974) were used in this study. Data was gathered by surveying 400 randomly selected freshmen and sophomores enrolled in four curricular academic programs. The areas of concentration were chosen because they represented the largest number of adult freshmen and sophomores. Significant differences at .05 level of significance were found between mean factor scores of traditional aged (18-22 years) students and older (23 years and above) students. Traditional aged students scored higher than older students on the motivational factors of Social Relationship (4.25 vs. 3.45), External Expectations (3.40 vs. 2.62) and Professional Advancement (5.97 vs. 5.63). Older students scored higher than traditional aged students on Cognitive Interest (6.35 vs. 5.84). No significant differences were found between mean factor scores of Social Welfare and Escape/Stimulation of traditional aged and adult learners. Comparison of demographic variables (sex, income level, and level of parental education) with motivational factors showed significant differences only in some areas. Females scored higher than males on Social Welfare, whereas males scored higher than females on Social Relationships, External Expectations and Professional Advancement.

Income was found to account for a significant proportion of variance in only Escape/Stimulation. No statistically significant relationship existed between levels of parent's education and motivational factors.

Governanti (1980) surveyed adult students attending a comprehensive community college to explore the relationship between important demographic variables (age, sex, family income, education, and occupation) and motivational orientations. Additionally, the study sought to compare the motivational orientations of traditional aged students (18-24 years) and non-traditional aged students (25 years or over). Usable data from 596 subjects comprised the sample. The EPS data were factor analyzed by principal component factor analysis with orthogonal rotation. Six factors were retained for rotation and named according to the meaning of its items, and according to a comparison with factors named by Morstain and Smart (1974). The six factors were Social Relationship, Occupational Advancement, Escape/Stimulation, Social Welfare, Cognitive Interest, and External Expectations. The results of the study revealed that traditional and non-traditional aged students enrolled in credit courses were rather similar in their motivational orientations and tended to rate each of the six factors in the same manner. "Cognitive Interest" was reported as the strongest motivational orientation for both age groups. The only significant differences found among traditional and non-traditional aged subjects were on the Social Relationship, Social Welfare and External Expectations scales. Non-traditional aged subjects had significantly lower means on all of the scales compared to traditional aged students.

However, the differences in the Social Relationships and External Expectations orientations had little practical importance since both groups held these as rather weak orientations. The only significant difference associated with age was that traditional aged subjects tended to assign slightly greater value to the External Expectation scale than the non-traditional aged subject. The results of the multiple regression analyses revealed that the "key" demographic variable (age, sex, family income, occupational status, and educational level) had little influence on the motivational orientations of the subjects. Governanti concluded that traditional and non-traditional aged students were rather similar in their motivational orientations and that "key" demographic variables played a rather minor role in influencing their motives for attending.

#### Chapter Summary

The literature reviewed revealed that reasons for attending college vary slightly with students attending different types of institutions, but there appeared to be no significant differences in factors selected. However, the strongest motivation for all students seemed to be vocationally-oriented. Even when age was a factor, younger persons were more vocationally-oriented compared to older persons who were more socially-oriented. Stability in reasons given for college attendance in research studies was found to exist. The Education Participation Scale had been used in a variety of studies where findings were similar and rather consistent. Professional Advancement and Cognitive Interest appeared to be the strongest motivational factors for attending college.

The literature reviewed did not reveal what factors motivated developmental students to attend college, what the significance of such factors were, and how they differed from students attending different types of institutions. Further, there was no investigation which identified and compared selected demographic variables of developmental and non-developmental students attending different types of institutions.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study sought to identify motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students and to compare the demographic and motivational factors of developmental students with non-developmental students at different types of institutions.

This chapter will present a description of the research procedure and methods utilized in this investigation. Descriptions of the following areas will be included (a) population, (b) sample, (c) location, (d) collection of data, (e) instrumentation, and (f) data analysis procedures.

#### Population

The target population in this study included a sample of students enrolled at three Southeastern Coastal Virginia colleges during the 1980 fall quarter or semester. The subjects were first-time, part-time or full-time students in developmental and non-developmental classes. Students were selected from the following institutions: Hampton Institute, an historically black, private, residential, four-year liberal arts institution; Old Dominion University, an historically white, public, primarily commuter, four-year liberal arts institution; and a two-year, public, commuter-oriented community college in the same geographic area. (The researcher is honoring the request of the two-year institution by not identifying it by name.)

The sample consisted of 934 students drawn from the three South-eastern Coastal Virginia colleges. All students were first-time, part-time or full-time students in developmental and non-developmental classes.

For each of the participating institutions except Hampton Institute which had a total enrollment of only 200 developmental students, EPS instruments were disseminated to 250 developmental students and 250 non-developmental students. The final sample of usable returns for developmental students from Hampton Institute was 102, or 51% of the number of instruments disseminated; from Old Dominion University, 173 or 69% of the number of instruments disseminated; and from the two-year institution, 200 or 80% of the number of instruments disseminated (Table 1).

The final sample of usable returns for non-developmental students from Hampton Institute was 200, or 80% of the number of instruments disseminated; from Old Dominion University 109, or 44% of the number of instruments disseminated; and from the two-year institution 150, or 60% of the number of instruments disseminated. Thus, 934 developmental and non-developmental students comprised the sample as shown in Table 1. It is noted here that two cases were missing from the sample (936) reported in Chapter IV which provided a Description of the Subjects, and an Analysis of the EPS. Consequently, 936 subjects' data were analyzed in providing a description of the subjects and in analyzing the EPS. However, the sample consisted of 934 subjects who responded to the EPS questionnaire and the Enrollment Survey.

TABLE 1

## SAMPLE, RECORD OF RESPONSES, AND INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENTS

Institution and Subjects	Total Questionnaires Disseminated	Total Usable Returns	Percent Usable Returns	Total Fall Enrollment First-Time Freshmen	Usable Returns as % of Fall Enrollment
<u>Hampton Institute</u>					
Developmental	200	102	51	200	51
Non-Developmental	250	200	80	770	26
<u>Old Dominion University</u>					
Developmental	250	173	69	289	60
Non-Developmental	250	109	44	1,662	7
<u>Two-Year Institution</u>					
Developmental	250	200	80	1,550	13
Non-Developmental	250	150	60	950	16
TOTAL		934			



Consequently, data from 934 subjects were analyzed for hypotheses one, two, three, and four.

The response rate to the questionnaire for some groups was low and the reasons given for such poor response varied from institution to institution. At Hampton Institute the faculty indicated that some students refused to participate. At Old Dominion the chairman of Freshman English stated that she had difficulty getting faculty to cooperate. Likewise, at the two-year college the head of the Psychology/Sociology Department reported that some faculty members refused to participate. The contact persons at Old Dominion and the two-year college stated they felt that faculty participation was poor because some faculty members did not want to take part of their class time for students to respond to the questionnaire.

### Location

Hampton Institute is a private, co-educational, four-year, residential, predominately black, liberal arts college located in Southeastern Coastal Virginia. The college offers a variety of undergraduate and graduate curricula leading to the bachelor and masters of arts degree. The college is built on Virginia's peninsula where the James and York rivers join in the city of Hampton, Virginia. The population of the city is 122,617. Two major military facilities are located in the region, Fort Monroe and Langley Air Force Base. The college's enrollment for the fall 1980-81 academic school year was 3,100 students of which 2,900 were undergraduates. Of this number 970

were first-time students. Information was secured through the office of the Registrar and the college catalog.

Old Dominion University is a four-year predominately white, co-educational, primarily commuter, state-supported, urban university located in Southeastern Coastal Virginia. The university offers a comprehensive program of liberal arts, sciences, and selected professional programs which provide opportunities sought by a broad range of undergraduate students. Several certificate programs and a wide range of programs at the masters and doctoral levels are available. The university is located in Norfolk, Virginia, which is the largest city in Virginia. The university's enrollment for the fall 1980-81 academic year was approximately 11,671 undergraduate students. Of this number approximately 1,951 were first-time students, according to information secured through the office of Planning and Analysis and the college catalog.

The two-year college is a state-supported commuter institution established as a part of a state-wide system of community colleges. The college is a comprehensive institution of higher education offering a variety of community and student services programs and transfer and career programs leading to the Associate in Arts, Associate in Science, and Associate in Applied Science degrees. Diplomas or certificates are awarded to students who complete one of the two-year and non-degree occupational curricula. The college operates under policies established by the State Board for Community Colleges and within the guidance of the College's Board. The college is located in

Southeastern Coastal Virginia and serves primarily the residents who live within a thirty-mile radius of the campus. The college's enrollment for the 1980-81 academic year was approximately 6,000 students. Of this number approximately 2,500 were first-time students. Information was secured through the office of Institutional Research and the college catalog.

### Collection of Data

This study used a survey research method to gather information about selected demographic characteristics of samples of developmental and non-developmental students enrolled at two- and four-year institutions and to identify their motivational factors for attending college. Data were gathered by a two-part survey instrument. Part one was entitled "Enrollment Survey" which asked the subjects to provide information about their sex, age, ethnic background, income, when they graduated from high school, and high school average. Part two was an adapted version of the revised Education Participation Scale (EPS) which asked the subjects to indicate the extent to which each of 40 reasons influenced them to enroll in courses at the college. Permission to use the EPS for this study was obtained through correspondence (see Appendix B) with Dr. Boshier, author of the EPS.

The instrument was administered to all subjects during the time period November 10 to November 25, 1980. Instruments were administered by faculty members at each participating institution. A copy of the Directions for Administering the instrument (Appendix C) was given to

those faculty members who assisted in collecting the data. There was no control on directions to subjects in responding to the EPS. There was no time limit for individuals to respond to the instrument; however, it was found that most subjects completed the instrument in approximately fifteen minutes. Since general procedures for collecting data varied for the three institutions, each will be dealt with separately.

Initial contact at Hampton Institute was made through the director of the Reading Center and the chairman of the Department of English. During these contacts the nature and the purpose of the study were explained. Copies of the instrument and guidelines for its administration were left with the director of the Reading Center and the chairman of the Department of English. The area of English was chosen because of access to a large number of freshman students enrolled in regular freshman English courses. Courses in developmental reading were coordinated through the Reading Center. The director of the Reading Center and faculty members who taught developmental reading courses administered the instrument to all freshman students at the beginning or ending of a regular class period. Faculty in the Department of English administered the instrument to freshman students enrolled in composition courses at the beginning or ending of a regular class period.

Initial contact at Old Dominion University was made through the chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. During this contact the nature and the purpose of the study were explained.

Clearance for use of subjects in the study was made through the University Review Board. A meeting was held with the coordinator of the Academic Opportunity Program (AOP) and faculty to explain the nature and purpose of the study because courses in developmental reading were coordinated by faculty in AOP. Copies of the instrument and guidelines for administering the instrument were left with the faculty. The faculty administered the instrument to freshman students enrolled in developmental reading classes. Subsequently, a meeting was held with the chairman of Freshman English. The area of English was chosen because of access to a large number of freshman students enrolled in regular courses. Faculty in the Department of English administered the instrument to freshman students enrolled in composition courses.

Initial contact at the two-year institution was made through the director of Institutional Research. During this contact the nature and the purpose of the study were explained. The chain of command which existed at the institution was involved as much as possible to insure maximum cooperation of division chairman, departmental heads, and faculty. Clearance for use of subjects in the study was made by the Research and Information Committee. The director of Institutional Research identified division chairmen and department heads to contact faculty who would provide the greatest access to subjects in developmental and non-developmental classes for the study. Subsequently, a meeting was held with the chairman of the Division of Developmental Studies and the head of Developmental Reading. Copies of the instrument and guidelines for administering the instrument were left

with the head of Developmental Reading. The head of Developmental Reading and faculty members who taught courses in developmental reading administered the instrument to freshman students enrolled in their classes.

In order to contact non-developmental students a meeting was held with the chairman of the Division of Business Science and the head of the Psychology/Sociology Department. Copies of the instrument and guidelines for the administration were left with them. Faculty members who taught introductory business courses administered the instrument to freshman students enrolled in their classes. Faculty who taught beginning psychology courses administered the instrument to freshman students enrolled in their classes.

#### Instrumentation

Part one of the Enrollment Survey, the demographic questionnaire, used variables thought to have bearing on why students attend college. The six variables -- sex, age, race, family or personal income, date of graduation from high school, and high school grade average, were variables responded to by checking appropriate response blanks. The demographic variables were coded as follows: Sex was coded 1 for male and 2 for female. Age was classified into six categories and given the following values: under 17 = 1, 18 - 24 = 2, 25 - 34 = 3, 35 - 44 = 4, 45 - 54 = 5, and 55 or older = 6. Ethnic background was classified into six categories and given the following values: Black/Negro = 1, White/Caucasian = 2, Asian/American = 3, Hispanic = 4, Native American = 5, and Other = 6. Income level (family or your personal income, if

single) was classified into six categories and was given the following values: \$0 - 5,999 = 1, \$6,000 - 7,999 = 2, \$8,000 - 12,999 = 3, \$13,000 - 21,999 = 4, \$22,000 - 34,999 = 5, and \$35,000 + = 6. The date of graduation from high school was classified into four categories and was given the following values: This year = 1, Last year = 2, Did not graduate = 3, and other = 4. Average grades in high school were classified into six categories and were given the following values: A = 1, A and B = 2, B = 3, B and C = 4, C = 5, and C and D = 6.

Part two, the Education Participation Scale (EPS) asked respondents to indicate the extent to which each of 40 reasons influenced them to enroll in their courses using a four-point Likert-type scale: (4) much influence, (3) moderate influence, (2) little influence, and (1) no influence. The right to left arrangement of the categories was alternated so that the choices for even numbered items ran from "much influence" to "no influence" and the choice for odd-numbered items ran from "no influence" to "much influence." The responses were recoded such that high scale values of 4 were associated with "much influence," scale values of 3 were associated with "moderate influence," scale value of 2 were associated with "little influence," and low scale values of 1 were associated with "no influence."

Boshier (1971) used the EPS inventory primarily for factor analysis of reasons for participation in adult education into clusters of motives. Morstain and Smart (1974) extended Boshier's use of the EPS by examining group differences in age-sex groupings for part-time students at Glassboro State College in New Jersey. Their factor analytic study yielded the identification of six factors. They report

reliability as calculated with coefficient alpha from .72 to .86 for each of the factor analytical scales derived for the instrument. The findings of other factor analytic studies of the EPS support the construct validity of the instrument (Governanti, 1980). The amount of variance accounted for by the factors derived by Morstain and Smart (1974) and Boshier (1977) was substantial. The six factor solution of Morstain and Smart accounted for 59% and Boshier's five factor solution accounted for 42%. Thus, the EPS appears to be psychometrically adequate for research purposes.

The instrument has been used with adult students attending state colleges and universities and community colleges. However, within the population, subjects for some studies have included traditional aged students.

#### Data Analysis Procedure

Four basic hypotheses guided this research inquiry. A series of one-way ANOVAs was used to assess the relative differences in the six motivational factors and two demographic variables (age and family or personal income). The Scheffé post hoc procedure for identifying the exact groups which differed was employed with significance level of .05. The nominal scale demographic variables (sex, race, date of graduation from high school, and average grades in high school) were summarized with percentages. A series of t-tests was used in comparing the motivational factors for developmental and non-developmental subjects and in contrasting selected demographic variables (age and family or personal income).



## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This study sought to identify motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students and to compare the motivational and demographic factors of developmental students with non-developmental students at different types of institutions.

This chapter will report findings of the study and will be divided into four sections: (a) description of the subjects; (b) analysis of the EPS; (c) findings from the testing of each hypothesis; and (d) summary of findings from testing of hypothesis.

#### Description of the Subjects

The sample of 936 students was drawn from three Southeastern Coastal Virginia colleges. Of the 936 subjects, 332 were male (35.5% of the sample) and 603 were female (64.4% of the sample) and there was one "no response" as shown in Appendix D. The subjects were divided into six age group categories. The typical age of subjects was between 18 - 24 years (83.2% of the sample). For the remaining age categories, 2.6% were under 17 years of age, 9.8% were 25 - 34 years of age, 3.2% were 35 - 44 years of age, 1.0% were 45 - 54 years of age, and 0.2% were 55 years of age or older (see Appendix D). Of the 936 subjects, 61.7% were black, 34.9% were white; 1.0% were Asian American, 0.6% were Hispanic, 0.5% were Native American, and 1.3% reported "Other." Appendix E shows the distribution of subjects by ethnic background.

Family or personal income was divided into six categories as presented in Appendix F. Approximately 18% of the subjects had family or personal incomes below \$5,999. For the remaining categories, 8.1% had family or personal incomes between \$6,000 - \$7,999, and 14.2% had incomes between \$8,000 - \$12,999. Approximately 23% of the subjects had family or personal incomes between \$13,000 - \$21,999 which was the most frequently selected category. Twenty-one percent had incomes between \$22,000 - \$34,999, and 14.5% had family or personal incomes \$35,000 and above.

There were 483 subjects (51% of the sample) who graduated from high school "this year" (1980), 184 subjects (19.7% of the sample) who graduated "last year" (1979), 21 subjects (2.2% of the sample) "did not graduate" and 246 subjects (26.3% of the subjects) responded to the category "other." Appendix G shows the distribution of subjects by the year they graduated from high school.

Average grades in high school as reported in Appendix H were classified into 6 categories. Only 3.4% of the subjects reported a high school average of "A," 19.4% of the subjects reported a high school grade average between "A and B," and 22.6% of the subjects reported a "B" average. The most frequently selected category for high school grade average was between "B and C" (31.5% of the subjects reported). For the remaining categories, 17.3% of the subjects reported a high school average of "C," and 5.8% of the subjects reported a high school grade average between "C and D."

### Analysis of the EPS

Nine hundred and thirty-six subjects responded to all 40 items on the EPS. These data were factor analyzed by principal component factor analysis with varimax rotated factor matrix of six factors. The unrotated factor patterns matrix is presented in Appendix J, while the rotated pattern matrix is presented in Table 2 with the items arranged by their loadings associated with each factor. The six varimax rotated factors and the items in each factor are also shown below. Only those items with loadings of .40 or greater are included. Item 2, "To share a common interest with my spouse or friend," item 13, "To acquire knowledge to help with other educational courses," item 20, "To help me earn a degree, diploma, or certificate," and item 27, "To provide a contrast to the rest of my life," were discarded because their loadings were less than .40.

Each factor was named according to the apparent meaning of its items, and according to a comparison with factors named by Governanti (1980). The following paragraphs list the factors, their item contents, and their item loadings.

TABLE 2  
 PRINCIPAL COMPONENT FACTOR ANALYSIS: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX

		FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
(Factor 1) SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS	Item 28	0.68139	0.04915	-0.03986	0.07929	0.09900	0.00252
	Item 24	0.63809	-0.00191	-0.15308	0.14784	-0.05715	0.07715
	Item 38	0.60933	0.23086	0.15231	0.11145	0.09974	-0.31956
	Item 05	0.59720	-0.02107	-0.03036	0.02153	0.07984	0.14346
	Item 08	0.57108	0.00939	0.06263	-0.02176	0.02314	0.39290
	Item 14	0.56272	0.22883	0.24411	0.07677	0.06618	0.03401
	Item 26	0.55747	0.31190	0.22460	0.09715	0.16947	-0.15097
	Item 31	0.54986	0.32048	0.26982	0.13542	0.09370	-0.10331
	Item 17	0.53920	1.32626	0.11784	0.17407	0.14075	-0.03171
	Item 09	0.53537	0.05529	0.20202	0.18005	-0.01292	0.18194
	Item 21	0.50445	0.10496	-0.20586	0.01965	-0.02254	0.22682
	Item 34	0.48593	-0.00711	-0.09506	0.07148	-0.01256	0.22703
	Item 19	0.47923	0.28123	0.05586	0.04509	0.14895	0.22674
Item 12	0.41942	0.00581	0.18140	-0.00662	-0.01446	0.42981	
(Factor 2) SOCIAL WELFARE	Item 39	0.14822	0.75819	0.07843	0.07920	0.03519	0.09125
	Item 22	0.06129	0.75626	0.00300	0.15916	-0.01872	0.04118
	Item 23	0.24120	0.69040	0.05397	-0.01610	0.11894	0.03038
	Item 29	0.04368	0.68063	0.14820	0.03122	0.10902	0.12059
	Item 04	0.19505	0.40416	0.17887	-0.07874	0.22044	0.21273
(Factor 3) EXTERNAL EXPECTATIONS	Item 36	0.29067	-0.04665	0.74873	-0.02228	0.05468	-0.02698
	Item 40	0.26177	0.11030	0.72675	0.01405	-0.03134	0.02921
	Item 06	0.13397	0.12053	0.61593	0.11081	-0.08792	0.13399
	Item 32	-0.00567	0.14779	0.55348	0.31635	0.12186	-0.00417
(Factor 4) OCCUPATIONAL ADVANCEMENT	Item 10	0.07024	0.09519	0.00948	0.64995	-0.10056	0.16819
	Item 18	0.04287	0.12530	0.01905	0.64079	0.02583	0.13882
	Item 15	0.25673	-0.08033	0.18927	0.54875	0.17543	0.09340
	Item 03	-0.11059	0.08679	-0.06208	0.50194	-0.01732	0.03620
	Item 30	0.34191	-0.06442	0.28110	0.47455	0.08208	-0.03411
	Item 33	0.30022	0.27410	0.11924	0.46683	-0.03126	0.02384
(Factor 5) COGNITIVE INTEREST	Item 37	0.10256	0.02954	0.00261	0.11731	0.80080	-0.08099
	Item 25	0.21518	0.12290	-0.12696	0.00046	0.76017	0.05818
	Item 07	0.12541	0.12038	0.17395	-0.07060	0.57567	0.26914
	Item 01	-0.08691	0.13593	0.07705	-0.02198	0.51274	0.22605
(Factor 6) ESCAPE STIMULATION	Item 11	0.04969	0.10611	0.09545	0.06648	0.16017	0.62109
	Item 35	0.16072	0.19026	0.08568	0.03658	0.14503	0.57417
	Item 12	0.41942	0.00581	0.18140	-0.00662	-0.01446	0.42981
	Item 16	0.21153	0.03950	0.30623	0.02986	0.02923	0.40933
DISCARDED ITEMS	Item 02	0.30819	0.05856	0.16192	0.12707	0.04115	0.19419
	Item 13	-0.05618	0.35490	0.17383	0.26214	0.20527	0.21820
	Item 20	-0.11184	0.07206	0.37023	0.11035	0.06901	0.03437
	Item 27	0.33182	0.31577	0.10917	0.09546	0.14156	0.38634

Factor 1: Social Relationships

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
28	To get a break in the routine of home work.	.681
24	To have a few hours away from responsibility.	.638
38	To make new friends.	.609
5	To get relief from boredom.	.597
8	To overcome the frustrations of day-to-day living.	.571
14	To fulfill a need for personal association and friendship.	.562
26	To become acquainted with congenial people.	.557
31	To improve my social relationships.	.549
17	To participate in group activity.	.539
9	To be accepted by others.	.535
21	To escape television.	.504
34	To escape an unhappy relationship.	.485
19	To gain insight into my personal problems.	.479
12	To stop myself from becoming a vegetable.	.419

By and large these items reflect a desire to make friends, fulfill needs for social relationships and participate in group activity. All of them are included in the Social Relationship factor derived by Governanti. Thus, this factor was named Social Relationships.

Factor 2: Social Welfare

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
39	To improve my ability to participate in community work.	.758
22	To prepare for community service.	.756
23	To gain insight into human relations.	.690
29	To improve my ability to serve mankind.	.680
4	To become more effective as a citizen.	.404

These items reflect a humanitarian concern and are consistent with the items in the factor called Social Welfare by Governanti. Consequently, Social Welfare was retained as a label for this factor.

Factor 3: External Expectations

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
36	To comply with the suggestions of someone else.	.748
40	To comply with instructions from someone else.	.726
6	To carry out the recommendations of some authority.	.615
32	To meet formal requirements.	.553

By and large these items reflect an extrinsic motivation and are included in the factor labeled External Expectations by Governanti. The same label was retained for this factor.

Factor 4: Occupational Advancement

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
10	To give me higher status in my job.	.649
18	To increase my job competence.	.640
15	To keep up with competition.	.548
3	To secure professional advancement.	.501
30	To keep up with others.	.474
33	To maintain or improve my social position.	.466

These items appear to reflect a desire for advancement within one's profession. All of the items except 33 were part of the factors called Occupational Advancement by Governanti. Therefore, the same label was retained for this factor.

Factor 5: Cognitive Interest

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
37	To learn just for the sake of learning.	.800
25	To learn just for the joy of learning.	.760
7	To satisfy an inquiring mind.	.575
1	To seek knowledge for its own sake.	.512

These items reflect an intellectual or cognitive interest in learning and are the same items in the factor titled Cognitive Interest by Governanti. Thus, the same label was retained for this factor.

Factor 6: Escape/Stimulation

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
11	To supplement a narrow previous education.	.621
35	To provide a contrast to my previous education.	.574
12	To stop myself from becoming a vegetable.	.429
16	To escape the intellectual narrowness of my occupation.	.409

These items appear to reflect a desire to escape from what might be considered a dull or boring environment. They are somewhat consistent with items found in the factor labeled Escape/Stimulation of Governanti. Item 11 and item 35 were not a part of Governanti's factors. However, the same label was retained for this factor.

In order to examine the responses of developmental and non-developmental students to motivational factors of the EPS scale, the six factors are compared by groups. The following paragraphs list the factors, their item content, and their item loading.

Factor 1: Social Relationships

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
	<u>Developmental</u>	
28	To get a break in the routine of home and work.	.659
24	To have a few hours away from responsibilities.	.636
5	To get relief from boredom.	.590
38	To make new friends.	.572
25	To learn just for the joy of learning.	.560
14	To fulfill a need for personal association and friendships.	.550



8	To overcome the frustration of day-to-day living.	.549
17	To participate in group activity.	.546
9	To be accepted by others.	.531
34	To escape an unhappy relationship.	.508
12	To stop myself from becoming a "vegetable."	.507
19	To gain insight into my personal problems.	.482
21	To escape television.	.471
31	To improve my social relationships.	.459

Non-Developmental

28	To get a break in the routine of home or work.	.736
24	To have a few hours away from responsibilities.	.645
5	To get relief from boredom.	.640
38	To make new friends.	.583
8	To overcome the frustration of day-to-day living.	.566
21	To escape television.	.557
26	To become acquainted with congenial people.	.527
34	To escape an unhappy relationship.	.509
17	To participate in group activity.	.505
31	To improve my social relationships.	.450
9	To be accepted by others.	.437
14	To fulfill a need for personal associations and friendships.	.433

In comparing the responses of the developmental and non-developmental students on the factor Social Relationships there was only one item (26 - To become acquainted with congenial people) which

appeared for non-developmental students and did not appear for developmental students. However, item 25, "To learn just for the joy of learning," item 12, "To stop myself from becoming a vegetable," and item 19, "To gain insight into my personal problems," were important variables for developmental students but were not for non-developmental students. Item 25 appeared under Cognitive Interest, and items 12 and 19 appeared under Escape/Stimulation for non-developmental students.

Factor 2: Social Welfare

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
	<u>Developmental</u>	
22	To prepare for community service.	.792
39	To improve my ability to participate in community work.	.742
23	To gain insight into human relations.	.657
29	To improve my ability to serve mankind.	.602
	<u>Non-Developmental</u>	
39	To improve my ability to participate in community work.	.785
29	To improve my ability to serve mankind.	.733
23	To gain insight into human relations.	.714
22	To prepare for community service.	.706
31	To improve my social relationships.	.440
26	To become acquainted with congenial people.	.418
4	To become more effective as a citizen.	.417
27	To provide a contrast to the rest of my life.	.406
14	To fulfill a need for personal associations and friendships.	.404

Responses were consistent for the first four items for developmental and non-developmental students under the factor Social Welfare. Items 31, 26, 4, 27, and 14 appeared only for non-developmental students. Developmental students responses to item 31, "To improve my social relationships," and item 14, "To fulfill a need for personal associations and friendships," were placed under the factor Social Relationships. Item 27, "To provide a contrast to the rest of my life" appeared under Escape/Stimulation, whereas item 26, "To become acquainted with congenial people," and item 4, "To become more effective as a citizen," did not appear under any of the factors for developmental students.

Factor 3: External Expectations

<u>EPS</u>	<u>Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
		<u>Developmental</u>	
35	To provide a contrast to my previous education.		.682
30	To keep up with others.		.553
32	To meet formal requirements.		.545
40	To comply with instructions from someone else.		.529
15	To keep up with competition.		.485
6	To carry out the recommendation of some authority.		.419
		<u>Non-Developmental</u>	
40	To comply with instructions from someone else.		.742
36	To comply with the suggestions of someone else.		.728
32	To meet formal requirements.		.609
6	To carry out the recommendations of some authority.		.604

Items 35, 30, and 15 appeared only for developmental students under the factor External Expectations. Item 35, "To provide a contrast to my previous education," appeared under the factor Escape/Stimulation for non-developmental students, whereas, item 15, "To keep up with competition," appeared under Occupational Advancement, and item 30, "To keep up with others," did not appear under any of the factors. Item 36, "To comply with the suggestions of someone else," appeared only for non-developmental students. The item did not appear for any of the factors for developmental students.

Factor 4: Occupational Advancement

<u>ESP Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
	<u>Developmental</u>	
10	To give me higher status in my job.	.776
18	To increase my job competence.	.754
3	To secure professional advancement.	.506
16	To escape the intellectual narrowness of my occupation.	.436
	<u>Non-Developmental;</u>	
18	To increase my job competence.	.602
3	To secure professional advancement.	.600
10	To give me higher status in my job.	.597
20	To help me earn a degree, diploma or certificate.	.494
15	To keep up with competition.	.448

Responses are consistent for the first three items for developmental and non-developmental students. Item 16, "To escape the intellectual narrowness of my occupation," appeared only for developmental students under the factor Occupational Advancement. However, item 16 appeared under the factor Escape/Stimulation for non-developmental students. Items 20 and 15 appeared only for non-developmental students. Item 15, "To keep up with competition," appeared under the factor External Expectations for developmental students, whereas, item 20, "To help me earn a degree, diploma or certificate," did not appear under any of the factors.

Factor 5: Cognitive Interest

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
	<u>Developmental</u>	
37	To learn just for the sake of learning.	.776
25	To learn just for the joy of learning.	.676
7	To satisfy an inquiring mind.	.611
1	To seek knowledge for its own sake.	.518
	<u>Non-Developmental</u>	
25	To learn just for the joy of learning.	.815
37	To learn just for the sake of learning.	.799
7	To satisfy an inquiring mind.	.534
1	To seek knowledge for its own sake.	.510

Consistency existed between all the items selected by developmental and non-developmental students for the factor Cognitive Interest. There

existed only a slight variation on the loading of items. Non-developmental students placed the greatest value on "To learn just for the joy of learning," while developmental students placed the greatest value on "To learn just for the sake of learning." This might imply that developmental students viewed learning as a means to an end, whereas, non-developmental students viewed learning as a more pleasurable experience.

Factor 6: Escape/Stimulation

<u>EPS Item No.</u>		<u>Loading</u>
	<u>Developmental</u>	
11	To supplement a narrow previous education.	.658
35	To provide a contrast to my previous education.	.651
27	To provide a contrast to the rest of my life.	.469
	<u>Non-Developmental</u>	
12	To stop myself from becoming a "vegetable."	.586
11	To supplement a narrow previous education.	.584
35	To provide a contrast to the rest of my life.	.578
16	To escape the intellectual narrowness of my occupation.	.474
8	To overcome the frustration of day-to-day living.	.439
19	To gain insight into my personal problems.	.411

Item 27 appeared only for developmental students. However, non-developmental students included item 27, "To provide a contrast to the

rest of my life," under the factor Social Welfare. Items 12, 16, 8, and 19 appeared only for non-developmental students for the factor Escape/Stimulation. Developmental students included item 12, "To stop myself from becoming a vegetable," item 8, "To overcome the frustration of day-to-day living," and item 19, "To gain insight into my personal problems," under the factor Social Relationships, whereas, item 16, "To escape the intellectual narrowness of my occupation," was included under Occupational Advancement.

Developmental and non-developmental students appeared to be more alike than different in their responses to the motivational factors. Responses were similar for the factors Social Relations, Social Welfare and Cognitive Interest with Cognitive Interest responses being identical. The greatest difference in response to items appeared for the factor External Expectations. Only three items (6, 32, and 40) appeared for both developmental and non-developmental students. A similar pattern of responses appeared for Occupational Advancement. Responses were consistent for items 10, 18, and 3; however, the loadings for developmental students were slightly higher than non-developmental students.

Comparison of the motivational factors for developmental students, non-developmental students, and combined developmental and non-developmental students with findings from Governanti's (1980) study indicated similar responses for the factors Social Relationships, External Expectations, Social Welfare, and Cognitive Interest with Cognitive Interest being evenly matched. Differences in responses appeared for Escape/Stimulation and Occupational Advancement. The

majority of the items which appeared under Escape/Stimulation in Governanti's study loaded under Social Relationships for all groups (see Appendix K).

#### Findings From Testing of Hypotheses

Consistent with the purpose of identifying the motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students and comparing the motivational and demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students at different types of institutions, four hypotheses are presented with a discussion of the data and findings for each. The a priori criterion of significance was set at  $p < .05$  for each hypothesis.

- H<sub>1</sub> There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.

Hypotheses 1 was tested by using a series of t-tests. Table 3 summarizes raw factor scores and displays t scores for developmental and non-developmental students at three institutions. The rank order of factor mean scores for developmental and non-developmental students within three types of institutions was computed by dividing the mean score of each factor by the number of EPS items in each factor. Table 4 shows the rank order of mean factor scores for developmental and non-developmental students within three types of institutions.

At Hampton Institute developmental students differed from non-developmental students on three factors. The developmental students placed less emphasis than non-developmental students on External Expectations, Occupational Advancement, and Cognitive Interest. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for External



TABLE 3  
 SUMMARY OF t-TESTS COMPARING DEVELOPMENTAL AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS  
 AT THREE INSTITUTIONS ON SIX EPS FACTORS

Institutions			Raw Factor Scores	SD	t-Scores	P
Hampton Institute	Factor 1 Social Relationships	D (N = 102)	25.91	8.6	.67	.50
		N-D (N = 200)	26.56	6.5		
	Factor 2 Social Welfare	D (N = 102)	10.57	3.2	1.28	.20
		N-D (N = 200)	11.07	3.0		
	Factor 3 External Expectations	D (N = 102)	8.26	2.8	2.20	.02*
		N-D (N = 200)	9.01	2.6		
Factor 4 Occupational Advancement	D (N = 102)	17.35	4.1	1.9	.05*	
	N-D (N = 200)	18.28	3.4			
Factor 5 Cognitive Interest	D (N = 102)	9.82	2.8	2.42	.01*	
	N-D (N = 200)	10.63	2.5			
Factor 6 Escape/Stimulation	D (N = 102)	9.51	2.9	-.18	.85	
	N-D (N = 200)	9.45	2.7			
Old Dominion University	Factor 1 Special Relationships	D (N = 173)	24.02	6.0	.03	.97
		N-D (N = 109)	24.05	6.9		
	Factor 2 Social Welfare	D (N = 173)	9.97	2.8	.55	.58
		N-D (N = 109)	10.18	3.2		
	Factor 3 External Expectations	D (N = 173)	8.57	2.4	3.45	.001*
		N-D (N = 109)	9.81	3.2		
Factor 4 Occupational Advancement	D (N = 173)	17.27	3.6	-1.61	.10	
	N-D (N = 109)	16.5	3.9			
Factor 5 Cognitive Interest	D (N = 173)	9.96	2.5	2.10	.03*	
	N-D (N = 109)	10.6	2.8			
Factor 6 Escape/Stimulation	D (N = 173)	8.95	2.5	-.65	.51	
	N-D (N = 109)	8.76	2.4			
Two-Year College	Factor 1 Social Relationships	D (N = 200)	24.72	9.2	1.29	.19
		N-D (N = 150)	25.90	7.8		
	Factor 2 Social Welfare	D (N = 200)	10.14	3.3	-.22	.82
		N-D (N = 150)	10.06	3.2		
	Factor 3 External Expectations	D (N = 200)	7.65	3.0	.08	.93
		N-D (N = 150)	7.63	2.4		
Factor 4 Occupational Advancement	D (N = 200)	15.60	4.2	2.67	.008*	
	N-D (N = 150)	16.75	3.8			
Factor 5 Cognitive Interest	D (N = 100)	10.30	3.1	-.06	.95	
	N-D (N = 150)	10.28	2.7			
Factor 6 Escape/Stimulation	D (N = 200)	9.69	2.9	-1.40	.16	
	N-D (N = 150)	9.26	2.7			

\*Denotes Significance at the .05 Level

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF EPS MEAN FACTOR SCORES FOR DEVELOPMENTAL AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS WITHIN THREE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

Developmental	Mean Factor Scores	Non-Developmental	Mean Factor Scores
<b>HAMPTON INSTITUTE</b>			
Occupational Advancement	2.9	Occupational Advancement	3.0
Social Welfare	2.6	Social Welfare	2.7
Cognitive Interest	2.4	Cognitive Interest	2.6
Escape/Stimulation	2.3	Escape/Stimulation	2.3
External Expectations	2.0	External Expectations	2.2
Social Relationships	1.8	Social Relationships	1.9
<b>OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY</b>			
Occupational Advancement	2.8	Occupational Advancement	2.7
Cognitive Interest	2.5	Cognitive Interest	2.6
Social Welfare	2.4	Social Welfare	2.5
Escape/Stimulation	2.2	External Expectations	2.4
External Expectations	2.1	Escape/Stimulation	2.2
Social Relationships	1.7	Social Relationships	1.7
<b>TWO-YEAR COLLEGE</b>			
Occupational Advancement	2.6	Occupational Advancement	2.8
Social Welfare	2.5	Social Welfare	2.5
Cognitive Interest	2.5	Cognitive Interest	2.5
Escape/Stimulation	2.4	Escape/Stimulation	2.3
External Expectations	1.9	External Expectations	1.9
Social Relationships	1.7	Social Relationships	1.8

Note. Rank Order for Mean Factor Scores

Expectations, Occupational Advancement, and for Cognitive Interests; the null hypothesis was retained for Social Relationships, Social Welfare, and the Escape/Stimulation factors. Developmental subjects had a lower raw factor score (8.26) on the factor External Expectations than did non-developmental subject (9.01). Developmental subjects also assigned less value to the Occupational Advancement and Cognitive Interest factors than non-developmental subjects as seen in their raw factor scores (17.35 versus 18.28 and 9.82 versus 10.63, respectively).

At Old Dominion University the developmental students differed from non-developmental students on two factors. The developmental students placed less emphasis than non-developmental students on External Expectations and Cognitive Interest. No significant differences were found on the other four factors. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected for the External Expectations and Cognitive Interest factors and retained for the Social Welfare, Occupational Advancement, Social Relationship, and Escape/Stimulation factors. For the External Expectations factor, developmental subjects raw factor score was lower (8.57) than that of non-developmental subjects (9.81). The developmental subjects had a lower raw factor score (9.96) on the factor Cognitive Interest than did non-developmental subjects (10.66). Hence, developmental subjects appeared to place less value on External Expectations and Cognitive Interest than non-developmental subjects as reasons for course enrollment.

At the two-year institution developmental students differed from non-developmental students on one factor. The developmental students placed less emphasis than non-developmental students on Occupational Advancement. No significant differences were found on the other five factors. Thus, the null hypothesis was retained for the Social Welfare, External Expectations, Social Relationships, Cognitive Interest and Escape/Stimulation factors. For the factor Occupational Advancement, developmental subjects had a lower raw factor score (15.60) than non-developmental subjects (16.75). It appeared as though developmental students were, by a small margin, motivated to attend college less for Occupational Advancement than non-developmental students at the two-year college.

A comparison between developmental and non-developmental students within institutions revealed that at the two four-year institutions significant differences existed at the .05 level for the same factors, External Expectations and Cognitive Interest. However, at Hampton Institute significant differences existed at the .05 level for the factor Occupational Advancement. Developmental students had lower raw factor scores for External Expectations and Cognitive Interest than non-developmental students at both four-year institutions. However, at the two-year institution a significant difference at the .05 level existed for only one factor, Occupational Advancement, where raw factor scores for developmental students were lower than non-developmental students. The strongest motivational factors for attending college for developmental and non-developmental students within the three types of institutions were Occupational Advancement, Cognitive Interest, and

Social Welfare as reported in Table 4. The only difference that existed in the motivational orientations was a shift in position of the factors for developmental and non-developmental students within the three types of institutions. Occupational Advancement was the strongest motivator for developmental and non-developmental students at all three institutions.

H<sub>2</sub> There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

Table 5 is a summary of the results of the ANOVA procedure for the six EPS factors across the three institutions. Table 6 summarizes raw factor scores for combined developmental and non-developmental students and the results of the Scheffé post hoc analysis which specified between which pair of institutions the difference were significant at the .05 level. The rank order of combined mean factor scores for developmental and non-developmental students within each institution was computed by dividing the sum of combined subjects mean factor scores by the number of EPS responses in each factor. Data are presented in Table 7.

#### Factor One - Social Relationships

Social Relationship was always at the bottom of the scale when factors were ranked in order according to mean factor scores. However, there was a modest difference where combined subjects at Hampton Institute scored slightly higher on this factor than combined subjects at Old Dominion. There was no statistically significant difference between responses at the two-year college and at the two four-year institutions.

TABLE 5  
 ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE SIX EPS FACTORS WITHIN GROUPS  
 ACROSS THE THREE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

<u>Factor One - Social Relationships</u>					
Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F. Ratio	P
Between Groups	2	774.8	387.4	6.67	.001*
Within Groups	931	54069.5	58.0		
Total	933	54844.3			
<u>Factor Two - Social Welfare</u>					
Between Groups	2	138.9	69.4	6.69	.001*
Within Groups	931	9287.4	9.9		
Total	933	9426.3			
<u>Factor Three - External Expectations</u>					
Between Groups	2	350.1	175.0	22.66	.000*
Within Groups	931	7191.4	7.7		
Total	933	7541.5			
<u>Factor Four - Occupational Advancement</u>					
Between Groups	2	572.6	286.3	19.08	.000*
Within Groups	931	13965.3	15.0		
Total	933	14537.9			
<u>Factor Five - Cognitive Interest</u>					
Between Groups	2	2.2	1.1	.14	.868
Within Groups	931	7309.7	7.8		
Total	933	7311.9			
<u>Factor Six - Escape/Stimulation</u>					
Between Groups	2	73.2	36.6	4.83	.008*
Within Groups	931	7055.8	7.5		
Total	933	7129.0			

\*Denotes Significance at the .05 level

TABLE 6  
 THE SCHEFFÉ POST HOC CONTRAST WITH RAW FACTOR SCORES AND STANDARD  
 DEVIATION SCORES ON SIX MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS

Institutions	Raw Factor Scores	Standard Deviations	Scheffé Procedure for Difference		
			HI	ODU	2yr
<u>Factor One - Social Relationships</u>					
Hampton Institute	26.34	7.35		*	
Old Dominion	24.03	6.36	*		
Two-year College	25.23	8.70			
<u>Factor Two - Social Welfare</u>					
Hampton Institute	10.90	3.11		*	*
Old Dominion	10.05	2.99	*		
Two-year College	10.10	3.31	*		
<u>Factor Three - External Expectations</u>					
Hampton Institute	8.76	2.73			*
Old Dominion	9.05	2.84			*
Two-year College	7.66	2.76	*	*	
<u>Factor Four - Occupational Advancement</u>					
Hampton Institute	17.97	3.70		*	*
Old Dominion	16.98	3.77	*		*
Two-year College	16.09	4.08	*	*	
<u>Factor Five - Cognitive Interest</u>					
Hampton Institute	10.36	2.67			
Old Dominion	10.23	2.70			
Two-year College	10.27	2.98			
<u>Factor Six - Escape/Stimulation</u>					
Hampton Institute	9.47	2.82		*	
Old Dominion	8.88	2.50	*		*
Two-year College	9.50	2.88		*	

\*Denotes groups significantly different at .05 level.

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF COMBINED EPS MEAN FACTOR SCORES FOR DEVELOPMENTAL AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL  
STUDENTS WITHIN THE THREE TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

Hampton Institute	Mean Factor Score	Old Dominion University	Mean Factor Score	Two-Year College	Mean Factor Score
Occupational Advancement	2.95	Occupational Advancement	2.75	Occupational Advancement	2.70
Social Welfare	2.65	Social Welfare	2.55	Social Welfare	2.50
Cognitive Interest	2.50	Cognitive Interest	2.45	Cognitive Interest	2.50
Escape/Stimulation	2.30	Escape/Stimulation	2.25	Escape/Stimulation	2.35
External Expectations	2.10	External Expectations	2.20	External Expectations	1.90
Social Relationships	1.85	Social Relationships	1.70	Social Relationships	1.75

Note. Rank Order of Mean Factor Scores



Analysis of variance for Factor One, Social Relationships scores, as displayed in Table 5, shows statistically significant difference across different types of institutions at the .05 level when the developmental and non-developmental subjects were combined. Therefore, the null hypothesis of no difference in means across institutions was rejected. A Scheffé post hoc analysis indicated that raw factor scores for Hampton Institute students and Old Dominion students' differed significantly from each other (Table 6). However, there was no significant difference in the raw factor scores between the two-year institution and the two four-year institutions on the factor Social Relationships. All groups placed lowest value on Social Relationships as a motivational factor in attending college as reported in their low mean factor scores. Although there is a significant statistical difference, it appears to have little meaning.

#### Factor Two - Social Welfare

Social Welfare ranked in the top three factors for combined groups at all three institutions. Combined groups at Hampton Institute placed slightly higher value on this factor as reported in their higher mean factor score (2.65) than combined subjects at Old Dominion (2.45) and the two-year college (2.50). The ANOVA procedures reported in Table 5 revealed a statistically significant difference for developmental and non-developmental students across different types of institutions at the .05 level. Hence, the null hypothesis of no difference in means across institutions was rejected. The Scheffé post hoc analysis between groups revealed that subjects at Hampton Institute scored

significantly higher than subjects at Old Dominion University and the two-year college on the factor Social Welfare at the .05 level of significance (Table 6). No significant difference was found on this factor between subjects at Old Dominion and subjects at the two-year college. Among the developmental and non-developmental students at Hampton Institute, Social Welfare appeared as the second strongest motivational factor. The combined groups at Old Dominion University and the two-year college ranked Social Welfare as their third most important motivational reason for attending college (Table 7).

#### Factor Three - External Expectations

External Expectations ranked in the lower three factors of the scale for combined groups at all three institutions. However, there was a difference where combined subjects at Old Dominion scored higher on the factor than combined subjects at Hampton Institute and the two-year college. A statistically significant difference for developmental and non-developmental students was reported in Table 4 for this factor. The Scheffé post hoc analysis between groups and across institutions revealed that subjects at Hampton Institute and Old Dominion University scored significantly higher than subjects at the two-year college on the factor External Expectations at the .05 level of significance (Table 6). Consequently, the null hypothesis of no difference in means across institutions was rejected. Even though External Expectations was ranked low as a motivational factor for attending college at the three institutions, combined subjects at Old

Dominion associated greater value to the factor than combined subjects at Hampton Institute and the two-year college.

#### Factor Four - Occupational Advancement

Occupational Advancement appeared as the strongest motivational factor for attending college at all three institutions. Combined subjects at Hampton Institute tended to have a slightly higher Occupational Advancement orientation than subjects at Old Dominion and the two-year college. The ANOVA procedure reported in Table 5 showed statistically significant differences. The Scheffé post hoc analysis between groups and across institutions revealed significant difference at the .05 level. As shown in Table 6 differences existed in raw factor scores between subjects at Hampton Institute and Old Dominion, Hampton Institute and the two-year college, and Old Dominion and the two-year college. Thus, the null hypothesis of no difference in means was rejected. Table 7 reported that combined subjects at the four-year institutions placed greater value on the Occupational Advancement factor than subjects at the two-year college as reported in their higher mean factor scores.

#### Factor Five - Cognitive Interest

Cognitive Interest ranked in the top three factors for combined groups at all three institutions. There was no statistically significant difference in mean scores of student groups across different types of institutions as reported in Table 5. Consequently, the hypothesis of no difference between developmental and non-developmental

students on Cognitive Interest was retained. Table 6 showed that all groups placed similar value on Cognitive Interest as a motivational factor in attending college as reported in their raw factor scores.

#### Factor Six - Escape/Stimulation

Escape/Stimulation ranked in the bottom three factors of the scale for combined groups at all three institutions. Even though a significant difference existed between subjects at Hampton Institute and Old Dominion, and the two-year college and Old Dominion, they appeared to be minimal because of the low factor mean scores (Table 7).

Scores presented in Table 5 indicated a statistically significant difference for the factor Escape/Stimulation at the .05 level. The Scheffé post hoc analysis revealed that Hampton Institute students raw factor scores differed significantly from those at Old Dominion. Likewise, the raw factor scores for the two-year college's students differed significantly from the raw factor scores of students at Old Dominion on this factor (Table 6). Subjects at the two-year college and Hampton Institute assigned greater value to this factor than did subjects at Old Dominion.

- H<sub>3</sub> There are no differences in the demographic variables of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.

Hypothesis III sought to determine whether differences were evidenced when demographic factors between developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution were compared. Therefore, each institution was separately studied on the variables.

Hypothesis III was tested using the t-test within each institution. The variables age and family or personal income were the independent variables with institutions and developmental and non-developmental students as the dependent variables.

#### Hampton Institute

Table 8 shows that no statistically significant differences were found on the demographic variables age and family or personal income. Consequently, the null hypothesis was retained for age and income.

#### Old Dominion

At Old Dominion, age showed a significant difference as reported in Table 8. The t-test results comparing mean scores between developmental and non-developmental students revealed that developmental students' mean scores were significantly lower than non-developmental students' scores on the variable age at the .05 level of significance. No statistically significant difference was found on income. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected for the demographic variable age. The null hypothesis for income was retained. At Old Dominion developmental subjects tended to be younger than non-developmental subjects.

#### Two-Year College

Table 8 shows that no statistically significant differences were found on the demographic variables age and family or personal income. Consequently, the null hypothesis was retained for age and income.

- H<sub>4</sub> There are no difference in the demographic variables of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF t-TESTS COMPARING DEVELOPMENTAL AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL  
STUDENTS AT THREE INSTITUTIONS ON TWO DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Institutions	Variables		Mean	SD	t-scores	P
Hampton Institute	Age	D (N = 102)	1.97	.1	-.03	.94
		N-D (N = 199)	1.96	.2		
	Income	D (N = 80)	4.13	1.4	.02	.98
		N-D (N = 184)	4.14	1.4		
Old Dominion University	Age	D (N = 173)	2.00	.3	2.92	.004*
		N-D (N = 109)	2.16	.5		
	Income	D (N = 143)	4.12	1.5	-.49	.62
		N-D (N = 106)	4.00	1.8		
Two-year College	Age	D (N = 200)	2.49	.8	-1.53	.12
		N-D (N = 150)	2.36	.7		
	Income	D (N = 182)	1.32	1.5	1.43	.15
		N-D (N = 144)	3.05	1.6		

\*Denotes significance at the .05 level.

Hypothesis IV sought to assess and contrast two demographic variables of combined developmental and non-developmental students across different types of institutions. A one-way ANOVA procedure using two demographic variables as the dependent variable with institutions and groups as the independent variable produced the results presented in Table 9. This procedure showed that a difference existed for both variables. A Scheffé post hoc analysis was used to specify between which two institutions the differences were significant at the .05 level where developmental and non-developmental students were combined at each institution (Table 10).

The combined subjects at the two four-year institutions and the two-year institution showed significant differences on age and income (Table 9). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. For age, the Scheffé post hoc analysis revealed that the two-year college had significantly older students than Hampton Institute and Old Dominion (Table 10). For income, the income level of subjects at Hampton Institute and Old Dominion was more likely to be higher than that of subjects at the two-year institution.

Information for the nominal scale demographic variables sex, race, date of graduation from high school, and average grades in high school, was secured utilizing data collected on Part I of the instrument. Table 11 illustrates the representation of responses by sex for developmental students within and across institutions. The figures indicate that the number of male and female subjects at Hampton Institute were approximately the same whereas at Old Dominion and the two-year college there were more female subjects than male subjects in

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF ONE-WAY ANALYSIS FOR INSTITUTIONAL CONTRAST  
ON DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F-Ratio	P
<u>Age</u>				
Between Groups	2	20.3	67.63	.000*
Within Groups	930	.3		
Total	932			
<u>Income: Family or Individual</u>				
Between Groups	2	143.03	57.99	.000*
Within Groups	836	2.46		
Total	838			

\*Denotes Significance at the .05 level.



TABLE 10

THE SCHEFFÉ POST HOC CONTRAST WITH RAW VARIABLE SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATION SCORES ON DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Institutions	Raw Variable Score	Mean	Standard Deviations	Scheffé Procedure for Difference		
				HI	ODU	2yr.
<u>Age</u>						
Hampton Institute	1.97	20.44	.20			*
Old Dominion	2.06	21.71	.43			*
Two-year College	2.44	26.33	.78	*	*	
<u>Income: Family or Individual</u>						
Hampton Institute	4.14	\$24,821	1.47			*
Old Dominion	4.08	22,160	1.64			*
Two-year College	2.91	12,911	1.58	*	*	

\*Denotes groups significantly different at the .05 level.

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SEX FOR DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS  
WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

SEX	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Males	48	47.1	69	39.9	76	38.0
Females	54	52.9	104	60.1	124	62.0
Total	102	100.0	173	100.0	200	100.0

the sample. Table 12 summarizes the responses by sex for non-developmental subjects within and across institutions. The table shows that the largest number of subjects in the sample were females at all three institutions.

Table 13 summarizes the representation of developmental subjects by ethnic background within and across institutions. At Hampton Institute and at the two-year college the majority of the subjects were black (96.1% and 75% respectively). However, at Old Dominion the majority (58.4%) of the developmental subjects were white. This was to be expected at Hampton Institute because by its mission it is a historically black institution. The racial composition of freshman students for the 1980 fall term at Old Dominion was approximately 85% white and 10% black as reported by the office of Affirmative Action. The office of Institutional Research at the two-year college reported the racial composition of freshman students for the 1980 fall term was approximately 70% white and 25% black.

Table 14 presents a frequency distribution of ethnic background for non-developmental subjects within and across institutions. The majority of the non-developmental subjects at Hampton Institute (98.5%) were black whereas the majority of the non-developmental subjects were white at Old Dominion (88.1%) and the two-year college (54%).

The date of graduation from high school indicated by developmental subjects within and across institutions is summarized in Table 15. At Hampton Institute the majority (78.4%) of the developmental subjects reported that they graduated from high school "this year" (1980). At

TABLE 12.

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SEX FOR NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS  
 WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

SEX	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Males	74	37.0	27	24.8	38	25.3
Females	126	63.0	82	75.2	112	74.7
Total	200	100.0	109	100.0	150	100.0

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RACE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS  
WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

Ethnic Background	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Black/Negro	98	96.1	59	34.1	150	75.0
White/Caucasian	1	1.0	101	58.4	45	22.5
Asian American	-	-	6	3.5	1	0.5
Hispanic	-	-	4	2.3	1	0.5
Native American	-	-	-	-	1	0.5
Other	1	1.0	1	0.6	2	1.0
Missing Cases	2	2.0	2	1.2	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note. Percentages do not total 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RACE FOR NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS  
WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

Ethnic Background	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Black/Negro	197	98.5	9	8.3	60	40.0
White/Caucasian	1	0.5	96	88.1	81	54.0
Asian American	-	-	-	-	2	1.3
Hispanic	-	-	-	-	1	0.7
Native American	-	-	2	1.8	2	1.3
Other	2	1.0	2	1.8	4	2.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DATA ON DATE OF GRADUATION FROM HIGH SCHOOL FOR  
DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

Date of Graduation From High School	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
This Year	80	78.4	118	68.2	50	25.0
Last Year	12	11.8	46	26.6	34	17.0
Did Not Graduate	-	-	-	-	13	6.5
Other	10	9.8	9	5.2	101	50.5
Missing Cases	-	-	-	-	2	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Old Dominion 68.2% reported "this year." However, at the two-year college 50.5% of the subjects reported the category "other."

Table 16 summarizes date of graduation from high school for non-developmental students within and across institutions. The pattern of responses for non-developmental students is similar to the responses given by the developmental students. Eighty percent of the students at Hampton Institute reported that they graduated from high school "this year" (1980). At Old Dominion 49.5% of the students reported "this year," whereas at the two-year college 44.7% of the students reported the category "other."

Table 17 shows the distribution of high school grade averages for developmental subjects within and across institutions. The largest percentage of the developmental subjects at Hampton Institute (39.2%) reported that their high school grade averages were in the "B and C" category. At Old Dominion subjects reported an almost even distribution for the categories "A and B," "B," and "B and C," with the following percentages respectively, 30.1%, 30.1% and 29.4%. At the two-year college the largest percent of the subjects (33.5%) reported the "C" category, and 30.5% reported the "B and C" category.

Table 18 summarizes the representation of non-developmental subjects on high school grade averages within and across institutions. At Hampton Institute the largest percent of subjects reported grades in the "B and C" category (32%) and 29.5% reported the "B" category. Subjects at Old Dominion reported the largest percentage of grades in the "A and B" category (35.8%) and the "B" category (26.6%). At the



TABLE 16

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DATA ON DATE OF GRADUATION FROM HIGH SCHOOL FOR  
NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

Date of Graduation From High School	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
This Year	160	80.0	54	49.5	38	25.3
Last Year	34	17.0	19	17.5	38	25.3
Did Not Graduate	1	.5	-	-	7	4.7
Other	5	2.5	36	33.0	67	44.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 17

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DATA ON HIGH SCHOOL GRADE AVERAGE FOR  
DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

High School Grade Average	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
A	-	-	7	4.0	-	-
A and B	11	10.8	52	30.1	9	4.5
B	29	28.4	52	30.1	16	8.0
B and C	40	39.2	51	29.4	61	30.5
C	19	18.6	11	6.4	67	33.5
C and D	2	2.0	-	-	45	22.5
Missing Cases	1	1.0	-	-	2	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF DATA ON HIGH SCHOOL GRADE AVERAGE FOR  
NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS WITHIN AND ACROSS INSTITUTIONS

High School Grade Average	Hampton Institute		Old Dominion University		Two-Year College	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
A	6	3.0	14	12.8	4	2.7
A and B	44	22.0	39	35.8	25	16.7
B	59	29.5	29	26.6	24	16.0
B and C	64	32.0	22	20.2	55	36.6
C	26	13.0	5	4.6	33	22.0
C and D	-	-	-	-	7	4.7
Missing Cases	1	0.5	-	-	2	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0</b>

two-year college the largest percentage of subjects reported grades in the "B and C" category (36.6%) and the "C" category (22%).

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

The following is a summary of the findings from the testing of the hypotheses.

H<sub>1</sub> There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.

1. Occupational Advancement was held as the strongest motivational factor by all the groups in all three institutions.

2. For all groups in the three institutions Cognitive Interest and Social Welfare were the second or third strongest motivational factors for attending college.

3. The major difference found in motivational reasons for attending college between developmental and non-developmental students within different types of institutions was that at both four-year institutions developmental subjects had significantly lower raw factor scores than non-developmental subjects on the factors External Expectations and Cognitive Interest.

4. At the two-year college, developmental students had significantly lower raw factor scores than non-developmental students on the factor Occupational Advancement. On the other factors differences in motivational reasons for attending college were not statistically significant.

5. At the two-year and four-year institutions in this study developmental and non-developmental students were found to be more alike than different within each institution in relationship to motivational reasons for attending college.

H<sub>2</sub> There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

1. Combined subjects at Hampton Institute had a significantly higher raw factor score on the factors Social Relationships, Social Welfare, Occupational Advancement and Escape/Stimulation than combined subjects at Old Dominion University.

2. Combined subjects at Old Dominion had significantly higher raw factor scores on the factor External Expectations than subjects at Hampton Institute and subjects at the two-year college.

3. The combined subjects at Hampton Institute had significantly higher raw factor scores on the factor Occupational Advancement than combined subjects at Old Dominion as well as the two-year college.

H<sub>3</sub> There are no differences in the demographic factors of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.

1. At all three colleges it was found that developmental and non-developmental students were more alike than different within each institution on the two demographic variables age and family or personal income. The only difference found in developmental and non-develop-

mental students was at the four year public institution where developmental students were more likely to be younger than non-developmental students.

A profile of the subjects within and across institutions indicated that:

1. The majority of the subjects were females within each of the three institutions.

2. The majority of the developmental subjects at the four-year private and the two-year public institutions were black, whereas at the four-year public institution the majority of the developmental subjects were white.

3. The majority of the non-developmental subjects at the four-year private institution were black, whereas at the four-year and two-year public institutions the majority of the non-developmental subjects were white.

4. At the two four-year institutions the majority of the subjects graduated from high school "this year" (1980), whereas, at the two-year public college the majority of the subjects reported the category "other."

5. In regard to high school grade averages for developmental subjects; at the four-year private institution the majority of the subjects' grades were in the "B and C" category, at the four-public institution there was an even distribution of grades in the "A and B" and "B" categories which represented the majority of the subjects, and at the two-year public institution the majority of the developmental subjects grades were in the "C" category.

6. In regard to high school grade averages for non-developmental subjects, at the four-year private and the two-year public institutions the majority of the subjects reported high school grade averages in the "B and C" category. At the four-year public institution the majority of the subjects reported grade averages in the "A and B" category.

H<sub>4</sub> There is no difference in the demographic factors of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

1. At the two-year, public, commuter college, a larger percent of combined subjects were more likely to be older than subjects at the four-year, primarily commuter college and the four-year, private, residential college.

2. At the two four-year institutions a larger percentage of combined subjects were more likely to have higher incomes than combined subjects at the two-year, public, commuter college.

3. At the two- and four-year public colleges, a larger percentage of subjects were more likely to be older than subjects at the four-year, private, residential college.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This study identified motivational factors and demographic variables associated with a sample of developmental and non-developmental students and compared the motivational factors and demographic variables of developmental and non-developmental students at three types of institutions. This chapter presents a summation of the study including a background of the problem, a statement of the problem, research procedures and findings. Second, conclusions for the study are presented based upon the findings. Finally, recommendations for utilizing the study and for developing further research are presented.

The reasons for college attendance of students are many. It is evident that reasons may vary but include socially oriented factors, vocationally oriented factors and intellectually oriented factors. Reasons for attending college of first-time freshman students have been well researched. National studies conducted by The American College Testing Program, the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems identified motivational factors related to reasons for attending college. In all three studies the majority of the freshmen included academic related reasons, job related reasons, financial reasons, and reasons related to location in the top four factors as motivators in their decision to attend college. Most studies of reasons why students go to college



indicated that some external motivating force was operative. Students have reported that motivation to attend college has come from significant others in the form of encouragement from parents, teachers, and peers. Students have also reported that the prospects for employment and social interaction with peers are enhanced when they place themselves in a collegiate environment. Since information about motivation for attending college was viewed as being important for college students in general, and because these data were significant to major national research agencies, the belief that the motivation for attending college of developmental students differed from that of non-developmental students needed to be investigated.

#### Statement of the Problem

The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To identify the motivational factors as defined by the Education Participation Scale (EPS) of samples of the developmental and non-developmental students attending two- and four-year institutions. According to Governanti (1980), who derived his factors from Morstain and Smart, the motivational factors are Social Relationships, External Expectations, Social Welfare, Occupational Advancement, Escape/Stimulation, and Cognitive Interest.
2. To compare the motivational factors of developmental and non-developmental students within an institution.
3. To compare the motivational factors of developmental and non-developmental students attending different types of institutions.

4. To identify selected demographic factors (age, sex, race, family or personal income, year graduated from high school, and high school grade average) of developmental and non-developmental students attending two- and four-year institutions.

5. To compare selected demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students within an institution.

6. To compare selected demographic factors of developmental and non-developmental students attending different types of institutions.

Four research hypotheses provided more specific direction for this study. They are presented within the findings section in this chapter.

#### Research Procedures

Participants in this study consisted of 934 students drawn from three Southeastern Coastal Virginia Colleges between November 10 to November 25, 1980. Since one of the major focuses of the study was to identify and compare motivational and demographic factors of students attending different types of institutions, the colleges were selected accordingly. They were (a) a four-year private, historically black, residential college (Hampton Institute), (b) a four-year public, historically white, primarily commuter college (Old Dominion University), and (c) a two-year public commuter community college. The 934 subjects were first-time, part-time or full-time students in developmental and non-developmental classes. A cluster random sample of students was drawn from selected courses.

A survey research method was used to collect information. Data were gathered by a two-part instrument where 934 students produced

usable survey responses. Part one of the instrument was entitled Enrollment Survey which collected demographic data. Part two was an Education Participation Scale (EPS) which collected data on motivational reasons for attending college. Instruments were administered by faculty members teaching selected courses at each participating institution. Objective one was addressed by factor analyzing the responses to the EPS. Objective four was addressed by summarizing the responses to the Enrollment Survey. Objectives two, three, five, and six were addressed by testing null hypotheses using the responses to the EPS. The findings from the analysis of the EPS were reported in Chapter 4.

#### Findings Related to the Purpose and Conclusions

The objectives of the study are presented below with findings.

1. To identify the motivational factors as defined by the EPS of samples of developmental and non-developmental students attending two-and four-year institutions.

The findings of this study's factor analysis of the EPS supported the literature of previous studies (Boshier, 1977; Governanti, 1980). Six factors or reasons were identified to underlie the responses of the subjects to the EPS. They were: Cognitive Interest, Escape/Stimulation, External Expectations, Occupational Advancement, Social Welfare, and Social Relationships.

2. To identify selected demographic variables (sex, age, race, family or personal income, year graduated from high school, and high school grade average) of developmental and non-developmental students attending two-and four-year institutions.

Six demographic variables were selected because literature supported their importance and they were accessible. In terms of sex, the majority (603; 64.4%) of the subjects (934) were females. In relationship to age, the majority of the subjects were in the 18-24 age category (83.2%); the second most frequent category was the 25-34 age category (9.8%). This study supported the findings by ACT (1970, 1979) and CIRP (1967 through 1977) on the demographic variable age. Findings from the national studies showed that the largest percentage of freshman students were 18 years of age when they enrolled in College. The profile on ethnic background revealed that there was a greater number of black subjects (574, 61.7%) than white subjects (325, 34.9%). In regard to income, the larger percentage of the subjects (196, 23.4%) reported family or personal income between \$13,000-21,999. One hundred and fifty-five (18.5%) subjects reported incomes of \$5,999 or less while 122 (14.5%) subjects reported incomes of \$35,000 or more. Findings are similar to those by Astin et al., (1979) which indicated that at all institutions, the largest percent (16.6%) of students reported that parents' income was between \$20,000 and \$24,999.

In comparing the data on year graduated from high school with the findings from CIRP reports (1971, 1972, 1974, 1976, 1977), an important contrast was found. Findings from the national studies showed that approximately 90% to 95% of the freshmen at all institutions matriculated in college the fall term following their graduation from high school. The findings in this study indicated that the majority of the subjects (483; 51.7%) entered college the fall term following

their high school graduation, while approximately 26% delayed their entrance two years. The reasons may be due to the under representation of community college students in the CIRP survey.

However, the pattern evidenced by this study appeared to reflect the nature of the sample. At the four-year private institution the majority of the students enrolled in college the fall term after their graduation. However, at the four-year public institution and especially at the two-year public college, a larger proportion of students indicated that they graduated from high school earlier. Even though this was the first time they had enrolled at the respective colleges, they could have been older students who had matriculated at other institutions previously.

In relation to average high school grades, the larger percentage of the subjects reported grades were in the "B and C" category (31%) and "B" category (22.6%) These findings were not consistent with findings by Astin et al., (1979) which indicated that at all institutions, the largest percentage of subjects (17%) acquired a "B" or better average in high school.

The remaining four objectives are presented in the form of null hypotheses.

- H<sub>1</sub> There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.

Developmental and non-developmental students enrolled at three types of institutions during the fall 1980 semester and/or quarter

(n = 934) were similar in their motivation for attending college. Both groups at the three institutions tended to rate similarly each of the six motivational factors. Occupational Advancement (job related reasons) was held as the strongest motivational factor. This contrasted greatly with previous research using the EPS (Boshier, 1977; Governanti, 1980; and Wolfgang, 1979) that suggested that the strongest motivation for college attendance was Cognitive Interest. Learning and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake (Cognitive Interest) was seen as an important factor because it always ranked in the top three factors on the scale for developmental and non-developmental subjects at all three institutions, but it was not the primary motivational factor. This study substantiated aspects of the research conducted by Astin et al., (1979) which indicated that students at two-and four-year public colleges reported that the primary reason for deciding to go to college was "to get a better job." However, findings for students at predominantly black private colleges indicated that to "gain a general education" was of primary importance. In addition, research conducted by Croake, et al., (1973) and Dole (1970) showed that "preparation for a career" was the strongest motivator for attending college.

Comparison of these findings with some previous studies on motivation for college attendance (ACT, 1972, 1979; Gray, et al., 1979) are difficult because of the differences in instruments. However, the previous studies revealed that the major motivational factors for college attendance for all students appeared to be occupationally related, academically related, financially related, and locality

related. These findings support the academically and occupationally related factors of this study; however, location and finance were not a part of the EPS instrument.

The major differences found in motivational reasons for attending college between developmental and non-developmental students within institutions was that at both four-year institutions, developmental students had significantly lower raw factor scores on the factors External Expectations (extrinsic motivation) and Cognitive Interests (intellectual interest in learning) than non-developmental students. Developmental subjects in this study tended to place less importance on the factors External Expectations and Cognitive Interest as motivational reasons for college attendance than did non-developmental subjects. At the two-year college developmental subjects had significantly lower raw factor scores on the factor Occupational Advancement than did non-developmental subjects. Developmental subjects at the two-year college tended to place less importance on Occupational Advancement as a motivational factor for attending college than did non-developmental subjects.

It can be concluded, therefore, that findings of this study are different from previous studies that used the EPS. In this study, the primary motivation for college attendance was Occupational Advancement. Previous studies that used the EPS primarily with adults, (non-traditional aged students) found Cognitive Interest the primary motivational orientation. This might imply that adult students (24 years of age and older) in previous studies were already gainfully

employed and had less of a need to indicate occupationally related reasons for college attendance, whereas, for traditionally aged students attainment of a job was a primary concern. Further, it can be concluded from this study that developmental students and non-developmental students were much more alike than different in their motivational reasons for attending college within different types of institutions.

H<sub>2</sub> There are no differences in the motivational factors of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

The Scheffé post hoc analysis revealed that significant differences existed between combined groups across the three institutions on five of the EPS factors. Combined subjects at Hampton Institute, a private, historically black college, had significantly higher raw factor scores on the factors Social Relationship (a desire to make friends and fulfill needs for social relationships), and Social Welfare (a desire to participate in community affairs), Occupational Advancement and Escape/Stimulation (a desire to escape what might be considered a dull and boring environment) than did combined subjects at Old Dominion University, a public, historically white college. However, combined subjects at Hampton Institute and at Old Dominion had significantly higher raw factor scores on the factor External Expectations than combined subjects at the two-year college. Subjects at the four-year institutions tended to place greater importance on External Expectations (extrinsic motivation) factors than did subjects at the two-year



institution as reason for attending college. The combined subjects at Hampton Institute had significantly higher raw factor scores for the factor Occupational Advancement than did combined subjects at Old Dominion and the two-year college. This was consistent with findings by Harris (1969) for the factor Occupational Advancement and similar to findings of the national study by Astin et al., (1979) where two- and four-year public college students were more similar to each other in reasons important in attending college.

In conclusion, differences in subjects' responses at the four-year, private, residential, historically black institution may be reflective of differences in subjects' value systems and educational aspirations. Therefore, it can be concluded that students at Hampton Institute perceived education to be important for vocationally, socially and intellectually reasons more than did students at Old Dominion and the two-year college. Since this was the first time that the EPS was used at a historically black institution, this conclusion must be tentative. Further, it can be concluded that students at Old Dominion and at the two-year college had similar motivational reasons for attending college. The study showed that developmental and non-developmental students were similar in their responses to the motivational factors within each institution and between institutions.

H<sub>3</sub> There are no differences in the demographic factors of developmental students and non-developmental students within an institution.

A significant finding for subjects within institutions on demographic variables was at Old Dominion where developmental students

tended to be younger than non-developmental students. No significant differences were found on the demographic variables age and income at Hampton Institute and at the two-year college.

A profile of the subjects within institutions on the demographic variables sex, race, date of graduation from high school, and average grades in high school indicated that:

1. At Hampton Institute, a larger percentage of developmental and non-developmental subjects were female (52.9% and 63% respectively). The majority of the subjects were black (96.1% developmental and 98.5% non-developmental), and the majority of the subjects graduated from high school "this year" (78.4% developmental and 80% non-developmental). In regard to high school grade average, the largest percentage of developmental and non-developmental subjects reported that their average was in the "B and C" category (39.2% and 32% respectively). Approximately 10% of the developmental subjects reported average grades in the "A and B" category, while 22% of the non-developmental subjects reported averages in the "A and B" category.

2. At Old Dominion University, the majority of the developmental subjects were female (60.1% female versus 39.9% male of the respondents); the majority of the non-developmental subjects were also female (75.2% female versus 24.8% male). The largest percentage of the developmental subjects were white (58.4%) with 34.1% being black. However, 88.1% of the non-developmental subjects were white, whereas 8.3% identified themselves as black. The majority of the subjects reported that they

graduated from high school "this year" (68.2% developmental and 49.5% non-developmental). In regard to high school grade average, developmental subjects reported an almost even distribution for the categories "A and B," "B," and "B and C" (30.1%, 30.1%, and 29.4% respectively). However, the largest percentage of non-developmental subjects (35.8%) reported high school grade averages in the "A and B" category.

3. At the two-year college, the majority of the developmental subjects were female (62% female versus 38% male): the majority of the non-developmental subjects were also female (74.7% female versus 25.3% male). The majority of the developmental subjects were black (75% black versus 22.5% white). However, the majority of the non-developmental subjects were white (54% white versus 40% black). For date of graduation from high school, the majority of the developmental subjects (50.5%) reported the category "other," whereas 25% reported "this year" (1980). Approximately 44% of the non-developmental subjects reported the category "other" for date of graduation from high school. However, the same percentage (35.3%) reported that they graduated "this year" (1980) or "last year" (1979). Concerning grades, the largest percentage of developmental subjects (33.5%) reported high school grade averages in the "C" category, however, the largest percentage of non-developmental subjects (36.6%) reported high school grade averages in the "B and C" category.

In comparing demographic variables between developmental and non-developmental students within institutions it was found that at

Hampton Institute, a four-year private, historically black institution, developmental subjects tended to have lower high school grade averages than non-developmental subjects. Findings at Old Dominion, a four-year public, historically white institution, were that developmental subjects tended to be younger than non-developmental subjects, to be more recent graduates from high school, to have lower high school grade averages, and a larger percentage tended to be black. The findings perhaps imply that since Old Dominion is primarily a commuter four-year public college, it is attracting more recent high school graduates who did not meet the college's regular admission requirements but desired a post-secondary educational experience. At the two-year public, commuter college a larger percentage of the developmental subjects tended to be black and to have lower high school grade averages.

At all three colleges, developmental subjects tended to have lower high school grade averages than non-developmental subjects. This fact was to be expected since at the four-year colleges one of the admission criteria for developmental students related to special conditions relative to high school grades. At the two-year college and at Old Dominion University a large percentage of developmental students were black. The reasons for this were not apparent. However, a growing number of blacks may be entering the two-year college because of the open admission policy and relatively low tuition.

Since developmental students were more likely to have lower high school grade averages than non-developmental students at all three institutions, it can be concluded that low academic performance in high

school was exemplified among developmental subjects attending post-secondary institutions. The largest number of differences existed on selected demographic variables for developmental and non-developmental students within institutions at Old Dominion; therefore, it can be concluded that at the four-year public institution, developmental students were least like non-developmental students on selected demographic variables.

H<sub>4</sub> There is no difference in the demographic factors of developmental students and non-developmental students across different types of institutions.

Significant findings for combined subjects across institutions on the demographic variable age revealed that subjects at the two-year college were more likely to be older than subjects at the two four-year institutions. This result was to be expected with the trend of a large number of older adults attending post-secondary institutions and especially two-year colleges. At the two four-year institutions, subjects scored significantly higher on the variable family or your personal income than subjects at the two-year college. Hence, subjects at the two four-year institutions were more likely to have higher yearly incomes than subjects at the two-year institution. This finding is somewhat contradictory to Astin's et al., (1979) findings on estimated parental income which revealed that two-and four-year public college freshman students had similar and higher incomes than freshman students enrolled in predominantly black private colleges. In this study, this result may imply that subjects who attend the two four-year institutions

were reporting family income, whereas subjects at the two-year institution were reporting their personal income. In addition, the unique quality and nature of Hampton Institute and its student body may have been an influencing factor.

A profile of the subjects across institutions on the demographic variables sex, race, date of graduation from high school, and average grades in high school indicated that:

1. Sex. The largest percentage of the subjects at the four-year private and public colleges and the two-year public college were female.

2. Race. At the two- and four-year public institutions the majority of subjects were white, whereas at the four-year private college, the majority of the subjects were black.

3. Date of Graduation From High School. At the two four-year institutions subjects were more likely to be recent high school graduates, whereas, at the two-year college subjects were more likely to have graduated from high school at least two years prior to enrolling.

4. High School Grade Average. At the four-year public institution subjects were more likely to have higher high school grade averages than subjects at the private four-year college and the public two-year college.

The study showed that developmental and non-developmental students were more different on selected demographic variables within institutions than between institutions. They differ depending on the type of institution they attend.

Finally, it can be concluded that developmental and non-developmental students within and across the three types of institutions

were more similar than different in their motivational reasons for attending college. Young adults go to college for occupational reasons. This study supported the literature which suggested vocationally oriented reasons as most important for traditional aged students in attending college. Perhaps findings in this study did not coincide with other studies using the EPS because the sample was different.

In relationship to demographic variables, it was found that developmental students are less like non-developmental students within and across the three types of institutions. At all three institutions, developmental students tended to have lower average high school grades than non-developmental students. Differences in age, race, family or personal income, and the year of graduation from high school appeared to be influenced by the type of institution they attended. A private, historically black, four-year residential college may attract students with demographic characteristics quite different from a public, historically white, four-year primarily commuter college as well as a two-year public commuter community college. Consequently, different types of institutions attract different types of students.

#### Recommendations Resulting From the Study

The following recommendation was made based on the findings from testing hypotheses and conclusions drawn.

The strongest motivational reason for attending college of developmental and non-developmental students was related to occupational advancement. Thus, it is recommended that curriculum planners provide an appropriate balance between

students' vocational and general education needs. Considerations should be given to providing students with early cognitively oriented as well as field related experiences relative to their chosen areas of concentration. This early exposure to job related experiences would assist students in goal clarification and ultimately in greater satisfaction in meeting their goals.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

Based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from this study, the following recommendations for additional research are suggested:

1. A study to determine if there is a relationship between selected demographic variables (age, race, income, year graduated from high school, high school grade average, educational level of parents) and motivational factors of developmental and non-developmental students.
2. A longitudinal study to see if motivational factors change or remain constant over a period of several years.
3. The development of a motivation index more sensitive to first-time freshman students' beliefs and experiences, which incorporates items about activities which youth might more readily identify.
4. Replication of this study in a different geographic region or with different types of institutions would increase the generalizability of the results.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Council on Education. National norm for entering college freshmen -fall, 1967. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.
- American Council on Education. National norms for entering college freshmen -fall 1968. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- American Council on Education. National norms for entering college freshmen -fall, 1969. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.
- American Council on Education. National norms for entering college freshmen -fall 1971. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- American Council on Education. The American freshman: National norms for fall 1972. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972.
- American Council on Education. The American freshman: National norms for fall 1974. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.
- Astin, A.W., King, M.R., & Richardson, G.T. The American freshman: National norms for fall 1979. Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles, 1979.
- Astin, A.W. Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Astin, H.S., Astin, A.W., Biscontin, A.S., & Frankel, H.H. Higher education and the disadvantaged students. Washington, D.C.: Human Service Press, 1972.
- Boshier, R. Motivational orientation of adult education participants: a factor analytic exploration of Houle's typology. Adult Education, 1971, 21, 3-26.
- Boshier, R. Motivational orientation re-visited: Life-space motives and the Education Participation Scale. Adult Education, 1977, 28, 89-115.
- Bowen, H.R. Investment in learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Carlsmith, J.M. & Aronson, E. Some hedonic consequences of confirmation and disconfirmation of expectations. Journal Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 151-156.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less time, more options.  
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Reform on campus. New York:  
McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Cooperative Institutional Research Program. The American freshman:  
National norm for fall 1976. Los Angeles, California:  
Cooperative Institutional Research Program, 1976.

Cooperative Institutional Research Program. The American freshman:  
National norm for fall 1977. Los Angeles, California:  
Cooperative Institutional Research Program, 1977.

Croake, J.W., Keller, J.F., & Catlin, N. Motivation for college  
attendance. College Student Journal, 1973, 7 (3), 18-25.

Cross, K.P. Adult learners: characteristics, needs, and interests.  
In R.E. Peterson and Associates (Eds.) Lifelong learning in  
America. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Cross, K.P. Beyond the open door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Dole, A.A. Stability of reason for going to college. The Journal of  
Educational Research, 1970, 63 (8), 373-378.

Dole, A.A. & Digman, J.M. Factors in college attendance. Journal of  
Applied Psychology, 1967, 51 (3), 247-253.

Feldman, K.A. College and students - selected readings in the social  
psychology of higher education. New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

Feldman, K.A., & Newcomb, T.M. The impact of college on students.  
(2 vols.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Fidler, P.P. Profile of USC (University of Southern California)  
entering freshmen, fall, 1976. (ERIC Document Service No.  
ED 138 220.)

Gist, N.P., & Bennett, W.S., Jr. Aspirations of Negro and White  
Students. Social Forces, 1963, 42, 40-48.

Governanti, M.P. A study of the motivational orientation of the  
adults attending a Comprehensive Community College. Unpublished  
doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and  
State University, 1980.

- Grant, W.V., & Lind, G.C. Digest of education statistics 1977-78. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.
- Grant, W.V., & Lind, G.C. Digest of education statistics 1979. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.
- Grant, W.V., & Eiden, L.J. Digest of education statistics 1980. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Grant, W.V., & Eiden, L.J. Digest of education statistics 1981. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.
- Gray, G.R., Jacobson, E., Micek, S.S., Patrick, C., Renkiewicz, N., & Dusen, W.V. Student-outcomes questionnaires: an implementation handbook. Boulder: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1979.
- Greenshields, M.J. The college-going decision: high school seniors give their reasons. College and University, 1957, 32 (2), 208-217.
- Harris, E.E. A study of reasons for college attendance. College Student Survey, 1969, 3 (1), 14-18.
- Houle, C. The inquiring mind. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Iffert, R. Retention and withdrawal of college students. Bulletin No. 1, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1958.
- Johnstone, J.W., & Rivera, R. Volunteers for learning. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.
- Jones, V. Attitudes of college students and their changes: A 37 year study. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1970, 81, 3-80.
- Kahl, J.A. Education an occupational aspiration of "common man, boys." The Harvard Educational Review, 1953, 23 (3), 186-203.
- Kandel, D., & Lesser, G.S. School, family, and peer influences on educational plans of adolescents in the United States and Denmark. Sociology of Education, 1970, 43, 270-287.

- Levin, B. & Clowes, D. Realization of educational aspirations among blacks and whites in two- and four-year colleges. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 1980, 4, 185-193.
- Maxwell, M. Improving student learning skills. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- McDill, E.L., & Coleman, J. Family and peer influence in college plans of high school students. Sociology of Education, 1965, 38, 112-126.
- Medsker, L.L., & Trent, J.W. The influence of different types of public higher education on college attendance from varying socioeconomic and ability levels. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Cooperative Research Project No. 438. Berkley, California: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkley, 1965.
- Moore, W., Jr. Against the odds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. 1970.
- Moore, W., Jr. Community college response to the high-risk student: a critical reappraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976.
- Morstain, B., & Smart, J. A motivational typology of adult learners. The Journal of Higher Education, 1977, 48, 665-679.
- Morstain, B., & Smart, J. Reasons for participating in adult education courses: A multivariate analysis of group differences. Adult Education, 1974, 24, 83-98.
- Nelson, H.Y. Right on target. American Vocational Journal, 1975, 50 (2), 92-95.
- Pantages, T.J., & Creedon, C.F. Studies of college attrition: 1950-1975. Review of Educational Research, 1978, 48, 49-101.
- Pervin, L.A. Reality and nonreality in student expectation of college. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 41-48.
- Richards, J.M., & Holland, J.L. A factor analysis of students "expectations" of their choices of a college. ACT Research Report No. 8. Iowa City: American Testing Program, 1965.
- Sanford, N. (Ed.). The American College. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Schwartzweller, H.K., & Lyson, T.A. Social class, parental interest and the educational plans of American and Norwegian rural youth. Sociology of Education, 1974, 47, 443-465.

Sewell, W.H., & Shah V.P. Social class, parental encouragement and educational aspirations. The American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73 (5), 559-572.

Sherif, M., and Sherif, C. Adolescent attitudes and behavior in their reference group within differing sociocultural settings. In John Hill (Ed.), Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.

Spence, D.S. A profile of higher education in the South in 1985. Southern Regional Educational Board. Atlanta, Georgia, 1977.

Stark, M. Commuter and residence hall students compared. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 277-281.

The American College Testing Program. College student profiles: norms for the ACT assessment. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1980.

The American College testing Program. Assessing students on the way to college. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1972.

Thomas, G.E., Alexander, K.L., & Eckland, B.K. Access to higher education: The importance of race, sex, social class, and academic credentials. School Review, 1979, 133-156.

Why they go to college: students give their reasons. Chronicle/Higher Education, January, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. LB 2300 C38X.)

Wolfgang, M.S. Motivation of adult and traditional age students for participation in selected undergraduate degree programs. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, University Microfilms International, 1979, 1-106.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A  
ENROLLMENT SURVEY

## ENROLLMENT SURVEY

You are requested to answer a number of questions about your background. The information obtained will be used in describing college students and in planning programs and services for students. Your personal responses will be held in strictest confidence. The information will be used for research purposes only. Please follow the directions for each part and answer all of the questions.

---

 Name

---

 Social Security Number

DIRECTIONS: Please place the appropriate number in the blank indicated before each alphabetized item. Mark only one answer for each item.

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>_____ A. Sex</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Male</li> <li>2. Female</li> </ol> <p>_____ B. Age</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under 17</li> <li>2. 18 - 24</li> <li>3. 25 - 34</li> <li>4. 35 - 44</li> <li>5. 45 - 54</li> <li>6. 55 or older</li> </ol> <p>_____ C. Race/Ethnic background</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Black/Negro</li> <li>2. White/Caucasian</li> <li>3. Asian American</li> <li>4. Hispanic</li> <li>5. Native American</li> <li>6. Other (specify)</li> </ol> <hr/> <p>_____ D. Income level (family or your income, if single)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. \$ 0 - 5,999</li> <li>2. 6,000 - 7,999</li> <li>3. 8,000 - 12,999</li> <li>4. 13,000 - 21,999</li> <li>5. 22,000 - 34,999</li> <li>6. 35,000 +</li> </ol> | <p>_____ E. When did you graduate from high school?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This year</li> <li>2. Last year</li> <li>3. Did not graduate</li> <li>4. Other</li> </ol> <p>_____ F. What was your average in high school?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A</li> <li>2. A and B</li> <li>3. B</li> <li>4. B and C</li> <li>5. C</li> <li>6. C and D</li> </ol> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|



CONFIDENTIAL

ENROLLMENT SURVEY  
PART II  
EDUCATION PARTICIPATION SCALE

Think back to when you enrolled for your courses at this college this year and indicate the extent to which each of the reasons listed below influenced you to participate.

Circle the category which best reflects the extent to which each reason influenced you to enroll.

There are 40 reasons listed. Circle one category for each reason.

Sometimes the "Much influence" category is on the right-hand side of the page, sometimes it is on the left.

No reason for enrolling is any more or less desirable than any other reason. Please be frank. There are no right or wrong answers.

START HERE:

- |                                                         |                   |                       |                       |                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. To seek knowledge for its own sake.                  | Much<br>influence | Moderate<br>influence | Little<br>influence   | No<br>influence   |
| 2. To share a common interest with my spouse or friend. | No<br>influence   | Little<br>influence   | Moderate<br>influence | Much<br>influence |
| 3. To secure professional advancement.                  | Much<br>influence | Moderate<br>influence | Little<br>influence   | No<br>influence   |
| 4. To become more effective as a citizen.               | No<br>influence   | Little<br>influence   | Moderate<br>influence | Much<br>influence |
| 5. To get relief from boredom.                          | Much<br>influence | Moderate<br>influence | Little<br>influence   | No<br>influence   |
| 6. To carry out the recommendation of some authority.   | No<br>influence   | Little<br>influence   | Moderate<br>influence | Much<br>influence |
| 7. To satisfy an inquiring mind.                        | Much<br>influence | Moderate<br>influence | Little<br>influence   | No<br>influence   |
| 8. To overcome the frustration of day-to-day living.    | No<br>influence   | Little<br>influence   | Moderate<br>influence | Much<br>influence |
| 9. To be accepted by others.                            | Much<br>influence | Moderate<br>influence | Little<br>influence   | No<br>influence   |
| 10. To give me a higher status in my job.               | No<br>influence   | Little<br>influence   | Moderate<br>influence | Much<br>influence |

To What Extent Did These Reasons Influence You to Enroll in Your Courses  
at This College?

11.	To supplement a narrow previous education.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
12.	To stop myself from becoming a vegetable.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
13.	To acquire knowledge to help with other educational courses.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
14.	To fulfill a need for personal associations and friendships.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
15.	To keep up with competition.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
16.	To escape the intellectual narrowness of my occupation.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
17.	To participate in group activity.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
18.	To increase my job competence	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
19.	To gain insight into my personal problems.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
20.	To help me earn a degree, diploma or certificate.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
21.	To escape television.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
22.	To prepare for community service.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
23.	To gain insight into human relations.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
24.	To have a few hours away from responsibilities.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
25.	To learn just for the joy of learning.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence

To What Extent Did These Reasons Influence You to Enroll in Your Course at This College?

26.	To become acquainted with congenial people.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
27.	To provide a contrast to the rest of my life.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
28.	To get a break in the routine of home or work.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
29.	To improve my ability to serve mankind.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
30.	To keep up with others.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
31.	To improve my social relationships.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
32.	To meet formal requirements.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
33.	To maintain or improve my social position.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
34.	To escape an unhappy relationship.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
35.	To provide a contrast to my previous education	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
36.	To comply with the suggestions of someone else.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
37.	To learn just for the sake of learning.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
38.	To make new friends.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence
39.	To improve my ability to participate in community work.	Much influence	Moderate influence	Little influence	No influence
40.	To comply with instructions from someone else.	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Much influence

The Education Participation Scale was developed by Roger Boshier, associate professor of adult education at the University of British Columbia: it was modified slightly for this study.

**APPENDIX B**  
**CORRESPONDENCE FROM DR. BOSHIER**

The University of British Columbia  
Adult Education Department  
5760 Toronto Road  
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1L2 Canada

---



November 13, 1980

Mrs. Lois M. Fears  
1115 Mary Peake Blvd.  
Hampton, Virginia 23666  
U.S.A.

Dear Lois:

This is permission to use the E.P.S. I have enclosed a sample scale and scoring key.

Would it be possible to keep in touch concerning the outcomes of your study? Most people promise to keep in touch but few do. I am in the process of norming the instrument and synthesizing a large mass of E.P.S. data. Anything you can contribute to this will be greatly appreciated and acknowledged in the usual fashion.

All the best for your work. Are you working with Sharan Merriam?

Yours,

Roger Boshier  
Associate Professor of  
Adult Education

RB:LB  
Encl.

APPENDIX C  
DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE EPS

## DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE EDUCATION PARTICIPATION SCALE

- Tell the respondents that this survey is being conducted to determine why students attend college. The abstract will provide additional information to be used only if it is needed.
- The Enrollment Survey and the Educational Participation Scale are essentially self-administering. The simple directions required appear in full at the beginning of each section.
- There will be respondents who will need no further instruction. However, if you think it is necessary, read the directions for the group, and then ask them to proceed by marking their choices.
- Respondents should be asked to fill out the identification information first. If necessary, ask them to read the directions of the first page silently while you read them aloud. Follow the same procedure for page two.
- Respondents should write yes or no in the top blank if he/she is a first-time student at this college this fall.
- Provide assistance to respondents if they have difficulty with work recognition and vocabulary.
- As the respondents begin to mark their answers, check unobtrusively to make certain that each respondent is marking just one choice for each set of four alternatives.
- There is no time limit for individuals to respond to the instrument. It has been found that most respondents complete the instrument in ten to twenty minutes. Collecting instruments as they are completed tends to speed up slow individuals.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

- Names and social security numbers are not absolutely mandatory. However, if a respondent refuses to fill out the instrument only because he has to enter his name, encourage him to respond without identifying himself.

APPENDIX D

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY SEX AND AGE



TABLE D.I  
DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY SEX AND AGE

		Number	Adjusted Frequency Percentage
Sex	Male	332	35.5
	Female	603	64.4
	No Response	1	0.1
	Total	936	100.0
Age Category	Under 17	24	2.6
	18 - 24	778	83.2
	25 - 34	92	9.8
	35 - 44	30	3.2
	45 - 54	9	1.0
	55 or older	2	.2
	No response	1	-
	Total	936	100.0

APPENDIX E

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND

TABLE E.I

## DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY RACE/ETHNIC BACKGROUND

Ethnic Background	Number	Adjusted Frequency Percentage
Black/Negro	574	61.7
White/Caucasian	325	34.9
Asian American	9	1.0
Hispanic	6	.6
Native American	5	.5
Other	12	1.3
No Response	5	-
Total	936	100.0

APPENDIX F

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY FAMILY OR PERSONAL INCOME IF SINGLE

TABLE F.I

## DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY FAMILY OR PERSONAL INCOME IF SINGLE

Income Level	Number	Adjusted Frequency Percentage
\$ 0 - 5,999	155	18.5
6,000 - 7,999	68	8.1
8,000 - 12,999	119	14.2
13,000 - 21,999	196	23.4
22,000 - 34,999	179	21.3
35,000 +	122	14.5
No Response	97	-
Total	936	100.0

APPENDIX G

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY WHEN THEY GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL

TABLE G. I  
 DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY WHEN THEY GRADUATED  
 FROM HIGH SCHOOL

---

High School Categories	Number	Adjusted Frequency Percentage
This year	483	51.7
Last year	184	19.8
Did not graduate	21	2.2
Other	246	26.3
No Response	2	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	936	100.0

---

APPENDIX H

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY HIGH SCHOOL GRADE AVERAGE



TABLE H.I  
DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS BY HIGH SCHOOL GRADE AVERAGE

---

Grade Category	Number	Adjusted Frequency Percentage
A	32	3.4
A and B	180	19.4
B	210	22.6
B and C	293	31.5
C	161	17.3
C and D	54	5.8
No Response	6	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	936	100.0

---

## APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL COMPONENT FACTOR ANALYSIS:  
UNROTATED FACTOR PATTERN MATRIX

TABLE I.1  
 FACTOR MATRIX USING PRINCIPAL FACTOR, NO ITERATIONS

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
Q01	0.20174	0.32917	-0.29451	0.16901	0.28517	0.02155
Q02	0.39190	-0.06123	0.06973	0.12242	-0.01128	0.05356
Q03	0.11504	0.36491	0.26206	0.14773	-0.09509	0.17672
Q04	0.46126	0.25816	-0.20607	0.02531	-0.09963	0.03160
Q05	0.46328	-0.37046	-0.11010	0.13707	-0.03622	0.03656
Q06	0.36777	-0.02978	0.35485	-0.16939	0.18085	0.35544
Q07	0.38671	0.25886	-0.31477	0.28160	0.25972	0.08311
Q08	0.52916	-0.26121	-0.09502	0.30677	-0.15853	0.09494
Q09	0.56207	-0.21156	0.13548	0.11803	-0.05413	0.01653
Q10	0.32951	0.31822	0.39342	0.24664	-0.17864	0.13252
Q11	0.33255	0.20628	-0.13056	0.35857	-0.01044	0.37391
Q12	0.46515	-0.11156	0.00992	0.34940	-0.16735	0.12186
Q13	0.35268	0.36037	-0.00058	-0.07924	0.12904	0.20152
Q14	0.62343	-0.11919	0.04414	-0.01275	-0.09198	0.16310
Q15	0.44504	0.10140	0.32694	0.27016	0.17157	0.17653
Q16	0.39013	0.10458	0.09073	0.33908	-0.09983	0.11431
Q17	0.63528	-0.11832	-0.03692	-0.17578	0.00464	0.11104
Q18	0.34542	0.37223	0.32594	0.22380	-0.08214	0.16581
Q19	0.58887	-0.07359	-0.17093	0.03123	-0.07934	0.03256
Q20	0.13146	0.30025	0.22762	0.06738	0.07480	0.05925
Q21	0.39255	-0.34416	-0.20793	0.03160	-0.14609	0.14863
Q22	0.42800	0.32274	-0.12962	-0.48087	-0.20219	0.16374
Q23	0.52401	0.24680	-0.24982	-0.33583	-0.20324	0.03276
Q24	0.44467	-0.50422	-0.04809	-0.01975	-0.05998	0.05831
Q25	0.35933	0.06004	-0.52927	0.06324	0.47396	0.13150
Q26	0.63154	-0.09173	-0.00187	-0.17285	0.00138	0.28691
Q27	0.56537	0.08271	-0.13281	0.08732	-0.07616	0.17033
Q28	0.53400	-0.41944	-0.09874	-0.00582	-0.00027	0.11703
Q29	0.44628	0.42442	-0.16223	-0.27411	-0.17385	0.05965
Q30	0.45707	-0.03557	0.38712	0.11587	0.16360	0.18150
Q31	0.64999	-0.07508	0.07399	-0.16006	-0.04576	0.23312
Q32	0.34601	0.20855	0.36682	-0.15504	0.32374	0.12862
Q33	0.51839	0.15129	0.25953	-0.02084	-0.12685	0.15320
Q34	0.38493	-0.33394	-0.08452	0.12000	-0.07606	0.11907
Q35	0.42044	0.16194	-0.16675	0.29097	-0.07387	0.31702
Q36	0.33131	-0.22977	0.33467	-0.22856	0.43988	0.30109
Q37	0.28535	0.12292	-0.35833	0.03424	0.63430	0.21112
Q38	0.55193	-0.24746	0.04450	-0.26598	0.01335	0.36602
Q39	0.51892	0.33311	-0.16661	-0.38386	-0.23383	0.09372
Q40	0.43754	-0.17851	0.33359	-0.27967	0.29170	0.33614

APPENDIX J

FACTOR RESPONSES FROM STUDY BY GOVERNANTI AND FINDINGS FOR ALL STUDENTS, DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS

TABLE J.1

FACTOR RESPONSES FROM STUDY BY GOVERNANTI AND FINDINGS FOR ALL STUDENTS,  
DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL STUDENTS

MG	SR			SW			EE			OA			CI			ES			NL				
	A	D	N-D	A	D	N-D	A	D	N-D	A	D	N-D	A	D	N-D	A	D	N-D	A	D	N-D		
<u>SR</u>																							
9	x	x	x																				
14	x	x	x																				
17	x	x	x																				
26	x		x																		x		
31	x	x	x																				
38	x	x	x																				
<u>SW</u>																							
4				x		x															x		
22				x	x	x																	
23				x	x	x																	
29				x	x	x																	
39				x	x	x																	
<u>EE</u>																							
6							x	x	x														
36							x		x												x		
4							x	x	x														
<u>OA</u>																							
3										x	x	x											
10										x	x	x											
11													x	x	x								
13																				x	x	x	
15							x			x		x											
16										x							x				x		
18										x	x	x											
30							x			x											x		
<u>CI</u>																							
1													x	x	x								
7													x	x	x								
25	x												x	x	x								
37													x	x	x								
<u>ES</u>																							
5	x	x	x																				
8	x	x	x																				
12	x	x												x		x							
21	x	x	x																				
24	x	x	x																				
27							x										x				x		
28	x	x	x																				
34	x	x	x																				
<u>NL</u>																							
2																					x	x	x
19	x	x																					
32							x	x	x														
35																	x	x	x				
20																					x	x	x
33										x												x	x

## Coding System:

SR - Social Relationship  
 SW - Social Welfare  
 EE - External Expectations  
 OA - Occupational Advancement  
 CI - Cognitive Interest  
 ES - Escape/Stimulation  
 NL - Number Loading, under 40  
 A - All Students  
 D - Developmental Students  
 ND - Non-Developmental Students  
 MG - Michael Governanti's study

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS FOR ATTENDING COLLEGE OF FIRST-TIME STUDENTS  
IN DEVELOPMENTAL AND NON-DEVELOPMENTAL COURSES  
IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

by

Lois Martin Fears

(ABSTRACT)

An increasing number of developmental students are attending colleges, however, little is known about their reasons for enrolling. A motivational orientation measure was used in this study to compare reasons why developmental and non-developmental students enrolled in courses at three colleges: Hampton Institute, Old Dominion University, and a two-year community college. These students were also compared on selected demographic variables (age, race, income, year graduated from high school, high school grade average).

A survey method was used to collect data which included a demographic questionnaire and a modified version of Boshier's Education Participation Scale, a measure of the extent to which 40 reasons influence students to attend college.

The responses of 934 subjects were factor analyzed and six clusters of motivational factors were identified. Comparison of raw factor scores and mean factor scores on six derived motivational factors scales were made for developmental and non-developmental subjects through a series of t-Tests and Analysis of Variance

procedures. The Scheffé post hoc analysis was used to determine directionality of significance. Demographics (age, income) were treated the same way.

The study found that developmental and non-developmental students were similar in their motivational orientations within and also across institutions. Developmental and non-developmental students were found to be more different on selected demographic variables within institutions than they were between institutions.