

---

## **The Argument Over Awarding Bachelor Degrees by Formerly Two-Year Degree Granting Institutions**

Jeffrey A. Nelson  
*Kent State University Trumbull*

*College and university faculty as well as administrators, along with some government officials, debate the placement of bachelor programs at formerly two-year institutions of higher education, including regional campuses and community colleges. Those individuals speaking against such a development point out the traditional path taken by American colleges and universities and note the successes achieved under this arrangement. Advocates for the change do not deny successes with the traditional order but they claim that the changing nature of the country demands an altered approach to higher learning, with formerly two-year facilities given the opportunity to develop bachelor programs. Both sides of this debate present admirable evidence and reasoning to defend their viewpoints.*

An important debate has recently arisen in American colleges and universities as well as political circles between those supporting and those objecting to the establishment of bachelor degrees at existing two-year institutions of higher learning (Fain, 2013). Individuals resisting the change rely heavily on history and tradition as their sources of evidence and reasoning for the argument while the backers of change emphasize the shifting needs of American communities (Marcus, 2014).

The field of higher education in the United States has had a distinguished past, dating to the founding of Harvard College in 1636 (Duniway, 2006). Closely following Harvard came the establishment of numerous other institutions of higher learning, all characterized by their independent nature in the sense that they had no direct connection to any government agency (Duniway, 2006). Still later, especially in the 1800s, various state legislative bodies began to feel an obligation to provide advanced educational opportunities for the citizenry and created a significant number of additional schools (Duniway, 2006).

A 20<sup>th</sup> century movement expanded the scene even further with the development of two-year campuses to supplement the already existing four-year facilities (Coley, 2000). This movement, growing especially in the

1960s, came in reaction to the calls by political, educational, and economic leaders to make higher education easily available to a wider range of the American people (Coley, 2000). Two of the major objectives of these new schools included: (a) offering students a strong foundation for the pursuit of the bachelor degree, including courses that could transfer to four-year institutions in that pursuit; and (b) providing the opportunity for earning a two-year degree, often called an associate degree, as a sign of notable educational accomplishment (Coley, 2000). In many cases these campuses became extensions of already existing colleges and universities and acquired labels such as “branch campus,” “regional campus,” or “extension” (Coley, 2000). In other instances the newborn schools served alone in the sense that they had no direct relationship with any other institution and received a title such as “junior college” or “community college” (Coley, 2000). Key advantages of the two-year over the four-year facilities centered on their generally lower consumer cost as well as the fact that their locations commonly proved more convenient than those of their four-year counterparts (Coley, 2000; Fonseca & Bird, 2007). Indeed, location played a truly critical role as, for example, in Ohio where James Rhodes, the state’s governor during much of the expansion era, preached that all of the state’s residents should have a college campus within commuting distance (James A. Rhodes, 2001).

Several decades later these two-year institutions have shown their worth throughout the country by providing millions of Americans with a solid educational experience and by honoring many of them with an appropriate degree (Coley, 2000). However, especially within the last ten years or so, a number of two-year college leaders have called for an expansion of some of their academic programs into four-year plans, culminating with the awarding of a bachelor degree (Marcus, 2014). These officials state that with the advancement in technology and other fields, a two-year arrangement often no longer prepares students adequately to enter certain careers (Harden, 2014). Moreover, they contend, in selected disciplines they now have on their campuses a large group of outstanding faculty able to deliver courses of study formerly reserved for four-year institutions (Breuder, 2014a). They further insist that their schools have an interest in expanded programs only in those fields where a documented, unmet community need exists (Breuder, 2014a). Representatives focus particularly on students not able to enroll at four-year campuses due to factors such as cost, time, as well as work and family demands (Harden,

---

2014). This movement for change received much of its original impetus in rural areas, then quickly spread to schools offering nursing studies and other high-demand concentrations (Marklein, 2014). The movement's power shows itself in the fact that at this writing 21 states permit at least some traditional two-year institutions to confer the bachelor degree, with no sign of the whole national trend slowing (Marklein, 2014). Two-year campus spokespersons claim their newfound programs to be a success thus far but point at additional work to be done, noting the low, 14<sup>th</sup> ranking of the United States among world nations in the proportion of persons 25 to 34 years old who have earned a bachelor degree or its equivalent (Breuder, 2014a; Fain, 2013).

Not all observers of the scene agree that it is appropriate or wise to delegate bachelor programs to two-year institutions (Lewin, 2009). A substantial number of prominent higher-education representatives, the group made up primarily of those connected to four-year schools, rate the plan as ill-advised and ultimately damaging to the excellent educational system that has served the country for so many years (Lewin, 2009; Marcus, 2014). A vigorous public discussion has understandably come about involving those supporting and those opposing the bachelor proposals (Fain, 2013). Not surprisingly, individuals opposed to the change rely heavily on history and tradition as their sources of evidence and reasoning for the argument while supporters of the other side turn to the changing needs of American communities (Marcus, 2014).

### **History, Tradition, and Social Change**

Not just in judicial proceedings but in political, economic, and educational contexts, Americans have turned to history and tradition as guides for effective decision-making (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009). The origins and evolution of an issue, including that issue's integration into society's customs, speak not only to successes and failures in the past but offer direction for the future (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009). Even long-ago happenings may have relevance for contemporary times, though admittedly more recent events may provide a source of refutation for judgments derived from studying that past (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009). Additionally, as a community's people develop, they may revise their attitudes and aspirations, changing their minds about how social needs should be met (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009). While they do not necessarily have an aversion to studying the past, and respecting it, they submit that an evolving culture

requires constant reevaluation by its representatives (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009; Wright, 1964).

### **The Argument Opposing Bachelor Degree Programs at Two-Year Schools**

The key argument against two-year institutions having the right to confer bachelor degrees centers on the claim that our past American experience has almost exclusively reserved that degree for four-year schools, and that they have done an excellent job in providing a quality education leading to the degree; to change a long-working plan that has benefitted many millions of citizens would be foolish (Kozlowski, 2014). Then president of the University of Michigan, Mary Sue Coleman, in referring to her own jurisdiction, stated that “I don’t see an economic necessity for creating more four-year programs in the state,” adding, “We’re doing very well with the programs that we’ve got and Michigan is to be envied for the quality of education that it has” (quoted in Kozlowski). Dan Nannini, a member of California’s higher education system, asked: “Would you ask Pepsi to make Coke? Would you want your heart surgeon to do your brain surgery?” (Nannini, 2014). He went on to say that two-year campuses have shown that they can do a fine job educating college students for the first two years; however, after that it has been the four-year schools that have provided the quality education—they have shown that they can carry out the task extremely well, thus our faith in them should remain (Nannini, 2014). Certainly, advocates of holding onto the traditional system assert, no important shift should occur unless the four-year schools endorse it (Painter, 2014).

Michael Boulos, executive director of the Presidents Council of State Universities of Michigan, called two-year campuses’ plans for expansion “clearly unnecessary,” “a solution in search of a problem”; he went on to note that such campuses “should stick with the important work they do extremely well, offering two-year degrees and preparing students for transfer to four-year schools” (quoted in Lewin, 2009). Nannini echoed Boulos’ sentiments, remarking that two-year institutions “have enough to do” with their existing obligations while “there are plenty of places, brick and mortar, and virtual, to earn a bachelor’s degree”; “Now is not the time to tack on another mission that others are already doing” (Nannini, 2014).

Another issue raised by those objecting to the bachelor program at two-year institutions relates to the clarity of the mission for varied schools. Whereas in the past, according to these objections, the different missions of

---

the two-year and four-year campuses were clear for everyone to see, the proposed arrangement “blurs the distinction between branches of higher education” (Marcus, 2014), bringing about potential confusion among the public. Charles Lucas, professor of education at the University of Arkansas, commented that “I get a little uneasy” at the prospect of two-year campuses taking on a major role formerly relegated exclusively to other institutions; “When you try to be all things to all people, you end up not being very good for any of them” (quoted in Lewin, 2009). Added Carol Geary Schneider, president of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, “Many people in leadership believe that’s the right division of labor [the traditional four-year structure],” “So like any fundamental change, the blurring of lines is uncomfortable” (quoted in Lewin, 2009). Boulos expressed agreement with Lucas and Schneider, maintaining that the proposed two-year college conversion would muddy the distinction between sectors of higher education, declaring: “It’s clearly mission creep” (quoted in Fain, 2013).

A number of critics submit that instead of fulfilling a truly important social and educational need, the proposal to extend the mission of two-year schools is no more than “an ego-driven, money-wasting cry for prestige and respect from institutions at the low end of the higher-education hierarchy” (Marcus, 2014). A big risk, a number of commentators state, lies in the fact that administrators of the eager-to-change two-year colleges may “like the up-market sound of becoming a state college, and begin to give short shrift to the two-year role that other institutions can’t fill” (Fain, 2014). According to these spokespersons, advocates for change are hardly doing so based on a wholesome motive.

Based on the immediately preceding commentary, it should come as no surprise that many opponents of the two-year conversion express serious doubts about the quality of education these altered schools would deliver. Rep. Craig Horn, co-chair of the North Carolina House of Representatives education innovation committee and a powerful political force dealing with potential changes in higher education in his state, asserted: “Universities unto themselves [not two-year colleges] tend to attract high-demand instructors” (quoted in Painter, 2014). Nannini stated that two-year colleges carry out their present tasks extremely effectively, but going into a new, relatively unfamiliar area probably would not result in truly excellent educational programs (Nannini, 2014). The picture does not get any brighter as painted by John Quiggin, stationed at the University of

Australia but a close observer of American colleges and universities. In recent remarks he placed two-year schools squarely “at the bottom of the status hierarchy [in higher education],” asserting that they “are failing badly” due to their high attrition rate and their ability to move only a third of their students to a degree within six years of initial enrollment (Quiggin, 2014). Quiggin’s portrayal certainly does not support the proposition that two-year campuses stand ready to move into an exemplary bachelor program. Indeed, “concerns about the quality of [proposed] degree programs,” in the view of some university officers, “could lead to accreditation snags” (Fain, 2013), making the whole venture potentially wasteful and harmful for all concerned, with the awarding of mere “watered-down bachelor’s degrees” (Lewin, 2009).

In fact, stated Matt McLogan, vice president for student relations at Grand Valley State University in Michigan, many four-year schools have already made it easy for students from two-year institutions to transfer their credits and finish their bachelor requirements (Marcus, 2014). Christine Mallon, assistant vice chancellor at California State University, added that some of the four-year schools not only work closely with the students in their transition but guarantee admission as a junior for those who have completed selected two-year programs (Baron, 2014). Since two-year and four-year institutions have consistently shown their skill at working together to make the shift from one school to another easily carried out by students, the argument goes, no need for a change in policy exists (Fain, 2013).

Keeping the status quo also means, according to numerous college and university officials, avoiding unnecessary competition between their institutions and two-year schools (Fain, 2013; Nannini, 2014). These authorities claim that while they agree that a competitive environment often can push opposing sides to greater achievement, in this case, especially with flattening enrollment in several regions of the nation, virtually all competitors would suffer (Fain, 2013; Nannini, 2014). The already established four-year campuses would likely lose students, these spokespersons state, while the two-year colleges would assume added costs for new faculty and facilities upgrades; the plan would almost certainly draw resources away from the two-year schools’ core mission (Fain, 2013; Nannini, 2014). In sum, opponents of two-year colleges taking on bachelor programs cannot find a single major argument that they feel supports such a move. The traditional manner of handling higher education in the United

---

States has resulted in notable success, they assert, and to upset that tradition in the form suggested would inflict significant harm on the institutions involved.

### **The Argument Supporting Bachelor Degree Programs at Two-Year Campuses**

Advocates of the bachelor project for selected two-year campuses see the country going through key social-cultural changes and contend that higher education, in order to adapt to these changes, must recast the way in which it carries out its mission. Those endorsing this project, primarily two-year school officials and some state legislators, submit that already established four-year colleges and universities by themselves cannot satisfy the nation's bachelor-program needs. Many of these proponents contend that history and tradition actually align more with their side than the opposition's since, they note, a major achievement for the country's higher education system has revolved around its ability to remold itself based on societal transitions (Chen, 2014b).

Jobs that used to require no more than an associate degree now demand the completion of a bachelor program in numerous instances, according to various representatives of two-year colleges, and who better to help seekers of those jobs move through a four-year program than those faculty and staff who guided them through the first two years (Breuder, 2014a; Chen, 2014b). Moreover, the argument continues, in certain instances some two-year campuses may have assembled a faculty capable of delivering bachelor programs formerly offered exclusively at four-year schools; if those two-year institutions can show a genuine community need for added programs, verified by legislative and/or educational authorities, those programs deserve support (Breuder, 2014a). Understandably, backers of change say, some officials of already established four-year institutions fear the competition from the proposed programs, and the loss of money that might well result. On the other hand, these backers submit, the competition could motivate affected schools to work even harder at offering top-quality programs at a reasonable cost (Breuder, 2014a; Kinsey, 2014).

While it is too early to judge the success of four-year programs already initiated at two-year institutions, positive signs do appear. Students are enrolling in large numbers, and after being in a program for a time, they seem pleased with the choice they have made. A Florida student remarked:

“This has definitely helped me focus again.” Another student spoke of her reaction to people who, knowing she attends a former two-year campus, questioned the worth of her program: “I just laugh it off. It’s a four-year accredited college. It’s funny more than anything.” Added still one more individual proudly: “My friends at universities were, like, ‘You’re the smart one’” (quoted in Marcus, 2014). A fine example of the success that can be achieved lies with the Chillicothe campus of Ohio University. The campus, which came into existence as a night school in 1946, in large part to provide an education for World War II veterans, later expanded to provide day classes as well, eventually supplying a wide variety of academic programs for a surging enrollment. Over the last several years the campus has expanded further into bachelor offerings, the vitality of this latest move indicated by the campus’ healthy growth into a vital four-year facility, with at least 10 independent bachelor choices (“Ohio University Chillicothe Bachelor,” 2014; “Ohio University Chillicothe History,” 2014). Even a number of past critics of the reconfiguration undertaken by former two-year campuses admit that thus far the new system seems to be working well. Moreover, the successful debuts find themselves not limited to one region but placed throughout the country (Chen, 2014a; Fain, 2013).

Advocates of the bachelor plan also point out research showing that students starting at one school and remaining there for the full four years have better completion rates than those who leave for another institution. Indeed, students, particularly those of the first generation, often achieve a comfort level at their native school not duplicated if they transfer. The seamless transition from two-year to four-year plan so often possible if the students stay at the same institution can pay handsome dividends (Breuder, 2014a; Chen, 2014a; Lewin, 2009).

Cost also comes into play as a key issue, proponents of the two-to-four-year expansion submit. They note that throughout the nation most two-year institutions charge significantly less in tuition and fees than do traditional four-year schools, even after a two-year campus has begun offering the bachelor degree. Students can generally save thousands, sometimes tens of thousands of dollars, by not following the customary route (Chen, 2014b; Kozlowski, 2014; Marcus, 2014). The financial advantages accrue not only for those attending freestanding two-year institutions, having no connection with another school, but often for students attending branch campuses of colleges and universities, such as in

---

Ohio where a number of major state universities maintain regional locations in addition to the central campus (see, e.g., "Tuition: Financing." 2014).

The monetary issue looms as especially important in light of the fact that while over 30% of American adults born after 1980 are earning bachelor's degrees, with that number being higher than 50% for wealthy individuals, the figure for low-income people stands at a mere 10% (Breuder, 2014b; Orszag, 2014; Perez-Pena, 2012). Even for those poorer persons who take on a college education, they are much less likely to attain the bachelor's degree than their affluent counterparts. Moreover, the researchers for this conclusion made sure to measure students with similar cognitive skills (Orszag, 2014). Peter Orszag, former director of the Office of Management and Budget in the Obama administration, stated: "This [the existing state in higher education] perpetuates inequality from one generation to the next and limits the economic benefits that could come if a wider swath of the population earned college degrees" (Orszag, 2014). Racially, blacks and Latinos, who earn much less per capita than whites, continue to trail far behind whites in the proportion of their people earning bachelor degrees, with the gap widening over the past decade (Perez-Pena, 2012). Overall, because at least 44% of low-income students who enroll in a college or university do so at a two-year campus, and because there exists a better chance of their attaining a bachelor degree if that original institution offers a seamless transition to a four-year program, it seems reasonable to assume that a change in policy might lessen the degree gap (Baron, 2014). Even more, the monetary gap between the rich and some of the poor might lessen since after earning a bachelor degree Americans generally find their earning power substantially increased (Leonhardt, 2014).

Altogether, advocates of a four-year collegiate program for existing two-year institutions find no fault with the quality of the bachelor offerings already available at traditional four-year schools. They submit, however, that the culture of the nation has changed so significantly over the years that the people deserve added educational options, options that might transform their lives for the better.

## **Conclusion**

The culture of the United States owns a longstanding sentiment that if a certain kind of activity is producing positive outcomes, those wanting to tamper with that activity must present to the national audience compelling reasons for doing so (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009). Officials associated with

traditional four-year institutions of higher learning contend that not only are they offering their students a high-quality education but they have taken major steps to display a genuine welcome to all types of enrollees, with special attention given to the needs of those who have studied at two-year schools (Baron, 2014; Marcus, 2014). They contend that their outstanding professoriate, excellent facilities, and proven experience simply cannot be replicated at a two-year campus (Kozlowski, 2014; Nannini, 2014; Painter, 2014). From their perspective, the backers of bachelor programs at two-year campuses have failed to prove a real need for an altered collegiate structure, and even if that need did exist, the proponents have not demonstrated that their plan would fill the void by providing a rich educational experience (Fain, 2013; Lewin, 2009).

The advocates for change, on the other hand, assert that many worthy Americans are not receiving bachelor degrees because of the existing collegiate system and they propose revising that system by permitting individuals to acquire their degrees through selected programs placed at two-year institutions (Breuder, 2014a; Chen, 2014b). A significant number of two-year schools have evolved over time, the proponents state, to the point that they have the faculty and facilities necessary to furnish high-quality bachelor programs (Breuder, 2014b). Supporters of the change pay special notice to low-income Americans, solid students in many instances but often unable to secure a four-year degree because of cost (Breuder, 2014a; Orszag, 2013, Perez-Pena, 2012). Their situation would change for the better, the contention goes, if they could enroll in a bachelor program at a two-year campus—where expenses would likely be much lower than at a traditional four-year institution (Baron, 2014; Orszag, 2013; Perez-Pena, 2012).

The decision made by college and university leaders on the bachelor program at two-year institutions will clearly have a substantial impact on the nation not just educationally but economically and socially as well. Whether the system remains the same or undergoes a key transformation will ultimately affect the whole American culture.

### **Personal Biography**

Jeffrey Nelson is associate professor of Communication Studies at the Kent State University Trumbull campus. He received his Ph.D. in Speech Communication from the University of Michigan.

---

**References**

- Baron, K. (2014, February 18). Renewed push to let community colleges award bachelor's degree. *EdSource Today*. Retrieved from <http://edsources.org/2014/bill-would-let-community-colleges-award-bachelors-degrees/57556>
- Breuder, R.L. (2014a, June 2). Community colleges: Four-year degrees and beyond. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-robert-l-breuder/community-colleges-four-year-degrees-and-beyond\\_b\\_5077331.html?view=print&comm\\_ref=false](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dr-robert-l-breuder/community-colleges-four-year-degrees-and-beyond_b_5077331.html?view=print&comm_ref=false)
- Breuder, R.L. (2014b, March 26). Illinois community colleges should offer 4-year degrees. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from [http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2014-03-26/opinion/ct-perspec-college-0326-20140326\\_1\\_community-colleges-4-year-degrees-illinois-board](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2014-03-26/opinion/ct-perspec-college-0326-20140326_1_community-colleges-4-year-degrees-illinois-board)
- Chen, C. (2014a, June 17). New bachelor's degrees offered at community colleges. *Community College Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.communitycollegereview.com/articles/338>
- Chen, C. (2014b, March 11). Obtaining your bachelor's degree at a community college. *Community College Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.communitycollegereview.com/articles/29>
- Coley, R.J. (2000). The American community college turns 100: A look at its students, programs, and prospects. *Policy Information Center of Educational Testing Service*. Retrieved from [www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICCC.pdf](http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICCC.pdf)
- Duniway, B. (2006). A brief history of higher education in the United States. On Purpose Publishing Company. Retrieved from <http://www.collegewin.com/higher-education/a-brief-history-of-higher-education-in-america.html>
- Fain, P. (2013, January 22). Evolution or mission creep? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/01/22/michigan-lets-community-colleges-issue-four-year-degrees-amid-controversy#sthash.rXENfgad.dpbs>
- Fonseca, J.W., & Bird, C.P. (2007, October). Under the radar: Branch campuses take off. *University Business*. Retrieved from <http://www.universitybusiness.com/article/under-radar-branch-campuses-take>

- Freeley, A.J., & Steinberg, D.L. (2009). *Argumentation and debate: Critical thinking for reasoned decision making* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Harden, M. (2014, February 28). Colorado community colleges can grant 4-year career degrees under new law. *Denver Business Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.bizjournals.com/denver/news/2014/02/28/colorado-community-colleges-can-grant.html?page=all>
- James A. Rhodes, Ohio's governor for 16 years, dead at age 91. (2001, March 5). *Gongwer News Service, Ohio Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.gongwer-oh.com/public/xref/jar01.pdf>
- Kinsey, T. (2014, March 31). Lawmakers to revisit 4-year degrees at Florida community colleges. *Bay News 9*. Retrieved from [http://www.baynews9.com/content/news/baynews9/news/article.html/content/news/articles/cfn/2014/3/31/proposed\\_bill\\_agains.html](http://www.baynews9.com/content/news/baynews9/news/article.html/content/news/articles/cfn/2014/3/31/proposed_bill_agains.html)
- Kozlowski, K. (2014, April 16). Michigan community colleges add 4-year degree into mix. *Detroit News*. Retrieved from <http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20140416/SCHOOLS/304160027>
- Leonhardt, D. (2014, May 27). Is college worth it? Clearly, new data say. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/27/upshot/is-college-worth-it-clearly-new-data-say.html?mod=Search&mabReward=relbias%3Ar%2C%7B%22%22%3A%22RI%3A14%22%7D>
- Lewin, T. (2009, May 2). Community colleges challenge hierarchy with 4-year degrees. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/03/education/03community.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/03/education/03community.html?_r=0)
- Marcus, J. (2014, April 14). Community colleges increasingly adding bachelor's degrees. *The Hechinger Report*. Retrieved from [http://hechingerreport.org/content/community-colleges-increasingly-adding-bachelors-degrees\\_15514/](http://hechingerreport.org/content/community-colleges-increasingly-adding-bachelors-degrees_15514/)
- Marklein, M.B. (2014, June 5). Community colleges shorten their names. *USA Today*, p. 3A.
- Nannini, D. (2014, February 18). Dan Nannini says. *EdSource Today*. Retrieved from <http://edsources.org/2014/bill-would-let-community-colleges-award-bachelors-degrees/57556>
- Ohio University Chillicothe bachelor degrees (2014). *Ohio University Chillicothe*. Retrieved from
-

---

<http://www.chillicothe.ohiou.edu/pages/academics/programs/bachelor-degrees.htm>

Ohio University Chillicothe history (2014). *Ohio University Regional Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://www.ohio.edu/regional/chillicothehistory.cfm>

Orszag, P. (2013, March 7). The diploma gap between rich and poor. *Washington Monthly*. Retrieved from

[http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/college\\_guide/blog/the\\_diploma\\_gap\\_between\\_rich\\_a.php](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/college_guide/blog/the_diploma_gap_between_rich_a.php)

Painter, H. (2014, April 27). Bachelor's degrees at community colleges? *The John William Pope Center for Higher Education Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.popecenter.org/commentaries/article.html?id=3002>

Perez-Pena, R. (2012, February 23). U.S. bachelor degree rate passes milestone. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/24/education/census-finds-bachelors-degrees-at-record-level.html>

Quiggin, J. (2014, May 16). Campus reflection. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B4-B5.

Tuition: Financing your education at Kent State. *Kent State University*. Retrieved from <http://www.kent.edu/tuition>

Wright, W.E. (1964). Judicial rhetoric: A field for research. *Speech Monographs*, 31, 64-72.