DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 393 HE 004 579

AUTHOR Pugliaresi, Lucian S.
TITLE Inquiries into a New Degree: The Candidate in Philosophy.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Ford Foundation Program for Research in Univ. Administration.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO Pap-P-13
PUB DATE Nov 70
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM Ford Foundation, 2288 Fulton Street, Berkeley, California 94720

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Costs; Degree Requirements; *Degrees (Titles); *Doctoral Degrees; Educational Economics; *Graduate Students; *Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Candidate in Philosophy Degree; University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

The pros and cons of formally recognizing the achievement of candidacy status by awarding a Candidate in Philosophy degree are discussed. The purpose of the study is to explore both the institutional economic impact of the new degree and to determine whether the University of California at Berkeley created a net benefit by what appeared to be a costless operation, i.e., certifying candidacy status. The author concludes that although marginal costs of the degrees were zero in terms of expenditures, there were costs to the public and students that outweigh benefits the degree might bring. The author also concludes that the degree does not seem to fulfill requirements for employment in the community college faculty market. A 21-item bibliography is included. (Author)

FORD FOUNDATION PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH IN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Office of the Vice President—Planning
University of California

FORD GRANT NO. 680-0267A

RESEARCH DIRECTORATE

Charles J. Hitch — President, University of California

Frederick E. Balderston — Professor of Business Administration
Chairman, Center for Research in Management Science
University of California, Berkeley
Academic Assistant to the President

OFFICE ADDRESS

2288 Fulton Street
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-5490

INQUIRIES INTO A NEW DEGREE:
THE CANDIDATE IN PHILOSOPHY

Lucian S. Pugliaresi

Paper P-13

November, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		ii
PREFACE		iii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	A NEW DEGREE IN ACADEMIA	4
	The Setting	4
	A New Intermediate Degree at Berkeley	8
	The Candidate in Philosophy Degree and the Department--A Preliminary Hypothesis	13
	Questionnaire Analysis of C.Phil.'s from Berkeley	17
	Candidate in Philosophy Questionnaire	18
III.	THE MARKET FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS	27
	Community College Interviews	27
IV.	CONCLUSION	39
BIBLIOGRAPHY		42

PREFACE

This is one of a continuing series of reports of the Ford Foundation sponsored Research Program in University Administration at the University of California, Berkeley. The guiding purpose of this Program is to undertake quantitative research which will assist university administrators and other individuals seriously concerned with the management of university systems both to understand the basic functions of their complex systems and to utilize effectively the tools of modern management in the allocation of educational resources.

The purpose of this study is to explore both the institutional and economic impact of the Candidate in Philosophy degree and to determine if the University has created value by what appears to be a costless operation, i.e., conferral of an intermediate degree. Questionnaires and interviews were used to acquire insight into the nature and status of this new degree in the academic market, within the internal functioning of the University, and to the recipient of the newly-instituted Candidate in Philosophy degree.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that institutions of higher learning certify as well as educate. In a society where certification plays such an important role in the assigning of social status and opportunities for good incomes, it is not surprising that certification is an important function of higher education. Thus, for the master's degree alone, the U.S. Office of Education reported over 328 varieties in 1963-64.[1] Now, with the introduction of intermediate degrees between the M.A. and the Ph.D. in recent years, the list of degrees offered by U.S. colleges and universities should continue to grow. To an important extent the level of resources available to our colleges and universities as they exist today depends upon their ability to continue to provide recognized certification. Jencks and Riesman comment on this certification process in The Academic Revolution:

> The crucial raison d'etre of the American college, the sine qua non of its survival and current importance, may not be education but certification. Virtually all college curricula lead to some sort of diploma or degree. A college that does not sort and label its students in this way evidently cannot find a clientele - at least we know of none that has done so over any considerable period of time. A "college" that does not offer any instruction, on the other hand, can still find a market for its degrees, and a substantial number of these diploma mills do in fact exist.[2]

The diploma mills do in fact exist and one could purchase the Doctor of Philosophy for the sum of $250 as late as 1959.[3]

---

[1] A recent publication from the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education by Stephen H. Spurr [17] contains a great deal of useful empirical data on academic degrees. See especially p. 65.

[2] Jencks and Riesman [12] present an excellent critical analysis of the sociological impact of American higher education. See especially p. 61.

[3] Stephen Spurr, op. cit., p. 18.

For the economist who must assess the impact of certification in the market place, a distinction must be made between certification and licensure. Certification only states that certain individuals have met a particular agency's standards and prohibits no one from practicing the occupation, licensure is an absolute requirement to practice the occupation. What occurs in the marketplace when certification is introduced is stated succinctly by Milton Friedman in Capitalism and Freedom:

> Certification is much less harmful in this respect (i.e., as opposed to licensure). If the certified "abuse" their special certificates; if, in certifying newcomers, members of the trade impose unnecessarily stringent requirements and reduce the number of practitioners too much, the price differential between the certified and non-certified will become sufficiently large to induce the public to use non-certified practitioners.[4]

Friedman's comments are of special interest in that certification may be introduced where there already exists more than a sufficient number of "licensed practitioners." There are also a number of characteristics of academic markets that make market analysis particularly difficult and must be kept in mind in any analysis of the certification process in institutions of higher education. Not only are there external demands by industry and educational institutions for certified individuals, but there are internal demands for certification by the students and the institutions that produce certified personnel. There are institutional requirements for accreditation of four year colleges that require a Ph.D. "license" of its employees in order to remain a recognized college. Demands for prestige, differentiated products and intricate certification procedures are all aspects of academic markets.

---

[4] Friedman's [9] discussion of the economic impact of certification and licensure is a classic. See especially p. 149.

This analysis is primarily concerned with a new intermediate degree that is the result of further certification only, there is no change or addition to the educational program. It is merely the formalization of the ABD (all-but-dissertation) stage in the Ph.D. program in a number of fields. A much more specific description of the Candidate in Philosophy degree and its emergence on the academic scene will be provided in the second chapter. The purpose of this study was to explore both the institutional and economic impact of this new degree and to determine if the University had created value by what appeared to be a costless operation, i.e., conferral of an intermediate degree. Extensive use of questionnaires and interviews was helpful in acquiring insight into the nature and status of this new degree in the academic market, within the internal functioning of the University, and to the recipient of the newly-instituted Candidate in Philosophy degree.

II. A NEW DEGREE IN ACADEMIA

The Setting

The formalization of the ABD (all-but-dissertation) stage by a number of major U.S. universities received its impetus from a conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities in 1966 and the meetings of the Council of Graduate Schools in 1967. The new intermediate degree, the Master in Philosophy (M.Phil.) or the Candidate in Philosophy (C.Phil.), was to be conferred to the individual who had been advanced to candidacy in the Ph.D. program and whose only remaining requirement for the Ph.D. was completion of the dissertation. By the time the Association of Graduate Schools had convened in October, 1966, Michigan and Yale had already authorized conferrel of an intermediate degree. The most sweeping changes in certification procedures were made at Yale which, except for a few specialized fields, eliminated its M.A. and M.S. degrees and now offered only the M.Phil., Ph.D., and a Certificate of Study for anyone who completed over a year of graduate school but had not been awarded any advanced degree.

The graduate schools were attempting to deal with a number of problems in graduate education that had been aggravated as the universities made a major committment to the production of Ph.D.'s over the last 15 years. Two major problems that graduate schools continue to face are high attrition rates among students in Ph.D. programs and the erosion of the M.A. and M.S. as respected intermediate degrees. Table I, which shows attrition rates among Woodrow Wilson Fellows, is one indicator of the high attrition rates that seem to be characteristic of Ph.D. programs, especially

TABLE I

PERCENT OF WOODROW WILSON FELLOWS ATTAINING THE Ph.D. DEGREE BY FIELD

FIELD	TOTAL ENROLLED 1958-60	% ATTAINING Ph.D. BY 1966
Humanities		
English	698	22.6
Modern Languages	260	26.2
Philosophy	189	31.7
Classics	79	35.4
Fine Arts	40	7.5
Musicology	49	6.1
Speech, Drama	21	19.0
American Studies	20	45.0
Other	7	14.3
Subtotal	1363	24.5
Social Sciences		
History, History of Science	475	27.6
Political Sciences	256	27.3
Economics	157	38.8
Psychology	103	57.3
Sociology	68	19.1
Anthropology	65	27.7
Religion	28	7.1
Area Studies	53	17.0
Other	77	15.6
Subtotal	1282	29.2
Science		
Math	253	49.8
Physics	236	62.7
Chemistry	161	74.5
Biology, Medical Sciences	118	49.2
Geology	21	61.9
Astronomy	8	75.0
Statistics	2	100.0
Other	6	66.7
Subtotal	805	59.2
TOTAL	3450	34.4

*Source: Data taken from Mooney [14], pp. 52-53, as cited by Breneman [3], p. 1

in the social sciences and humanities. Studies by Stark [18] and Breneman [3] show similar characteristics in the graduate programs at Berkeley with the attrition rates rising as one moves from the hard sciences to the social sciences and humanities. The Deans were aware of the high attrition rates in the humanities and social sciences and Dean Robert Baker of the University of Virginia commented on one of the functions of the new intermediate degree:

> Graduate deans recognize that this certificate whatever its acceptance might be, is not likely to affect very many students in the experimental fields where the necessity of staying in the laboratory until the dissertation is essentially finished is a long-established practice. It would, however, serve to give more status to students in the humanities and some of the social sciences, and perhaps even in mathematics, while they are at the same time attempting to make a living and write the dissertation. It would further serve as a higher status symbol than the Master's degree for those unfortunate people who never get the doctoral dissertation completed.[1]

The relevance of a new intermediate degree to the social sciences and humanities was of special interest to the Berkeley Division of the Graduate Council and will be discussed later in this chapter in the appropriate section.

Dean John Perry Miller of the Yale Graduate School, which chose to eliminate its M.A. and M.S. degrees, accurately stated the status of these degrees in many of our universities:

> . . . for some time we have been unhappy with the traditional intermediate degrees, i.e., the M.A. and M.S. degrees. We feel they have lost their meaning. For over a decade we have discussed proposals to

---

[1] Dean Rovert H. Baker, in Whaley [19], p. 103.

> raise the standards of these degrees without success. Our final conclusion was to cease awarding them, a fitting end for degrees which began as "giveaways" and, after a career with many ups and downs, are now too often viewed as "consolation prizes."[2]

Yale was also aware that it would be just as easy to erode the M.Phil. certification procedure as it had been for the M.A. and the M.S. degrees and so financial support for the dissertation was tied to the conferral of the Master in Philosophy degree. Dean Miller commented upon the necessity of special provisions in conferring the M. Phil.:

> In the past the Master's degree has frequently been a convenient consolation prize. We realize that in establishing a new intermediate degree there is a danger that students will be certified as having completed the requirements for the Ph.D. but told that they cannot go further. Examining committees face the temptation of passing a student so that he can receive his Master in Philosophy degree with the hope that informal advice will prevent him from going on or that eventually he will fall off the vine. The withholding of financial support is one device which may be used to discourage him. In view of these temptations and our firm intention to avoid this situation, we have established the principle that any student recommended for the Master in Philosophy degree may proceed toward the Ph.D. He has a first claim on a place in the department's quota of students and upon financial aid. In short, in recommending the student for the Master in Philosophy the department agrees to give him preference over new incoming students and to embrace him in at least a limited liaison if not a permanent marriage.[3]

Faculty departments are complex organizations and until a study of M.Phil.'s at Yale is completed, it is difficult to determine what the results of a certification procedure of this nature will show.

The graduate schools have also felt that the new intermediate degree

[2] Dean John Perry Miller, in Whaley [19], p. 98.

[3] Ibid., p. 99.

would have substantial economic impact. Many proponents of the intermediate degree felt it would make recipients of this new degree more employable and help fill the demand for college teachers at the undergraduate level. The following comments are from the 1966 conference of the Association of Graduate Schools, Dean John Perry Miller:

> We believe firmly that there are many teaching positions in colleges and universities which can be satisfied well and perhaps even better by persons who have not gone through the rigors of the dissertation.[4]

Dean Stephen H. Spurr:

> The sum total of all these factors will be to increase immediately the supply of qualified graduate students for employment in four-year liberal arts colleges and junior colleges. The Candidate's degree, simply because it is an intermediate philosophical degree awarded at an already recognized stage in graduate study, can be immediately and importantly effective . . . The Candidate's degree will be supplying desperately needed scholars and teachers.[5]

The Deans were searching for a certification procedure that would, among other things, help alleviate the short supply of college teachers and provide employment for their Ph.D. candidates, and it should be emphasized that few or no changes were introduced into the educational programs. By 1968, 15 graduate schools in the U.S. and Canada offered a new intermediate degree and Table II gives a breakdown by institution of the graduate schools that offer new intermediate degrees.

A New Intermediate Degree at Berkeley

The Candidate in Philosophy degree was conferred for the first time at the University of California, Berkeley, in June of 1968. It developed

---

[4] Miller, in Whaler, op. cit., p. 98.

[5] Stephen H. Spurr, in Whaley [19], p. 112.

TABLE II - INTERMEDIATE DEGREES

Institution	Award	Degree (D) or Certificate (C)	Awarded to All (A) or Individual Basis (I)	Date Authorized	Date First Granted	Number thru 1968	Average # per Year Through 1968	Ave. # per Year thru 1968 as % of Fall 1968 Enrollment
Univ. of Toronto	Master of Phil.	D	I	Nov. 1963	June 1965	46	11.5	-
Univ. of Waterloo	Master of Phil.	D	I	Dec. 1964	Oct. 1966	1	.3	-
Univ. of Michigan	Candidate in Phil.[a]	C	A	May 1966	May 1966	1,877	625.6	9.48%
Yale	Master of Phil.	D	I	May 1966	June 1967	330	165.0	7.06
Northwestern	Candidate in Phil.	C	A	Dec. 1966	Feb. 1968	375	375.0	13.39
Indiana Univ.	Candidate in Phil.	C	A	April 1967	Jan. 1968	500	500.0	7.08
Univ. of Minnesota	Candidate in Phil.	C	A	May 1967	Jan. 1968	1,870	1,870.0	36.06
Univ. of Rochester	Candidate	C	A	May 1967	Mar. 1968	478	478.0	32.61
Rutgers	Master of Phil.	D	I	Jan. 1967	May 1968	4	4.0	.18
Univ. of Virginia	Cert. of Candidacy	C	I	June 1967	June 1967	25	12.5	.59
UCLA	Candidate in Phil.	D	I	Feb. 1968	June 1968	40	40.0	.49
UC Berkeley	Candidate in Phil.	D	I	Feb. 1968	Sept. 1968	56	56.0	.64
Univ. of Wisconsin	Cert. of Phil.	C	A	Apr. 1968	Sept. 1968	850	850.0	12.25
Univ. of Washington	Candidate in Phil.[b]	C	A	May 1968	July 1967[c]	346	173.0	3.86
Univ. of Hawaii	Cert. of Progress	C	I	Aug. 1968	Dec. 1968	8	8.0	.58

[a] Also Candidate in Education, Candidate in Musical Arts.

[b] Also Candidate in Business Administration, Education, and Musical Arts.

[c] Retroactive to July 1967.

Source: Spurr [17], data taken from pp. 98-99. The data from the last two columns was compiled from Chandler [7].

along similar lines to the new intermediate degrees listed in Table II although the certification procedures were not nearly as comprehensive as those at Yale University. All traditional certification procedures remained intact and the new degree only required further certification at the ABD level which was to conform to the provisions set down by the Berkeley division of the Graduate Council. The Candidate in Philosophy degree was to be conferred only upon those students that "possessed the intellectual capacity to complete the requirements for the Ph.D. degree" and was not to be conferred in those cases which there was "doubt in the minds of the faculty of the department that the student could complete the requirements for the Ph.D. degree."[6] The new degree grew out of a recommendation of the Graduate Council in 1966 in the hope that it would increase the percentage of graduate students granted the Ph.D. degree.

It was the hope of the Graduate Council that the Candidate in Philosophy degree would allow the graduate student a certain amount of flexibility upon reaching the dissertation stage in his graduate program. The new degree was to mark "a significant level of achievement beyond the Master's degree" and therefore allow students to enter into full-time teaching positions with the option of continuing on to the dissertation depending upon the personal ambitions of the student. It was also the desire of the Graduate Council that the degree was not to be the result of a separate terminal program and therefore susceptible to the label of "second class" and that those "colleges that emphasize their desire to engage teachers rather than scholars" would respect the degree. In addition to those advantages listed above, the Candidate in Philosophy degree was to provide financial support (employment, etc.) for those students that chose to continue their

[6]Directive from Dean Sanford S. Elberg, May 16, 1968.

graduate studies into the dissertation. The Graduate Council felt that increased financial support was the primary factor required to increase the percentage of doctorates and this is evident in the "Report of the Graduate Council" issued in November of 1966:

> It is overwhelmingly apparent, however, that the single most needful step for an increase in the percentage of graduate students granted the doctorate annually is an improved level of financial support for graduate students, especially those in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Such improved support, our studies indicate, will be immediately reflected in the number of college and university teachers graduated from Berkeley; without such increased support, no mere change in doctoral programs will suffice.[7]

The "Report of the Graduate Council" indicated two major benefits that were to accrue through certification at the ABD level:

(1) The student would now be more employable than if he had not received the degree.
(2) A new degree at the ABD level would make available qualified teachers to a market in short supply.

As a result of these benefits, there would be an "improved level of financial support" which would increase the percentage of doctorates granted annually because greater access to financial remuneration would help more students to complete their dissertation, especially in the social sciences and humanities. The two benefits listed were the results of conclusions reached by the Graduate Council in 1966 in an academic environment that saw a crisis developing as higher education faced what was perceived to be a critical shortage of qualified teachers. The perceived teacher shortage will be discussed in more detail at the end of the chapter. The second argument assumes that the high attrition rates in the

[7] Report of the Graduate Council [11], p. 2.

social sciences and the humanities could be largely alleviated by increased financial support. The conclusions of a recent study on the determinants of Ph.D. production at Berkeley point to a number of factors that are contradictory to the argument advocated by the Berkeley division of the Graduate Council. A theory of departmental behavior is presented by David Breneman [3] which identifies a number of variables other than insufficient "financial support" that are responsible for the high attrition rates in the social sciences and humanities.

Breneman studied 28 departments at Berkeley and developed both a production function for Ph.D.'s and a conceptual model of departmental behavior. Among the variables used in Breneman's production function were the percent of students financed with teaching assistantships, research assistantships, and fellowships. The estimated coefficients in the production function were invariably higher for funds allocated to research assistants than any of the other variables. The model also indicated that the departments at Berkeley were prestige maximizers and did so through two basic methods: first, by securing the employment of prestigious faculty and second, by placing their newly graduated Ph.D.'s in prestigious institutions. Since full-time-equivalent (FTE) student enrollment has been used for the allocation of faculty positions to a campus, with graduate enrollments weighted as more than twice the value of undergraduate enrollments, an increase in graduate enrollment has generated more new faculty positions than an identical increase in undergraduate enrollment. As positions in prestigious institutions become more scarce, the production of Ph.D.'s as a percent of total graduate enrollment is reduced because the department acts to restrict output (conferral of Ph.D.'s). There is no desire to restrict enrollments or provide students with information on the high attrition rate in the par-

ticular department because reduced enrollments mean reduced faculty positions and, correspondingly, reduced departmental prestige. Although the mechanisms through which departments act to accomplish this end are often subtle, and sometimes overt, Breneman's data support his model, and raise some serious questions for the Graduate Council to consider.

The conclusions of Breneman's study are of special interest to this study of the Candidate in Philosophy degree at Berkeley and will be helpful in interpreting the role of this new degree within the internal functioning of the University.

The Candidate in Philosophy Degree and the Department - A Preliminary Hypothesis

This study focused on the total number of Candidate in Philosophy (C.Phil.) degrees conferred from September, 1968 to June, 1969. Table III gives a breakdown by field of the total number of C.Phil. degrees conferred at the University of California, Berkeley, through June, 1968.[8] The decision whether or not to confer the new degree was left up to the departments and, after making that decision, the departments were only required to confer the new degree on an individual basis to their doctoral candidates at the ABD stage and only upon request by the student and departmental approval. Identifying the factors involved in the department's decision whether or not to confer the new degree will require interviewing of department heads, but we can draw on Breneman's analysis of departmental behavior and the data on the C.Phil.'s to arrive at some tentative conclusions.

The hypothesis is that the department's decision on whether or not to confer the C.Phil degree and the extent to which the degree is conferred on

---

[8] The total number of C.Phil.'s conferred by field was provided by the Graduate Division with the help of Dean Elberg.

TABLE III: CANDIDATE IN PHILOSOPHY DEGREES CONFERRED AT UC BERKELEY FROM SEPTEMBER 1968 TO JUNE 1969

Field		Total Conferred
Humanities		
English		48
French		3
German		7
Linguistics		1
Near Eastern Languages		2
Oriental Languages		2
Romance Languages		6
Slavic Languages		8
	Males	49
	Females	28
	Subtotal	77
	% of Total	69%
Social Sciences		
Economics		1
Geography		5
	Males	6
	Females	0
	Subtotal	6
	% of Total	5%
Sciences		
Applied Mathematics		2
Genetics		4
Immunology		1
Mathematics		17
Paleontology		1
Statistics		1
Zoology		3
	Males	22
	Females	7
	Subtotal	29
	% of Total	26%
	TOTALS	
	Males	77
	Females	35
	Total	112

an individual basis is a function of the attrition rate in that particular department's Ph.D. program. The functional relationships would hold as long as the behavior of the department remained within the constraints of the prestige model developed by Breneman, that is, the department expands or maintains high enrollment to obtain resources to employ prestigious faculty, but only confers that number of Ph.D.'s which it can successfully place in prestigious institutions. In general and for purposes of this analysis, the department will not make decisions which it views as having a negative impact upon its reputation in the academic community.

The humanities drew 69% of the total number of C.Phil.'s conferred and the humanities have traditionally had high attrition rates. It should be emphasized that the humanities enrollment at Berkeley only amounts to 13% of the students enrolled in doctoral programs for 1968-69, and the English department which has only 5% of the total doctoral enrollment [20] conferred 42% of the C.Phil. degrees. If this trend were to continue, we would expect that those departments that were characterized by high attrition rates, or more specifically, a greater number of student years per degree,[9] would also be the same departments that conferred the greatest number of C.Phil. degrees as a percent of the department's doctoral enrollment. Table IV provides a list of 28 departments at Berkeley and their ranking by student years per Ph.D. degree.

The natural and physical sciences make up 45% of the enrollment in doctoral programs; yet, the hard sciences only conferred 26% of the total number of C.Phil. degrees. More extensive data on the number of C.Phil. degrees conferred over time will be required to test conclusively the hypo-

[9] The number of student years per degree is helpful in pointing out those departments which not only have high attrition in their Ph.D. programs, but lengthy programs for completion of the Ph.D. See Breneman [3].

TABLE IV: SEVEN YEAR ENROLLMENT AND DEGREE TOTALS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, 1961-67

DEPARTMENT	COLUMN A Ph.D. Degrees Awarded	COLUMN B Ph.D. Student Years[a]	Degrees per Student Year (Col A/Col B)	Student Years per Degree (Col B/Col A)
Entomology	79	397	.198	5.02
Chemistry	335	1802	.185	5.38
Chemical Eng.	75	404	.185	5.39
Electrical Eng.	175	1032	.169	5.90
Civil Eng.	129	763	.169	5.91
Physics	380	2438	.155	6.42
Zoology	94	634	.148	6.74
Botany	52	352	.147	6.77
Geology	37	270	.137	7.30
Biochemistry	63	469	.134	7.44
Geography	21	158	.132	7.52
Mechanical Eng.	94	716	.131	7.62
Psychology	162	1238	.130	7.64
Astronomy	32	246	.130	7.69
Spanish	18	150	.120	8.33
History	177	1517	.116	8.57
Math	194	1680	.115	8.66
Classics	13	118	.110	9.08
German	24	219	.109	9.12
Bacteriology	17	157	.108	9.24
Economics	137	1316	.104	9.61
Anthropology	69	720	.095	10.43
Political Sci.	96	1026	.093	10.69
Physiology	24	267	.089	11.12
English	105	1374	.076	13.09
Sociology	57	753	.075	13.21
French	28	374	.074	13.36
Philosophy	27	507	.053	18.78

[a] Enrollment figures are understated for those departments that require doctoral students to first earn the M.A. degree - those student years are not recorded. Enrollments include both degree and non-degree winners.

Source: Office of Institutional Research, University of California, Berkeley. See Breneman [3].

thesis that a correlation exists between the number of C.Phil.'s conferred and the number of student years per degree in the various departments at Berkeley.

Since the majority of departments chose not to confer the new degree, it raises some interesting points on how the departments viewed the new degree when the decision was made. One could imagine that departments which viewed the degree as having a negative impact upon their prestige would not confer the new degree, while other departments may have viewed the degree as having a neutral or possibly a positive impact on the department's prestige and approval was given to confer the degree. Departments with higher numbers of student years per degree could be expected to generate pressures from students for reform in the doctoral program, but even for a limited procedure such as further certification, the culmination of any change or reform in the doctoral program would have to be weighed against its impact on the reputation of the department. This would offer an explanation why a number of departments with a high number of student years per degree did not confer the new degree as its impact on prestige was probably considered to be negative by those particular departments.

Questionnaire Analysis of C.Phil.'s From Berkeley

In an attempt to assess the economic impact of the C.Phil. degree in the academic market and its value to the recipient, a questionnaire was mailed to the holders of the C.Phil. We mailed a questionnaire to slightly less than one hundred of the one hundred-twelve recipients of the new degree and even with the difficulty in acquiring accurate addresses a final sample of forty-nine responses were obtained. The reader most likely recog-

CANDIDATE IN PHILOSOPHY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Major _____ Field of Specialization _____ Sex_____

2. Do you posess the Ph.D. degree? Yes No Date rec'd _____

3. Are you presently working on your dissertation or thesis? Yes No
   If YES when do you expect to complete the requirements for the Ph.D.?_____

4. If employed, what is your present occupation (please specify as to TA, RA, or career position in industry or education)?_____
   _____

5. At the time you received the Candidate in Philosophy degree, what specific occupational opportunities were open to you?_____
   _____

6. Did the Candidate in Philosophy degree have any impact in helping you acquire a job?_____
   _____

7. Do you feel the Candidate in Philosophy degree has had any impact on your decision to continue, postpone, or terminate your work towards the Ph.D. (please specify)?_____
   _____

8. Do you think the University should continue to offer the Candidate in Philosophy degree?_____

   COMMENTS _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____

nizes two statistical problems in this particular study, i.e., (1) a bias may be evident as we have data from only those that responded to our questionnaire, and (2) no control group was available. Hopefully, both the structure of the questions on the questionnaire and some prior knowledge on our part was helpful in overcoming the statistical difficulties.

The responses were separated into three groups:

(1) Those who have received the Ph.D. degree.
(2) Those who do not possess the Ph.D., but are presently working on their dissertation.
(3) Those who do not possess the Ph.D. and are not working on their dissertation.

Table V gives a breakdown by field of the responses to the questionnaire. Both groups two and three present problems, as a large number in group two may never complete their dissertation,[10] and a few in group three may at some later date begin working on their dissertation and complete the requirements for the Ph.D. Table VI gives a statistical breakdown of the responses to the questionnaire and our interpretation of the responses will be aided by the comments that many of the recipients of the new degree included along with their responses.

Over half of the recipients felt the University should continue to offer the degree, but not without some reservations. For example, the group that had received the Ph.D. after receiving the C.Phil. was opposed to the new intermediate degree. A new Ph.D. in English commented upon the C.Phil. degree:

> The University should no longer offer the Candidate in Philosophy degree as it is unrecognized and offers no

[10] It is assumed that many of the respondents that are now working on their dissertation will not receive the Ph.D. degree. Sixty-five percent is much higher than the demonstrated completion rate for students in these fields. See Table IV.

TABLE V: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE
SEPARATED INTO THREE GROUPS

Field		Number of Degrees Conferred
Group One: Those that have received the Ph.D. degree.		
English		4
French		1
German		1
Mathematics		2
Oriental Languages		1
Romance Languages		1
	Males	6
	Females	4
	Total	10
	% of Total	20%
Group Two: Those that do not have the Ph.D., but are presently working on their dissertation.		
English		16
Geography		1
German		1
Immunology		1
Linguistics		1
Mathematics		5
Near Eastern Languages		1
Romance Languages		3
Slavic Languages		3
	Males	22
	Females	10
	Total	32
	% of Total	65%
Group Three: Those that do not possess the Ph.D. and are not working on their dissertation.		
Mathematics		3
Geography		1
Statistics		1
Romance Languages		1
French		1
	Males	4
	Females	3
	Total	7
	% of Total	15%

TABLE VI: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE IN TABULAR FORM

PRESENT OCCUPATION					
Instructor	Not in Market	Assistant Professor	Industry/ Government	Unemployed	Total Responses
17 (35%)	11 (10%)	14 (41%)	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	49 (100%)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE GROUPS

	GROUP #1		GROUP #2		GROUP #3		% TOTALS	
QUESTIONS	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Do you view your present position as permanent?	5	3	8	14	1	4	40%	60%
Did the C.Phil. have any impact in helping you acquire a job?	1	9	3	17	2	4	17%	73%
Should the University continue to offer the C.Phil. degree?	3	7	20	11	7	1	61%	39%
Did the C.Phil. have any impact on your decision to continue, postpone or terminate work on your thesis?	1	9	2	26	5	2	20%	80%
No effect:		9		26		2		80%
Continue:	1		2		1		9%	
Postpone:	1				3		9%	
Terminate:					1		2%	

> advantage to the graduate at all in the job market. The academic world just doesn't allot any status to it, nor does the University which gives it.

An English major who had just acquired her Ph.D. concurred:

> Frankly, all this (Candidate in Philosophy degree) seems useless considering the sorry state of the job market (at least in my field, and in the humanities in general). What you ought to be studying is ways to improve that market, that is, open up more jobs for more people. Also you should find a way to force universities to hire women equally with men, on the basis of merit solely, not as tokens for their sex -- nor discriminated against because of it.[11]

A Ph.D. in Spanish had similar feelings toward the new degree:

> The Candiate in Philosophy degree could be replaced by a certification that one has successfully passed the qualifying exams. As a "degree" it actually means nothing, since one can spend years in this "limbo," i.e., working on the dissertation but never bringing it to completion. I feel there are too many "degrees" of various sorts being awarded, all of which tend to downgrade the final culminating Ph.D. degree.

These comments are from the first group, and as holders of Ph.D.'s, probably saw the new degree as a threat to the status of their newly acquired doctorate.

The recipients that found themselves in the third group, those that were not working on their dissertation, had understandably different attitudes toward the new degree. A French major commented:

---

[11] See Table III. The English major's comments may seem humorous, but her reference to discrimination against women in academia is not unfounded. Females have represented 10% of the Ph.D.'s conferred at U.C. Berkeley, versus 32% of the C.Phil. degrees conferred. The ability of women to receive the C.Phil. at a greater rate than the Ph.D. seems less than accidental. See Office of Analytical Studies, 1968-69 Academic Year [21], p. 2.

> I think the Candidate in Philosophy degree is a good idea, but I wish it did have more prestige so that I could keep my job as Assistant Professor at San Jose State without the dissertation.

Her comments were typical of many of the recipients, but a Spanish major commented for many on the disappointment holders of the new degree had to face:

> The degree does not have national recognition and, to my knowledge, is no more significant than an M.A. The candidate who has completed all requirements for the Ph.D. except the dissertation is just as qualified to teach college courses as he is after completion of the thesis. The C.Phil. degree should make this clear and, if it were nationally recognized as such, it would be a sound alternative for the Ph.D. for those who do not intend to teach beyond the undergraduate level. I had hoped the C.Phil. would have allowed me to remain and teach undergraduate courses, but I must complete the thesis to keep my job.

The comments were not all negative, as many recipients of this new degree felt it had value in a personal sense. Many looked upon it as an "ego booster," or "an administrative signpost that provides a psychological boost." A Slavic Literature major commented on why the University should continue to offer the new degree:

> I think that the Candidate in Philosophy is a good way of showing recognition of the fact that the student has progressed substantially toward the Ph.D. degree, since, in my opinion, passing the orals certainly represents an "achievement." I am very glad that I have the Candidate in Philosophy degree, and I think it will be helpful if I apply for a teaching position prior to the actual completion of my dissertation.

The C. Phil. had little or no impact on the students' decisions on whether or not to continue, postpone or terminate work towards the dissertation. Only one student felt it influenced him to terminate work on his dissertation, and 9% of the students felt it helped them to continue working towards their Ph.D. One student commented that he was "determined not to be stuck with it (C.Phil.) for life." If the degree had had some impact in diverting students from the Ph.D., some real costs and benefits would have been involved, but its impact upon the student's decisions was neglible.

In an attempt to assess the new degree's impact in the academic market, the students were asked their present occupation and if they felt the C.Phil. had any impact in helping them to acquire a job. No control was available, so it is difficult to say whether the distribution among the present employers is significantly different from their colleagues at the ABD stage without certification. Interviews with faculty placement officials at a number of Bay Area educational institutions and with officials of the Educational Placement Office at the University of California, Berkeley, have helped in lieu of a control group and will be discussed in the chapter on Community Colleges.

The responses to the questionnaire and the comments by the C.Phil. recipients are obviously subjective, but are helpful in providing insight into the recipients' attitudes towards the new degree. A few (17%) recipients of the C.Phil. felt it had an impact in helping them acquire a job, but only one recipient, a Linguistics major, made a comment on how he felt the new degree aided him:

> The C.Phil. degree is undoubtedly useful in securing positions in University teaching for those of us who enjoy teaching and need to make a living as well as work on the dissertation.

An Arabic major felt the new degree had a negative impact and should be discontinued:

> The C.Phil. had a negative impact upon the department I'm working for as I was informed that it was "a kind of admission that one is not about to write a thesis -- unless the opposite is proven." This is certainly not the notion I had of the C.Phil. which now appears to be no more than an administrative gimmick. I don't think the University is serving the students by offering the C.Phil.

A consistent problem for those seeking employment with the C.Phil. was its lack of recognition in the academic market. Many had hoped the C.Phil. degree would allow them to teach without the thesis and a French major commented upon her particular situation:

> Everyone knows thesis writing is a useless farce for candidate and committee. Real teachers don't need it and shouldn't be forced to do it as a useless exercise. But until teaching ability and knowledge about one's major area become more acceptable than ability to write correctly something basically irrelevant to anyone, what can we do but plug away and do it and be angry and frustrated.

A number of the proponents of the intermediate degree felt it would have special applicability for the small liberal arts colleges and Community or Junior Colleges. Dean Stephen A. Spurr commented upon the C.Phil.'s and their function in Community Colleges:

> While it may be assumed that many holders of this latter (C.Phil.) degree will be qualified for and will accept teaching positions in Junior Colleges and four-year liberal arts colleges, so also may holders of any specialized degree that may evolve in the coming years.[12]

[12] Stephen H. Spurr, in Whaley [12], p. 112.

Comments such as these were common at the AGS meeting in 1966. This prompted us to examine the attitudes of the officials at the Community Colleges towards hiring recipients of the Candidate in Philosophy degree.

III. THE MARKET FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

Community College Interviews

The community colleges were chosen as one possible academic market worthy of further investigation with respect to the C.Phil. for three reasons

(1) The C.Phil. was intended to be especially adaptable to markets of this nature.

(2) Community colleges do not require Ph.D.'s for accreditation.

(3) Recent indications that an over-supply of Ph.D.'s may be evident make the hiring practices of these institutions of special interest to the C.Phil.

It is a commonly held belief that an overproduction of Ph.D.'s will lead to their absorption in junior colleges and secondary schools. Allan M. Cartter [5], who has continually pointed out the emerging problem of Ph.D. over-production, comments:

> One can also predict that with the more plentiful supply an increasing number of teachers with the doctorate will take positions in junior colleges (currently less than 15 percent of junior college faculty were trained at the doctorate level) and in secondary schools.[1]

If we are to arrive at some conclusions on the role of the C.Phil. in this particular market, we should have some understanding of (a) the relative supply and demand for Community College teachers, and (b) specific information on the attitudes and philosophy of hiring officials toward the training of Community College teachers. These two points are of special

[1] Cartter [5], p. 170.

relevance to the C.Phil. as we would expect hiring officials to adjust their requirements for employment as conditions of supply and demand change.[2]

Officials from 14 Community College districts (17 Community Colleges) were interviewed in an attempt to determine their hiring preferences and their attitudes on the present state of the academic market.[3] A total of 14 placement officers (some represented more than one college) were interviewed and their responses are displayed in Table VII. If any significance is to be placed on the table, then we must also consider the comments of the officials. The lack of knowledge of the C.Phil. degree by the placement officers is indicated by part B of Table VII and is not surprising as little or no publicity was provided for this new degree by the University. The overwhelming bias against Ph.D.'s may seem surprising, but it is not irrational once one understands the function of the Community Colleges as described by their officials. The President of a northern California Community College put his position succinctly:

> The role of the Community College is very specific to a certain need, and the Ph.D. obscures this need. He has an orientation and involvement in research that makes him unsuitable to the teaching load (15 hours), which he considers

[2]When hiring new faculty, placement officers at most community colleges are constrained by a fixed salary schedule and minimum certification requirements. Although trade-offs can be made within the salary schedule (e.g., a teacher with less experience receives a lower salary than teachers with more experience), a new faculty position is not allocated any specific amount of funds and there is no incentive for placement officers to be cost conscious. "Qualifications" as determined by the values of the hiring officials are the most flexible adjustments that these officials can make under different conditions of supply and demand, at least in the short run.

[3]It has been suggested in conversations with Professor Robert Adams, U.C. Santa Cruz, that the academic market is a series of segmented markets which may at times appear to be quite distinct from one another. The central point is that generalizations about the market for Community College teachers may not apply to the market for teachers at the state colleges and universities. The Community College market was chosen as only one possible market that has relevance to the C.Phil.

TABLE VII

COMMUNITY COLLEGE INTERVIEWS

A. Hiring Attitudes Toward Specific Degree Holders.

1. What is your reaction to each of the following when they apply for employment at your institution?

	Ph.D.	M.A.	C.Phil.
(a) Would not hire	1	0	1
Strong negative bias	6	0	6
Some negative bias	3	0	4
Some positive bias	1	3	1
Strong positive bias	1	10	0
Can't say	1	1	2

	Yes	No
(b) Does the cost (salary) of a Ph.D. have any impact on whether or not he is hired?	1	13

B. Knowledge of C.Phil. by Community College Officials.

	Yes	No
1. Are you aware that U.C. Berkeley awards a C. Phil. degree?	1	13
2. Do you know what it signifies?	0	14

> barbaric. We look deliberately for an M.A. with excellent academic credentials and teaching experience because, frankly, he's the best man for the job.

Comments such as these were not uncommon and are of special interest to C.Phil.'s given the present state of the academic market. The president continued on the question of the C.Phil. degree:

> The individual that gets this degree is brought down the same narrow track as the Ph.D. I've received from 1500-2000 applications since January and when we're looking for someone we choose carefully and get the individual that has specific training and experience in quality teaching.

A placement official from a local Community College on the peninsula had similar feelings about Ph.D.'s:

> We've had over 2000 applications in the last four months with Ph.D.'s comprising over 5% of those applications. When we have an opening, we look for other things besides the Ph.D., e.g., auto-tutorial skills, communications, and the latest methodology in teaching. This is especially true in English where Chaucer experts are a dime a dozen and a good remedial reading teacher is rare.

This same official had a similar attitude about the C.Phil.:

> As I understand it, this person (C.Phil.) has had the same training as the Ph.D., except that he hasn't completed his dissertation. We have specific needs that require quality teaching and the C.Phil. is hardly an answer to that need. It offers us nothing.

The specialization that many Ph.D.'s must acquire was considered unsuitable by another official:

> I don't think the Ph.D. is necessary for the Community College as he tends to be too narrowly specialized. We would

> rather have adequate specialization, but with a little more breadth training. If you look at many Ph.D.'s transcripts, they have too many units in individual study.

This same official commented upon his hiring practices:

> Through the years more responsibility for hiring new teachers is being shared by the faculty. Their preferences to date have shown a policy of hiring individuals that have a commitment to quality teaching. I doubt if they would look upon the C.Phil. or the Ph.D. as that individual.

Another official attempted to examine his bias against the Ph.D.'s:

> I am strongly opposed to hiring Ph.D.'s at this institution. It may be because of some deep psychological reason because I don't have a Ph.D. myself, but I just don't see them as an asset to our school. A lot of Ph.D.'s, especially in the sciences, are too research oriented.

The complaint of over-specialization and research orientation was a common one expressed by many of the officials. A placement officer at a nearby Community College summed up the situation as perceived by many of the officials interviewed:

> What you people at Berkeley must learn is that the Community College has a threefold role that includes vocational, transfer, and community service programs and none of these require a Ph.D. or an ABD. Our transfer students do quite well at the four year institutions and to maintain that performance we will continue to hire those individuals that perform the best as teachers, and Ph.D.'s just don't have that type of training.

Dr. Lyman Glenny [10] spoke for the overwhelming majority of officials interviewed in this study when he commented on Community Colleges in a re-

cent address:

> As we look toward the next decade, it would be tragic, if not disastrous, for the surplus products of our research-oriented graduate schools to end up teaching in the Junior and Community Colleges as the National Research Council and the National Science Foundation would have them do. These are institutions which require the highest caliber of teaching, attracting as they do students with a very wide range of interests and abilities.[4]

Not all the placement officers felt the same as Dr. Glenny, and one assued me that most Community Colleges actively recruited Ph.D.'s as he did. His comments were as follows:

> Research and publications please me very much and I'll go for the Ph.D. almost exclusively. We have had only a few openings and it is for that reason alone that we don't have more Ph.D.'s, but don't you believe it when they (the other placement officers) tell you they have a bias against Ph.D.'s.

This same official had somewhat different feelings about the C.Phil.:

> This degree doesn't impress me at all, in fact, I wouldn't look at it any different than a M.A. unless I was convinced that the individual was soon to complete his dissertation.

In an attempt to at least partially verify the comments of many of the officials, the number of Ph.D.'s as a percent of total faculty was examined for twelve of the Community Colleges over a ten year period. Only four of the institutions had greater than a 5% increase in Ph.D.'s over a ten year period and their faculties now had between 10% and 15% Ph.D.'s. What is of special interest is that two of the institutions indicated that much of

[10] Glenny [10], p. 19.

the increase was due to faculty completing their Ph.D.'s after being admitted to the staff. Those officials that indicated they had a strong bias against Ph.D.'s insured that that particular bias was reflected in the faculty composition, and one school with an enrollment in excess of 5000 never had more than two Ph.D.'s on their staff.

Most of the indicators of supply and demand for teachers in the Community College market show a relative oversupply. All of the officials interviewed indicated that they had no problem acquiring qualified teachers and that applications for employment had showed a considerable increase over the last twelve months than in previous years. One official that admitted he preferred hiring Ph.D.'s summed up the situation:

> Its definitely a buyer's market. I have on file 5000 qualified applicants and there is no doubt in my mind that if an opening occurred today I would have over 500 applications within two weeks. Yesterday, I had to turn down a Ph.D. from Lawrence Radiation Laboratory with over ten years experience in mathematics and physics, there are just no openings right now.

Another official commented on what occurred when his institution announced that a number of faculty positions were open:

> I've received over 3000 applications for 12 positions and many of our applicants are from other schools that have turned people loose, especially in English and the foreign languages. I have also been surprised by the number of physicists, mathematicians, and chemists that are available.

An official from a rural Community College commented on the ready availability of teachers:

> The situation has definitely improved and we haven't had to make faculty recruiting trips for three years. Its a choice

> among riches as we have had between 2500 and 3000 applications with approximately 5% to 6% holders of the Ph.D. The overwhelming number of applicants are from History, Political Science and English.

The only fields mentioned where qualified applicants were in short supply were Home Economics, Nursing and Ethnic Studies. Qualified applicants were available to teach Ethnic Studies but teachers of black and Mexican American ancestry remained in short supply.

Fully assessing the extent of the oversupply will require further study, but faculty recruiters are aware that a plethora of qualified applicants are available and in this context experience is being chosen over the new graduate. Table VIII shows a comprehensive profile of new Community College faculty. An interview with Tom S. Phair, the compiler of the table, pointed out that the percentage of new faculty hired in California Community Colleges with college teaching experience (41%) is on the increase.[5]

The C.Phil. finds himself in a curious position with respect to the two points mentioned above. First, in a period of relative oversupply of college teachers, the ABD is receiving certification at the most inopportune time. Second, placement officials at Community Colleges are looking for and acquiring individuals with either extensive teaching experience or in-depth training in teaching, a characteristic that most C.Phil.'s lack. Meanwhile, those Community Colleges that do recruit Ph.D.'s are, for the most part, attempting to maximize their prestige. In these cases, the marginal increment in prestige of an additional Ph.D. is many times greater than a C.Phil., and the marginal cost of that Ph.D. as compared to a C.Phil. is presented in Table IX and is an average of $794 annually for 10 Bay Area institutions

---

[5]Tom S. Phair is the Community College Placement Advisor, Office of Educational Career Services, U.C. Berkeley. See Phair [15].

TABLE VIII

New Full-Time Faculty Members in the 91 Public Community Colleges of California
1969-1970 Academic Year

SUBJECT				STATUS OF DEGREES				EXPERIENCE STATUS								
	Total Hired In Subject Area	Recruited From Calif.	Recruited Outside of Calif.	Less than M.A. Degree	M.A. Received In 1968-1969	M.A. Received Prior to 1968-1969	Doctorate	No Prior Teaching Experience	Experienced Secondary Teacher	Experienced Elementary Teacher	Experienced Four-Year Institution	Experienced in Community College	Junior College Practice Teaching or Intern	Research Assistant	Teaching Assistant	Non-Teaching Experience (Commerical Etc.)
Art	66	60	6	4	18	44		4	8	1	18	21			9	5
Agric.	15	15		8	3	4		2	10		1	1				1
Bus. Admin.	50	47	3	10	10	28	2	4	13		6	17	2		1	7
Sec. Sci.	29	26	3	6	7	15	1		15		3	8				3
Data Proc.	20	19	1	7	3	9	1	1	2	1	3	5			2	6
Crime.	18	18		12	3	2	1	4	2		1	6				5
Drama	23	22	1	5	9	9		4	6		4	6				3
Engineering	15	13	2	8	2	4	1	1	1		5	3	2			3
English-Gen.	141	117	24	14	48	75	4	7	35	5	39	37	6		7	5
Comp. & Lit.	54	47	7	2	18	30	4	4	22		12	13	1		2	
Remedial	43	38	5	6	9	25	3	1	18	3	8	10			3	
Speech	52	45	7	5	25	20	2	7	18	1	11	8	3		3	1
Homemkg.	32	28	4	9	11	12		6	7	2	3	8		1	3	2
Journ.	17	17		4	3	10		2	2		4	5			2	2
Langs.	50	47	3	6	10	30	4	3	20	2	13	8	1		2	1
Library	45	40	5	5	10	30		6	12		11	6				10
Math	76	67	9	5	19	50	2	4	33		14	17	1	1	5	1
Music	33	28	5		9	24		1	8	2	7	6	4		3	2
Nursing	101	96	5	33	17	51		5	5		19	30	2		1	39
Philosophy	19	19			9	8	2		5		7	3	2		1	1
P.E. Men	89	85	4	18	19	52		1	64	1	10	11			1	1
P.E. Women	39	35	4	7	21	11		2	19		9	7			2	
Psychology	66	60	6		19	38	9	5	6	2	22	19	5	1	3	3
Life Science	62	56	6	1	25	27	9	3	15	2	21	10		1	7	3
Earth Science	28	26	2	4	7	14	3		3	2	8	8	1		3	3
Chemistry	38	34	4		13	17	8	3	13	2	11	6		1	2	
Physics	28	27	1	2	9	16	1	2	10	1	6	3	1		3	2
Soc.Sci.Econ.	11	8	3	1	2	8			2	1	6	1		1		
Soc.& Anthro.	51	45	6	7	13	28	3	9	13	2	12	9	2	1	1	2
Geography	8	6	2	1	3	4		2	1		3	2				
History	100	90	10	12	22	60	6	8	37		22	26	3		3	1
Pol. Science	37	32	5	2	11	22	2	3	11		7	9		2	3	2
Voc. Tech.- Photo	6	5	1	2	2	2		1	1		2					2
Dental Tech.	21	19	2	19	1		1	3			2	4	1			11

TABLE VIII (con't)

SUBJECT				STATUS OF DEGREES				EXPERIENCE STATUS								
	Total Hired In Subject Area	Recruited From Calif.	Recruited Outside of Calif.	Less Than M.A. Degree	M.A. Received in 1968-1969	M.A. Received Prior to 1968-1969	Doctorate	No Prior Teaching Experience	Experienced Secondary Teacher	Experienced Elementary Teacher	Experienced Four-Year Institution	Experienced in Community College	Junior College Practice Teaching or Intern	Research Assistant	Teaching Assistant	Non-Teaching Experience (Commerical Etc.)
Machine Shop	7	7		7				1				6				6
Aeronautics	14	13	1	13	1			2		1		6				5
Electronics	23	23		15	1	7		3	2		1	7				10
Fire Service	2	2		2								1				1
X-Ray Tech.	8	7	1	8				1	1			2				4
Auto Tech.	21	20	1	20		1			3	1	1	4				12
Other	68	56	2	41	12	15		3	14	4	2	13				32
Counseling	93	88	5	17	18	51	7	5	64	2	3	17			1	1
Other	62	56	6	15	17	26	4	6	25	1	7	9	3		3	8
TOTAL	1781	1619	162	363	459	879	80	129	546	39	344	392	40	8	77	206
%		91	9	20	26	49	5	7	31.5	2	19	22	2	.5	4	12

Office of Educational Career Services
University of California, Berkeley

compiled by Tom S. Phair,
Community College Placement Adviser

TABLE IX: COMMUNITY COLLEGE STARTING SALARIES

10 Community College Districts (16 Community Colleges) in Greater Bay Area, 1970-71

Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F
DISTRICT[a]	M.A.	B.A. + 75 units (C. Phil.)	B.A. + 90 units (C. Phil.)	Ph.D.	Ph.D. Bonus Col. E minus Col. D
Cabrillo	8,887	9,914	10,257	11,090	833
Hartnell	8,857	9,391	9,938	10,476	538
Los Rios	9,047	9,952	10,857	11,943	1,086
Marin[b]	9,551	10,062	10,571	11,071	500
Peralta	8,280	8,916	9,552	10,836	1,284
San Mateo	9,805	10,085	10,365	11,500	1,135
San Francisco[c]	9,880	9,880	9,880	10,950	1,070
Santa Rosa	8,856	9,756	10,656	11,256	800
Solano	8,841	9,462	10,083	10,633	550
West Valley	9,416	10,276	10,875	11,218	343
Average of 10 Districts	9,142	9,769	10,303	11,097	794
Average of 67 Community Colleges, 68-69[d]	8,145	8,947	9,185	9,851	666

[a] A number of officials did not have new salary schedules available, hence ten districts are presented instead of fourte

[b] Marin grants a $1000 gift if the doctorate is earned while employed at the district.

[c] San Francisco has only one salary schedule, and non-experienced Ph.D.'s begin on the third step.

[d] Last year available.

Source: California Community Colleges [4]. 1970-71 salary schedules were obtained from officials at the Community Colleges.

and an average of $666 annually for 67 California Community Colleges - not a considerable amount for these institutions.[6]

[6] Phair, op. cit.

IV. CONCLUSION

One may question whether or not policy recommendations can be made on the basis of the limited empirical evidence presented. Nevertheless, the C.Phil. remains a part of the certification procedure of many graduate programs at Berkeley and the evidence indicates that there is a high probability it has not so far achieved the stated objectives of its originators. The analysis suggests a number of conclusions:

(1) Although the marginal cost of the C.Phil. is zero in increased expenditures to the University, it may have costs to the public and the students that outweigh any benefits it may bring.

(2) If the University does wish to serve the teaching needs of the Community College, then the C.Phil. may not fulfill the requirements for employment in that market.

The first point draws largely upon Breneman's [3] theory of department behavior. The C.Phil. offers the faculty no incentive to reform their doctoral programs, or to reduce attrition rates, and may even help to perpetuate and encourage doctoral programs that are not in the best interests of either the public or the students enrolled in the programs.[1] The logical conclusion to this argument is that the new degree should be discontinued. If the University does wish to serve the Community Colleges alternative programs could be implemented.[2] Mary Wortham in a recent AAUP

[1] A summary of Breneman's analysis is presented in the first chapter. In conversations with Dr. Breneman it was suggested that many departments were aware that their behavior was in direct conflict with the goals of the students and the C.Phil. merely helped the faculty to live with themselves.

[2] Further testing will be required on both a broader and in-depth basis to obtain a representative sample of the hiring practices of the Community College officials. What the limited survey indicates is that U.C. graduate programs may not provide versatile academic preparation for teaching and that the hiring officials give considerable weight both to experience and motivation toward teaching.

the basic problem of the C.Phil.:

> Dean Elder of Harvard calls the Candidates' degree "a bloody epithet that says exactly what it is. I'd be damned if I'd work to get one." Although the Candidate's degree may have the ring of Brahmin condescension to some, the completion of the comprehensive examination for a doctorate clearly marks a welcome addition to the ranks of graduate degrees. However, the new Candidate's degree does not touch the basic problem of a more suitable preparation for classroom-centered college teachers.[3]

One such alternative the University may wish to consider is the Doctor of Arts in College Teaching (D.A.C.T.) which all Community College officials interviewed by this study showed favorable interest.[4] In a recent poll [16] of 107 public tax-supported Community Colleges within the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools the responses indicated that 85 percent of the administrators believe the Doctor of Arts degree would be generally accepted by Community College instructors and of those administrators 82 percent did not favor the research-oriented dissertation as part of the Doctor of Arts degree. In addition, 62 percent of the administrators favored the Doctor of Arts degree over the Ph.D. or Ed.D. for the Community College instructor. A local Community College official commented favorably on a D.A.C.T. degree:

> I would react much more favorably to a Doctor of Arts than to a Ph.D. If the program emphasized practical application of teaching skills, I don't see how it could miss. The Community Colleges have been waiting for something like this for a long time.

Individuals with this degree would receive the same salary as the Ph.D.

---

[3] Mary Wortham [20], p. 375.

[4] A number of Doctor of Arts programs have been suggested, but for the most part, they include in-depth training similar to that of the Ph.D. with an emphasis on practical application of teaching skills rather than a dissertation.

as the salary schedules only specify "doctorate from an accredited institution."

A program oriented towards training college teachers would not necessarily require increased expenditures, but a reallocation of resources. The call to reduce Ph.D. output is getting louder and if Ph.D. output is reduced, some of those resources freed as a result of cutbacks could be utilized to serve a market that is expected to see continued growth in the future.[5] A program of this nature should be tried on a limited and experimental basis at first, and at all times the D.A.C.T. program should be focused on the quantitative and teaching needs of the market it is to serve.

[5] Many officials expressed concern over continued defeat of Community College bonds in the face of increasing enrollment. Community Colleges are expected to grow on the basis of increasing enrollments, not on the future voting habits in the local districts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Berelson, Bernard, Graduate Education in the United States, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

[2] Bossone, Richard M., "Understanding Junior-College Students," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XXXVI, No. 5, pp. 279-283.

[3] Breneman, David W., An Economic Theory of Ph.D. Production: The Case at Berkeley, Ford Foundation Research Program, Office of the Vice President, Planning and Analysis, Berkeley, June 1970.

[4] California Community Colleges, "Salary Schedules for Teaching Personnel in California Public Community Colleges 1968-69."

[5] Caplow, Theodore, and McGee, Reece J., The Academic Marketplace, New York: Basic Books. Inc., 1958.

[6] Cartter, Allan M., "The Economics of Higher Education," Neil W. Chamberlain, (ed.), Contemporary Economic Issues, Homewood, Illinois:

[7] Chandler, Marjorie O., Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees Fall 1968, Summary Data, National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.: 1970.

[8] Elberg, Dean Sanford S., Directive to all Departments, University of California. Berkeley, May 16, 1968.

[10] Glenny, Lyman, "Doctoral Planning for the Seventies: A Challenge to the States," Opening Address, Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Ed -ional Board, Houston, Texas, June 1970.

[11] Hand, Cader, Report of the Graduate Council, Berkeley Division, an unpublished recommendation to the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate that a new degree be created. November 8, 1966.

[12] Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David, The Academic Revolution, New York: Anchor Books, 1969.

[13] Kerr, Clark, The Uses of the University, New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

[14] Mooney, Joseph D., "Attrition Among Ph.D. Candidates: An Analysis of a Cohort of Recent Woodrow Wilson Fellows," The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. III, No. 1, (Winter, 1968), pp. 47-62.

[15] Phair, Tom S., "1961 Report of Placed Candidates Characteristics," Office of Educational Placement, University of California, Berkeley, California, 2120 Oxford, Berkeley, California 94720.

[16] Shell, Edwin Taylor, "An Investigation of the Doctor of Arts Degree for the Junior College Instructor," A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School, Northwestern State College, May, 1969.

[17] Spurr, Stephen, Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

[18] Stark, Rodney, "Graduate Study at Berkeley: An Assessment of Attrition and Duration," Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1966. Unpublished.

[19] Whaley, Gordon W., ed., Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Eighteenth Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities, New York City, October 24-25, 1966.

[20] Wortham, Mary, "The Case for a Doctor of Arts Degree: A View from Junior College Faculty," AAUP Bulletin, Vol. LIII, No. 4, September 1967.

[21] University of California, Office of Analytical Studies, 1968-69 Statistical Summary - Students and Staff - University of California, Office of the Vice President - Planning and Analysis.