DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 205 SP 024 949

AUTHOR Loadman, William E.; Holcomb, Zolda J.
TITLE Follow-Up of Autumn, 1978 through Autumn, 1982 Doctoral Graduates at the Ohio State University's College of Education. Technical Report #1 [and] Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 103p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; Career Development; *Doctoral Degrees; Doctoral Dissertations; Educational Background; *Education Majors; Education Work Relationship; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; Teacher Education Programs; Work Experience
IDENTIFIERS Ohio State University

ABSTRACT

A follow-up study of doctoral graduates from the College of Education at Ohio State University covered all graduates from Autumn, 1978 through Autumn, 1982 (N=636). A questionnaire obtained information on: (1) general educational background courses taken; (2) instructors; (3) advisor and advisory committee; (4) general examinations; (5) dissertation process; (6) campus facilities and services; (7) present work experience; (8) research and publication record; and (9) demographics. Demographic information revealed slightly more male than female graduates. Most graduates were Caucasian. The major area studied at the bachelor's level was not education, and, at the master's level, approximately a third did not major in education. A substantial number taught K-12 prior to the doctorate, and there was a substantial increase in college level teaching after receipt of the doctorate. Overall, the graduates indicated that their doctoral program significantly contributed to their current job satisfaction. The respondents recommended some changes in the program: (1) increased contact with advisor; (2) more research and statistics courses, and (3) more computer training. Over 100 tables present data gathered for this analysis. (JD)

FOLLOW-UP PROJECT 1983

TECHNICAL REPORT #1 (PART 1)
PH.D. GRADUATES

DR. WILLIAM E. LOADMAN

DIRECTOR

Technical Report #1: Follow-Up of Autumn, 1978 through Autumn, 1982 Doctoral Graduates at The Ohio State University's College of Education

April, 1984

Prepared by:

William E. Loadman
Zelda J. Holcomb

Produced for the OSU College of Education as part of a total effort to redesign teacher education. This project is funded entirely from State of Ohio, Department of Education Project 419 monies.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

INTRODUCTION

During Spring Quarter 1983 the follow-up project staff of the College of Education conducted a survey of all graduates of doctoral programs beginning with the 1978-1979 academic year through Autumn Quarter 1982. A questionnaire that requested information on various topics was mailed to 636 doctoral graduates identified by the Alumni Information office. The topics covered in the questionnaire included demographics, educational background, employment history, academic program, and features of advanced degree programs (see Appendix A). The first mailing was sent on April 15, 1983 with a return deadline of May 23. A second mailing was sent on June 1 with a return deadline of June 20.

Subsequent to the two mailings 365 graduates (57%) returned completed questionnaires. Appendices B and C are copies of the informational letters mailed with the questionnaire. A chi-square for goodness of fit was computed to determine if this sample was representative of the population by department. The subsequent analysis demonstrated that the sample was not representative. Examination of Appendix D, which shows the total number of doctoral graduates and the contribution of each department to the chi-square value, shows that the nonrepresentativeness is due primarily to the over-representation of Educational Administration and Vocational-Technical graduates, and the underrepresentation of Art Education and Agricultural Education graduates. Therefore, when using the data the reader should consider the disproportional number of graduates from these departments included in this sample. The non-representativeness of this sample means the results can be generalized to the sample with confidence, but cautiously to the overall population.

The information obtained from the completed questionnaires was statistically analyzed. The analyses for each item included frequencies and percentages, the mean, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum values. The results of these analyses were used to develop a profile of this sample of doctoral graduates and a description of the doctoral programs in the College of Education. The same statistics were computed for each program area and are being forwarded to each program head. This technical report contains the results and the descriptions based on these statistics.

The first section of the report is the profile of the College of Education doctoral graduate based on the demographic questionnaire items and various other questionnaire items. The remaining sections are organized around the questionnaire topics; i.e., educational background, employment history, academic program, and features of advanced degree programs.

PROFILE OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES 1978-1982

Using demographic and other select questionnaire items the following profile of doctoral graduates was developed. The majority of the graduates:

- are males (53%) (Table 1)
- are Caucasian (85%) (Table 2)
- are 31-35 years (30%) 36-40 (30%) (Table 3)
- resided in Ohio at time of application (55%) (Table 4)
- received their bachelor's degree at an institution other than the Ohio State University (OSU) (83%) (Table 7)
- did not major in education at the undergraduate level (54%) (Table 8)
- received their master's at an institution other than OSU (63%) (Table 11)
- majored in education at the master's level (73%) (Table 12)
- identified a graduate assistantship as a significant or primary source for financing their doctoral education (73%) (Table 19)
- had previous teaching experience at the K-12 level (65%) (Table 66)
- presently have college teaching experience (76%) (Table 73)
- are satisfied with their present job responsibilities (74%) (Table 75)
- are satisfied or very satisfied with their current geographical location (73%) (Table 82)
- are satisfied or very satisfied with application of their studies to their current job (71%) (Table 80)
- are satisifed with the opportunities to advance on their current job (54%) (Table 81)
- believe that the doctorate has improved their financial security (56%) (Table 85)
- spend at least five percent of their job time teaching (65%) (Table 88)

- spend at least five percent of their job time performing research and evaluation (91%) (Table 89)
- spend at least five percent of their job time performing service activities (59%) (Table 90)
- spend at least five percent of their job time performing administrative duties (62%) (Table 91)
- have not published any articles related to their dissertation research (75%) (Table 69)
- would recommend their graduate program to someone working in the same field (71%) (Table 87)

DEMOGRAPHICS

This section is based on the questionnaire items dealing with sex, ethnic background, age, and geographical location at the time of application for the doctoral program. The frequencies and percentages cited in this section, as well as the remaining sections, were computed on only those respondents who gave a response to the item. Therefore, the total sample size will vary from item to item. Reference to the appropriate table, cited throughout this report, will assist the reader with interpretation of the values.

The responses of these doctoral graduates indicate that slightly more males (N=191) than females (N=171) graduated between 1978 and Autumn 1982. The respective percentages are 53 percent and 47 percent (see Table 1).

Table 2 shows that the ethnic background of the majority of the graduates is Caucasian (86%). Approximately 13 percent of the graduates can be classified as minority students. Blacks/Afro-Americans are the largest minority group represented (7%).

Of the five age categories, (1) 20-25; (2) 26-30; (3) 31-35; (4) 36-40; and (5) over 40; the majority (90%) of the respondents were almost equally divided among categories three, four and five; 29 percent, 30 percent, and 30 percent, respectively. Hence, the overwhelming majority of doctoral graduates who responded are over the age of 30 (see Table 3).

Tables 4-6 show the geographical location of the graduates at the time they applied for admission to The Ohio State University for doctoral studies. The majority of the respondents (66%) were located in a city other than Columbus; yet, the majority were residing in Ohio (55%). Furthermore, this information demonstrates that approximately five percent of the graduates resided outside of the United States.

Table 1
Sex

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Female	170	47
(2) Male	191	53
Total	361	100

Table 2
Ethnic Background

Alternatives	N	%
(1) American Indian/Native American	13	4
(2) Asian American/Pacific American	3	1
(3) Black/Afro-American	26	7
(4) Hispanic/Chicano	4	1
(5) White/Caucasian	310	86
(6) Other	5	1
Total	361	100

Table 3

Age

Alternatives	N	%
(1) 20-25	2	1
(2) 26-30	36	10
(3) 31-35	106	29
(4) 36-40	110	30
(5) over 40	109	30
Total	363	100

Table 4

City of Residence at Time of Application

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	236	66
(2) Columbus	122	34
Total	358	100

Table 5

State of Residence at Time of Application

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	161	45
(2) Ohio	200	55
Total	361	100

Table 6

Country of Residence at Time of Application

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	19	5
(2) USA	338	95
Total	357	100

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

A number of questionnaire items dealt with the respondents educational background. Questions about the bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees regarding majors, minors, graduation year, and financing of the doctoral degree were answered by the graduates. The majority of the respondents (83%) received their undergraduate degrees at an institution other than The Ohio State University. The majority of the respondents did not major in education (54%) or have a minor in education (78%) at the bachelor's level. The self-reported undergraduate grade point averages (GPA) for this group ranged from 1.88 to 4.00. The average of the reported GPA's was 3.14. The standard deviation was .44 (see Tables 7-10).

As with the bachelor's degree, the majority of the respondents (63%) received their master's at an institution other than The Ohio State University. But unlike the bachelor's degree, the majority of the respondents (73%) majored in an educational field (see Tables 11-12).

At the doctoral level 56 percent of the respondents had a minor area in education, but a substantial percentage (44%) chose their minor area outside of education. The largest number of graduates (N=71) representing 20 percent of the respondents started their doctoral studies in 1976. The largest number of respondents (N=99), 28 percent, graduated in 1982. The mean length of time for completion of the doctoral degree was 3.27 years.

Information regarding the financing of graduates' doctoral studies demonstrated that scholarships and fellowships contributed the least to their financial support. The graduates were requested to rate the contribution of full-time employment; part-time employment; graduate assistantship;

scholarship or fellowship; loans; and personal resources to the financing of their doctoral program (Tables 16 to 21). The rating could be (1) none, (2) some, (3) significant, or (4) primary. The mean rating for scholarships and fellowships was 1.65 indicating some but limited support from this source. Graduate assistantship was selected by 73 percent of the graduates as making a significant or primary contribution to the financial support of their doctoral studies. The mean rating for the graduate assistantship was 2.97. It should be noted, also, that 40 percent of the respondents rated full-time work as a primary or significant contributor; and 43 percent rated personal resources as a primary or significant contributor. The mean value for each of these categories was 2.19 and 2.46, respectively. In addition 41 percent of the respondents held a full-time job during their doctoral program. Of those who held full-time jobs 44 percent indicated they worked full-time during 25 percent or less of their course work (Table 22).

Table 7

Institution -- Bachelor's Degree

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	293	83
(2) OSU	60	17
Total	353	100

Table 8

Academic Major -- Bachelor's Degree

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	191	54
(2) Education	161	46
Total	352	100

Table 9

Academic Minor -- Bachelor's Degree

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	179	79
(2) Education	49	22
Total	228	101*

*Rounding error

Table 10

GPA -- Bachelor's Degree

Alternatives	
Minimum GPA	1.88
Maximum GPA	4.00
Mode	3.00
Mean GPA	3.14
Standard Deviation	.45

Table 11

Institution -- Master's Degree

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	218	63
(2) OSU	128	37
Total	346	100

Table 12

Academic Major -- Master's Degree

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	95	27
(2) Education	255	73
Total	350	100

Table 13

Academic Minor -- Doctorate Degree

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Other	118	44
(2) Education	150	56
Total	268	100

Table 14

Year Doctoral Program Began

Alternatives	N	%
1967	1	.3
1968	2	1
1969	2	1
1970	4	1
1971	5	1
1972	11	3
1973	12	3
1974	24	7
1975	34	10
1976	71	20
1977	55	16
1978	60	17
1979	46	13
1980	20	6
1981	2	1
Total	351	100

Table 15

Year Graduated -- Doctoral Degree

Alternatives	N	%
1978	15	4
1979	62	18
1980	94	27
1981	72	21
1982	99	29
1983	3	1
Total	345	100

Table 16

Contribution of Full-time Employment

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	108	47
(2) Some	30	13
(3) Significant	33	14
(4) Primary	59	26
Total	230	100
Mean	2.19	
Standard Deviation	.27	

Table 17

Contribution of Part-time Employment

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	88	51
(2) Some	65	38
(3) Significant	15	9
(4) Primary	4	2
Total	172	100
Mean	1.62	
Standard Deviation	.74	

Table 18

Contribution of Graduate Assistantship

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	29	10
(2) Some	48	17
(3) Significant	109	38
(4) Primary	98	35
Total	284	100
Mean	2.97	
Standard Diviation	.96	

Table 19

Contribution of Scholarships/Fellowships

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	100	63
(2) Some	30	19
(3) Significant	11	7
(4) Primary	17	11
Total	158	100
Mean	1.65	
Standard Deviation	1.01	

Table 20

Contribution of Loans

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	85	47
(2) Some	65	36
(3) Significant	24	13
(4) Primary	7	4
Total	181	100
Mean	1.74	
Standard Deviation	.83	

Table 21

Contribution of Personal Resources

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	28	11
(2) Some	125	47
(3) Significant	76	29
(4) Primary	38	14
Total	267	101*
Mean	2.46	
Standard Deviation	.86	

*Rounding error

Table 22

Percentage of Coursework during Full-time Employment

Alternatives	N	%
(1) 1-25%	63	44
(2) 26-50%	12	8
(3) 51-75%	14	10
(4) 76-99%	26	18
(5) 100%	28	20
Total	143	100
Mean	2.61	
Standard Deviation	1.64	

GRADUATE PROGRAM OF STUDY

Course Work

Using the list of areas of study found in Table 23 the graduates identified their major field of study. The five areas with the largest number of graduates were: physical education (N=36); guidance and counseling (N=34); vocational education (N=27); educational administration (N=26); and higher education administration (N=19). Utilizing the same list, graduates identified the number of courses they had taken in each area of study and whether they wished they had taken more or less in each of these areas. The graduates could check (1) for no courses, (2) for 1 or 2 courses, or (3) for 3 or more courses taken in the program area. For the second part of the question they identified their satisfaction with the number of courses taken. They could select (1) for less courses or (2) for more courses; a blank indicated they were satisfied with the number of courses taken.

There were seven curricular areas in which the majority of the respondents indicated they had taken at least one course. In rank order, the areas are: statistics and research design (95%); measurement/evaluation (80%); program evaluation (61%); philosophy of education (60%); field based methodology/ethnography (59%); learning systems design development (54%); and general curriculum and instruction (51%). For all of the listed curricular areas the majority of the students, ranging from 65 percent to 96 percent, were satisfied with the number of courses they had taken. Yet it should be noted that a substantial number of students (70 or more) wished they had taken more courses in statistics and research (N=94); program evaluation (N=86); learning systems design development (N=78); measurement and evaluation (N=71); and field-based methodology/ethnography (N=71). These statistics

indicate that for all program majors the research related courses had the greatest enrollment and are also the courses of which most graduates wish they had taken more. Generally, the graduates are very satisfied with their doctoral course work (see Tables 24-25).

In addition to recording the number of courses they had taken in each curricular area, the graduates were asked to tally the number of courses that fell into designated descriptive categories. The categories were (a) exceptional in overall quality, (b) clearly inferior in overall quality, (c) inadequately organized, (d) intellectually challenging, (3) graded on a rigorous scale, and (f) taken outside the college. The responses to these categories could be one of the following: (1) none; (2) 1-3; (3) 4-6; (4) 7-9; (5) 10-12; (6) >12 but not all; or (7) all. The mean number of courses and the standard deviation for each of the categories were computed by interpolation and computation for grouped data (see Tables 26-32).

In the category dealing with the number of courses taken that were exceptional in overall quality, there was no one range of numbers that was an overwhelming majority. Twenty-six percent of the respondents selected 4 to 6 courses as the number of courses that were exceptional in overall quality. Twenty-two percent of the respondents rated 1 to 3 courses as exceptional, and another 22 percent rated more than 12 courses but not all as exceptional in quality. The mean number of courses rated as exceptional was 7.66, and the standard deviation was 4.62.

For the item dealing with courses that were clearly inferior the majority (57%) of respondents selected the range of 1 to 3 courses they had taken as being inferior. The mean number of courses rated as inferior was 2.47. The standard deviation was 2.60. The 1 to 3 courses range was also selected by

61 percent of the respondents as the number of courses they took that were inadequately organized. The mean number of courses rated as inadequately organized was 2.59 and the standard deviation was 2.72. The item dealing with the number of courses intellectually challenging did not produce an overwhelming majority for any number range of courses. Twenty-three percent of the respondents selected the 4 to 6 range; twenty percent selected the more than 12 courses but not all courses and nineteen percent felt that 7 to 9 courses were intellectually challenging. The mean number of courses for this item was 8.37 with a standard deviation of 5.37. The majority of the responses (53%) to the number of courses graded on a rigorous scale was divided between 1 to 3 courses (26%) and 4 to 6 courses (27%). Respondents indicated that 26 percent of their course work was taken outside the College of Education. But it should also be noted that 62 percent of the graduates indicated that if repeating their doctoral programs they would take some more or considerably more courses outside of the College. The higher means on the categories of exceptional in overall quality, intellectually challenging, and graded on a rigorous scale, as well as the lower means on the categories of inadequately organized, and inferior in overall quality, indicate a positive attitude by the respondents regarding the quality of their doctoral courses.

Instructors

The respondents also tallied the number of instructors they had in their doctoral program who could be described by the following categories (see Tables 33 to 36): (a) exceptionally knowledgeable; (b) used varied and stimulating instructional techniques; (c) readily available and responsive to students; and (d) thoroughly prepared for each class. None of these categories had an overwhelming majority in any one number range of instructors.

The means across these items computed by interpolation, ranged from 6.49 to 9.37 instructors. The response of none was negligible in most categories. These facts indicate that the respondents generally viewed the instructors that taught them as competent and concerned about students and their teaching.

Table 23

DOCTORAL PROGRAM MAJOR

	N	%
1) Comparative Education	2	.6
2) History of Education	4	1.2
3) Instructional Media	5	1.5
4) Philosophy of Education	3	.9
5) Sociology of Education	--	---
6) General Curriculum (Secondary)	1	.3
7) General Curriculum (Elementary)	10	2.9
8) Learning Systems Design/Development	5	1.5
9) Agricultural Education	13	3.8
10) Business Education	2	.6
11) Distributive Education	2	.6
12) Early Childhood Education	11	3.2
13) Elementary Education	5	1.5
14) English Education	7	2.0
15) Exceptional Children	13	3.8
16) Foreign Language	14	4.1
17) Health Education	5	1.5
18) Industrial Technology Education	12	3.5
19) Math Education	8	2.3
20) Physical Education	36	10.5
21) Reading	7	2.0
22) Science Education	5	1.5
23) Social Studies Education	6	1.8
24) Teacher Education	12	3.5
25) Vocational and Technical Education	27	7.9
26) Secondary Subject Matter Areas	2	.6
27) Adult/Continuing Education	15	4.4
28) Counseling and Guidance	34	9.9
29) Educational Administration (K-12)	26	7.6
30) Higher Education Administration	19	5.6
31) Personnel Work (Post Secondary)	4	1.2
32) School Psychology	4	1.2
33) Field-based Mehodology/Ethnography	1	.3
34) Measurement/Evaluation	2	.6
35) Program Evaluation	4	1.2
36) Statistics/Research Design	3	3.6
37) Other	13	3.6

Table 24

NUMBER OF COURSES TAKEN DURING DOCTORAL PROGRAM

	No Courses		1 or 2 Courses		3 or more Courses	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1) Comparative Education	217	69	84	27	14	4
2) History of Education	191	52	140	43	17	38
3) Instructional Media	224	71	62	20	30	10
4) Philosophy of Education	129	39	166	51	33	10
5) Sociology of Education	194	63	105	34	11	4
6) General Curriculum (Secondary)	152	49	81	26	76	25
7) General Curriculum (Elementary)	208	71	53	18	31	11
8) Learning Systems Design/Development	144	45	116	36	60	19
9) Agricultural Education	218	76	24	8	45	16
10) Business Education	265	95	8	3	5	2
11) Distributive Education	265	95	9	3	4	1
12) Early Childhood Education	219	79	32	12	27	10
13) Elementary Education	227	82	26	9	24	9
14) English Education	257	90	10	4	18	6
15) Exceptional Children	222	76	36	12	33	11
16) Foreign Language	251	90	9	3	19	7
17) Health Education	246	90	19	7	9	3
18) Industrial Technology Education	243	88	14	5	19	7
19) Math Education	249	92	14	5	9	3
20) Physical Education	223	80	5	2	50	18
21) Reading	242	86	21	8	18	6
22) Science Education	246	92	12	5	9	3
23) Social Studies Education	244	91	11	4	13	5
24) Teacher Education	156	54	60	21	73	25
25) Vocational and Technical Education	204	74	26	9	46	17
26) Secondary Subject Matter Areas	197	84	11	5	27	12
27) Adult/Continuing Education	203	72	42	15	37	13
28) Counseling and Guidance	162	57	59	21	61	22
29) Educational Administration (K-12)	178	63	42	15	63	22
30) Higher Education Administration	168	56	66	22	64	22
31) Personnel Work (Post Secondary)	216	81	34	13	18	7
32) School Psychology	203	75	40	15	26	10
33) Field-based Mehodology/Ethnography	110	42	96	36	59	22
34) Measurement/Evaluation	60	20	150	49	95	31
35) Program Evaluation	112	39	134	47	42	15
36) Statistics/Research Design	19	6	124	38	186	57

Table 25

CHANGES IN COURSES TAKEN IF PROGRAM WERE REPEATED

	Less		More	
	N	%	N	%
1) Comparative Education	17	27	47	73
2) History of Education	24	42	33	58
3) Instructional Media	14	16	75	84
4) Philosophy of Education	23	31	51	69
5) Sociology of Education	19	28	50	73
6) General Curriculum (Secondary)	15	29	36	71
7) General Curriculum (Elementary)	21	48	23	52
8) Learning Systems Design/Development	19	20	78	80
9) Agricultural Education	12	50	12	50
10) Business Education	9	64	5	36
11) Distributive Education.	9	82	2	18
12) Early Childhood Education	7	27	19	73
13) Elementary Education	8	50	8	50
14) English Education	--	--	--	--
15) Exceptional Children	7	18	32	82
16) Foreign Language	8	47	9	53
17) Health Education	7	44	9	56
18) Industrial Technology Education	5	39	8	62
19) Math Education	5	36	9	64
20) Physical Education	10	44	13	56
21) Reading	5	16	26	84
22) Science Education	8	50	8	50
23) Social Studies Education	9	64	5	36
24) Teacher-Education	5	11	41	89
25) Vocational and Technical Education	9	36	15	63
26) Secondary Subject Matter Areas	6	35	11	65
27) Adult/Continuing Education	12	22	43	78
28) Counseling and Guidance	8	19	34	81
29) Educational Administration (K-12)	9	18	41	82
30) Higher Education Administration	7	10	63	90
31) Personnel Work (Post Secondary)	6	15	34	85
32) School Psychology	8	24	26	76
33) Field-based Mehodology/Ethnography	4	5	71	95
34) Measurement/Evaluation	7	9	71	91
35) Program Evaluation	3	3	86	97
36) Statistics/Research Design	19	17	94	83

Table 26

Number of Courses Rated Exceptional

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	5	1
(2) 1-3	76	22
(3) 4-6	90	26
(4) 7-9	58	16
(5) 10-12	40	11
(6) > 12 but not all	77	22
(7) All	7	2
Total	353	100
Mean	7.66	
Standard Deviation	4.62	

Table 27

Number of Courses Rated Inferior

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	82	24
(2) 1-3	194	57
(3) 4-6	39	11
(4) 7-9	18	5
(5) 10-12	6	2
(6) > 12 but not all	4	1
(7) All	0	-
Total	343	100
Mean	2.47	
Standard Deviation	2.60	

Table 28

Number of Courses Inadequately Organized

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	65	19
(2) 1-3	205	61
(3) 4-6	45	13
(4) 7-0	8	2
(5) 10-12	6	2
(6) >12 but not all	5	2
(7) All	2	1
Total	336	100
Mean	2.59	
Standard Deviation	2.72	

Table 29

Number of Course Intellectually Challenging

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	2	1
(2) 1-3	58	17
(3) 4-6	79	23
(4) 7-9	67	19
(5) 10-12	57	16
(6) >12 but not all	71	20
(7) All	15	4
Total	349	100
Mean	8.37	
Standard Deviation	5.37	

Table 30

Number of Courses Graded on a Rigorous Scale

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	19	6
(2) 1-3	88	26
(3) 4-6	92	27
(4) 7-9	62	18
(5) 10-12	27	8
(6) >12 but not all	45	13
(7) All	5	2
Total	338	100
Mean	6.34	
Standard Deviation	4.40	

Table 31

Number of Courses Taken Outside the College

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	27	8
(2) 1-3	79	23
(3) 4-6	89	26
(4) 7-9	61	18
(5) 10-12	44	13
(6) >12 but not all	46	13
(7) All	1	.3
Total	347	101*
Mean	6.44	
Standard Deviation	4.38	
*Rounding error		

Table 32

If Program Repeated -- Number of Courses Outside College

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Considerably Less	1	.3
(2) Some Less	8	2
(3) Same Number	124	35
(4) Some More	153	44
(5) Considerably More	64	18
Total	350	99*
Mean	3.77	
Standard Deviation	.78	
*Rounding Error		

Table 33

Number of Instructors Exceptionally Knowledgeable

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	0	-
(2) 1-3	33	10
(3) 4-6	72	21
(4) 7-9	76	22
(5) 10-12	52	15
(6) >12 but not all	88	25
(7) All	25	7
Total	365	100
Mean	8.94	
Standard Deviation	4.79	

Table 34

Instructors Used Varied and Stimulating Techniques

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	16	5
(2) 1-3	96	28
(3) 4-6	94	27
(4) 7-9	56	16
(5) 10-12	29	8
(6) >12 but not all	46	13
(7) All	11	3
Total	348	100
Mean	6.49	
Standard Deviation	4.30	

Table 35

Number of Instructors Readily Available and Responsive.

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	2	1
(2) 1-3	55	16
(3) 4-6	80	23
(4) 7-9	68	20
(5) 10-12	42	12
(6) >12 but not all	79	23
(7) All	22	6
Total	348	101*
Mean	8.61	
Standard Deviation	4.70	

*Rounding error

Table 36

Number of Instructors Thoroughly Prepared for Class

Alternatives	N	%
(1) None	0	-
(2) 1-3	36	10
(3) 4-6	76	22
(4) 7-9	66	19
(5) 10-12	56	16
(6) >12 but not all	99	28
(7) All	18	5
Total	351	100
Mean	9.37	
Standard Deviation	4.42	

Table 37

Committee Assistance in Planning Program

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	8	2
(2) Inadequate	13	4
(3) Weak	34	10
(4) Adequate	111	31
(5) Strong	106	30
(6) Exceptional	86	24
Total	358	101*
Mean	4.54	
Standard Deviation	1.18	

*Rounding error

FEATURES OF ADVANCED DEGREE PROGRAMS

Advisory Committee and Other Support Services

Questionnaire items dealing with graduates' advisory committees requested the respondents to rate the committee in seven categories (see Tables 37 to 43). The ratings could be (1) does not apply, (2) inadequate, (3) weak, (4) adequate, (5) strong, or (6) exceptional. The first category, assisting in planning program of study, was rated by the majority (54%) of the respondents as strong or exceptional. The majority of the respondents (72%) rated their advisory committees as strong or exceptional in providing assistance in writing and reviewing their general examinations. This is consistent with the results of another item where 73 percent of the graduates agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they received constructive feedback on their general examination performance. Excluding the response category of (1) does not apply, the mean response value for this item was 4.99. The committees were also rated strong or exceptional by a majority of the respondents (72%) in pressing them for professional excellence. In the categories of providing feedback on the design of their dissertations and providing assistance in writing their dissertations, 64 percent of the respondents rated their committees as strong or exceptional for each. In addition, 85 percent of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the support they received from their advisor during the dissertation process. The mean response to this item was 3.37, and the standard deviation was .87. The category of providing assistance in finding employment did not have such a clear-cut majority responding to one alternative. The largest percentage (31%) selected (1) did not apply. The second highest rating (17%)

was (4) adequate. Finally, 65 percent of the respondents rated their advisory committee as strong or exceptional for providing personal and professional comfort during their doctoral studies.

It is clear from these results that these doctoral graduates have a positive view, in these specific areas, of their committees' support during their doctoral program. Furthermore, the graduates identified those aspects of their program they felt were most beneficial. Based on the frequency of an item, the responses were grouped into ten categories (see Table 44). They included graduate associateship, knowledgeable faculty, faculty support, flexibility of the program, research sequence, interaction with peers, intellectual stimulation, the dissertation, course work, and "other." The "other" category included a wide range of responses such as evaluation courses, maturing process, emphasis on research, professional contacts, professional growth, emphasis on writing, support of independent thought, and hands on experience.

Excluding the "other" category, the most frequently cited benefit was the flexibility of the program (14%). The two next highest categories both dealt with the faculty; (1) faculty support (12%) and (2) knowledgeable faculty (6%). The large "other" category and its wide range of responses indicate the individual nature of the doctoral program, hence the idiosyncratic choice of what was most beneficial.

Other services available during their doctoral studies that the respondents rated included: (a) the library; (b) the computer center; (c) the educational placement office; and (d) the educational consulting service (see Tables 44 to 47). The respondents could rate these services as: (1) did not use; (2) inadequate; (3) weak; (4) adequate; (5) strong;

or (6) exceptional. The library received a strong overall rating with 71 percent rating it strong or exceptional. In addition, 25 percent rated it as adequate. The mean response was 4.93 (excluding the "did not use" category). Forty-six percent of the respondents rated the computer center as strong or exceptional. It should be noted that 25 percent of the respondents did not use the center. The educational placement office and the educational consultation service were not used by a large percentage of the students, 42 percent and 41 percent, respectively. The next largest rating (21%) was adequate for the educational placement office. The same was true for the consultation service, 21 percent rated it as adequate.

It is difficult to make an overall statement regarding the rating of these auxillary services, but eliminating the respondents who did not use the services produces a positive view of these services. Although the graduates' responses reflect a positive view of their doctoral program, they also recommended some changes in the program (see Table 45). Like the responses on the beneficial aspects of the program, these responses were grouped into categories. Ultimately seven categories were identified including an "other" category. The categories included more structure, more research and statistics courses, more computer training, increased emphasis on job hunting skills, more contact with advisor, and "other." The "other" category included a wide range of responses such as: more internships, more emphasis on outside area, more women on the faculty, improve research sequence, increase standards, more courses in grant writing, better selection of teaching assistants, improve generals process, and more hands on contact.

Excluding the "other" category, the most frequently cited category was for more research and statistics courses. The second highest category was more contact with advisory and the third highest was more computer training. As with the responses to the most beneficial aspects of the program, the "other" category contains the majority of the responses indicating the personal interpretation of the response. Furthermore, close examination of Tables 46 and 47, which contain a complete listing of responses to the two questionnaire items, will reveal duplicate responses on beneficial aspects of the program and recommended changes to the program. This finding should be viewed in light of the overall generally high ratings given to many of these items in the previous sections.

General Examinations

A number of questionnaire items (Tables 48 to 56) addressed the graduates' experiences in preparing for and taking their general examinations, the usefulness of the experience, and a description of the exam format. The majority of the students (94%) took both written and oral exams, and they were taken in an on-campus supervised situation. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents completed their examinations in half-day sessions. The majority of the respondents (74%) had three half-day sessions.

In preparing for the exams, 75 percent of the respondents felt their study efforts were guided by a clear sense of what materials would be covered on the exam. Eighty percent of these graduates felt preparing for the examination had been a useful experience. Most of the respondents (40%) spent 4 to 6 weeks preparing for their general examinations. Subsequent to their preparation 98 percent of these graduates passed their general examinations on the first attempt. The questionnaire item that stated the

general exams were a measure of the student's knowledge and skills was agreed to or strongly agreed to by 85 percent of the respondents. The general exams appeared to have been a rewarding and positive experience for these graduates. They were aware of the purpose and the usefulness of the experience.

Dissertation

In describing the type of dissertation they completed, most students (36%) classified it as a descriptive investigation. The next highest classification (26%) was an experimental or quasi-experimental study. In conducting the study 61 percent of the respondents rated themselves as thoroughly prepared in the methodology they used in their dissertation. In addition, 92 percent stated that a committee member was knowledgeable in the methodology used, and 62 percent identified the committee chairperson as that individual. For the theoretical background of the study 86 percent responded that a committee member was knowledgeable of it, and the committee chairperson was identified by 71 percent as that committee member. The graduates were requested to identify how many weeks it took to complete their dissertation proposal. The number of weeks ranged from 1 to 99. The most frequent number of weeks reported was 10 (16%). The next highest number of weeks was 20 (11%). The mean number of weeks to complete a dissertation proposal, for these graduates, was 19.06, the standard deviation was 19.22.

The range of values for the number of weeks it took to complete the dissertation after the proposal was completed was from 2 weeks to 99 weeks. The most frequent number of weeks was 20 (14%) and the next highest values were 30 weeks (13%) and 40 weeks (11%). The mean number of weeks for completing the dissertation was 32.53 with a standard deviation of 20.31.

Subsequent to completing their dissertations 40 percent of the graduates have published articles based on their dissertation research. An additional 30 percent intend to publish an article based on their dissertation (see Tables 60-68).

Table 38

Committee Assistance in Writing and Reviewing Generals

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	2	1
(2) Inadequate	3	1
(3) Weak	10	3
(4) Adequate	85	24
(5) Strong	145	41
(6) Exceptional	112	31
Total	357	101*
Mean	4.97	
Standard Deviation	.91	
*Rounding error		

Table 39

Committee Pressed for Professional Excellence

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	2	1
(2) Inadequate	6	2
(3) Weak	20	6
(4) Adequate	75	21
(5) Strong	113	32
(6) Exceptional	143	40
Total	359	102*
Mean	5.01	
Standard Deviation	1.03	
*Rounding error		

Table 40

Committee Provides Assistance and Feedback
On the Design of Dissertation

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	7	2
(2) Inadequate	13	4
(3) Weak	26	7
(4) Adequate	77	22
(5) Strong	102	29
(6) Exceptional	126	36
Total	351	100
Mean	4.80	
Standard Deviation	1.22	

Table 41

Committee Provides Assistance in Writing Dissertation

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	9	3
(2) Inadequate	12	3
(3) Weak	32	9
(4) Adequate	71	20
(5) Strong	90	25
(6) Exceptional	140	40
Total	354	100
Mean	4.81	
Standard Deviation	1.28	

Table 42

Committee Providing Assistance in Finding Employment

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	111	31
(2) Inadequate	48	14
(3) Weak	41	12
(4) Adequate	61	17
(5) Strong	51	14
(6) Exceptional	41	12
Total	353	100
Mean	3.05	
Standard Deviation	1.79	

Table 43

Committee Providing Personal and Professional Comfort

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	3	1
(2) Inadequate	17	5
(3) Weak	30	8
(4) Adequate	78	22
(5) Strong	93	26
(6) Exceptional	137	100
Total	358	100
Mean	4.82	
Standard Deviation	1.21	

Table 44

Most Beneficial Aspect of Program

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Graduate associateship	19	4
(2) Knowledgeable faculty	28	6
(3) Faculty support	54	12
(4) Flexibility of program	60	14
(5) Research sequence	26	6
(6) Interaction with peers	23	5
(7) Intellectual stimulation	16	4
(8) Dissertation	16	4
(9) Course work	26	6
(10) Other	174	39
Total	442	100

Table 45

Recommended Changes in Graduate Program

Alternatives	N	%
(1) More structure	17	5
(2) More research/statistics	27	8
(3) More computer training	19	6
(4) More emphasis on job hunting	13	4
(5) More contact with advisor	22	7
(6) Other	243	73
Total	331	103*

*Rounding error

Table 46

Beneficial Aspects of Doctoral Program

1. Graduate associateship work experience
2. Knowledgeable faculty
3. Advisor's attitude
4. Course work from advisor
5. Faculty support
6. Classical model of guided independent study
7. Flexibility of program
8. Research sequence
9. Interaction with peers
10. Intellectual stimulation
11. Emphasis on writing
12. Dissertation
13. Evaluation courses
14. Administrative course work
15. Course work
16. Made him more analytical
17. Maturing process
18. Application of theory to practice
19. Hands on experience
20. National reputation of college and faculty
21. Support of independent thought
22. Emphasis on research
23. Emphasis on leadership development
24. Professional contacts
25. Professional growth

Table 47

Recommended Program Changes

1. More structure
2. Require more statistics/and research methodology
3. Computer language proficiency
4. More emphasis on job hunting
5. Ethnographic research
6. Research project prior to dissertation
7. Skill development
8. Professional and personal comfort
9. More emphasis on outside area
10. More women on faculty
11. More substance
12. More experience in the faculty dealing with students from different disciplines
13. An off-campus advisor during dissertation
14. More internship
15. More course work in labor relations in higher education
16. Cooperative programing between curriculum, instruction, and administration
17. More hands on contact
18. More program evaluation courses
19. More emphasis on minor areas
20. More contact with advisor
21. More time outside classroom with faculty and classmates
22. More departmental seminars with visiting scholars
23. Consideration of part-time study due to economic times
24. More course work outside the college
25. Evaluation of curriculum by graduates
26. More staff/student interaction
27. Improve research sequence in college
28. Increase standards
29. Improve course syllabi
30. Reduce the number of graudate students assigned to an advisor
31. K-12 people instructing basic courses in higher education
32. More freedom to select dissertation topic
33. More flexibility in course selection
34. Seminar for writing dissertation
35. Course in grant writing
36. More faculty contribution to their specialty area
37. Diversified faculty
38. Get the Ph.D. in Education more respected
39. Common interest of faculty
40. Courses need to be improved in school counseling
41. Improve generals process
42. Better selection of TA's
43. Eliminate residency requirement

Table 48
The Quality of Service/Support
Provided by the Library

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Did not use	4	1
(2) Inadequate	2	1
(3) Weak	10	3
(4) Adequate	90	25
(5) Strong	151	42
(6) Exceptional	106	30
Total	363	102*
Mean	4.93	
Standard Deviation	.94	

*Rounding error

Table 49
The Quality of Service/Support
Provided by the Computer Center

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Did not use	90	25
(2) Inadequate	3	1
(3) Weak	10	3
(4) Adequate	92	25
(5) Strong	126	35
(6) Exceptional	41	11
Total	362	100
Mean	3.79	
Standard Deviation	1.75	

Table 50
The Quality of Service/Support
Provided by the Educational Placement Service

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Did not use	149	42
(2) Inadequate	26	7
(3) Weak	40	11
(4) Adequate	76	21
(5) Strong	49	14
(6) Exceptional	18	5
Total	358	100
Mean	2.73	
Standard Deviation	1.70	

Table 51
The Quality of Service/Support
Provided by the Educational Consulting Service

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Did not use	148	41
(2) Inadequate	15	4
(3) Weak	34	9
(4) Adequate	77	21
(5) Strong	52	14
(6) Exceptional	34	9
Total	360	98*
Mean	2.92	
Standard Deviation	1.83	
*Rounding error		

Table 52
Format of General Exams

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Oral	2	1
(2) Written	19	5
(3) Oral and Written	340	94
Total	361	100

Table 53
Conditions of General Exams

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Take-home	22	6
(2) On-campus supervised	338	93
(3) Does not apply	2	1
Total	362	100

Table 54

Length of General Exams

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Half day seesions	269	89
(2) Full day sessions	33	11
Total	302	100

Table 55

Number of Sessions for General Exams

Alternatives	N	%
1	8	3
2	23	8
3	221	74
4	33	11
5	11	4
6	1	1
7	1	1
Total	298	102*
Mean	3.02	
Standard Deviation	.72	

*Rounding error

Table 56
Sense of Exam Content Was Clear

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No exam	2	1
(2) Strongly disagree	14	4
(3) Disagree	27	8
(4) Neutral	45	13
(5) Agree	153	43
(6) Strongly agree	117	33
Total	358	102*
Mean	4.92	
Standard Deviation	1.10	
*Rounding error		

Table 57
Exams Were a Useful Learning Experience

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No exam	1	1
(2) Strongly disagree	10	3
(3) Disagree	19	5
(4) Neutral	42	12
(5) Agree	151	42
(6) Strongly agree	132	37
Total	355	100
Mean	5.05	
Standard Deviation	1.00	

Table 58

Time Spent Preparing for Exams

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Less than one week	7	2
(2) 1-3 weeks	71	20
(3) 4-6 weeks	144	40
(4) 7-9 weeks	62	17
(5) 10 or more weeks	76	21
Total	360	100
Mean	3.36	
Standard Deviation	1.08	

Table 59

Students Who Passed Exam on First Administration

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	6	2
(2) Yes	354	98
Total	360	100

Table 60

Exams Measured Knowledge and Skills

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No exam	1	1
(2) Strongly disagree	6	2
(3) Disagree	7	2
(4) Neutral	39	11
(5) Agree	174	49
(6) Strongly Agree	132	37
Total	359	102*
Mean	5.16	
Standard Deviation	.85	
*Rounding error		

Table 61

Type of Dissertation Research

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Historical research	22	6
(2) Case study	15	4
(3) Descriptive investigation	129	36
(4) Ethnography/field study	24	7
(5) Correlational study	36	10
(6) Experimental/quasi	93	26
(7) Program evaluation	9	3
(8) Other	26	7
Total	354	99*
*Rounding error		

Table 62

Preparation in Methodology

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Totally unprepared	8	2
(2) Inadequately prepared	16	5
(3) Minimally prepared	110	32
(4) Thoroughly prepared	207	61
Total	341	100
Mean	3.51	
Standard Deviation	.70	

Table 63

Committee Member Knowledgeable in Methodology

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	29	8
(2) Yes	315	92
Total	344	100

Table 64

Which Committee Member Knowledgeable in Methodology

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Dissertation advisor	185	62
(2) Other committee member	112	38
Total	297	100

Table 65

Committee Member Knowledgeable in Theory

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	47	14
(2) Yes	297	86
Total	344	100

Table 66

Which Committee Member Knowledgeable in Theory

Alternatives	N.	%
(1) Dissertation advisor	196	71
(2) Other committee member	79	29
Total	275	100

Table 67

Weeks to Complete Proposal

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	99.00
Mode	10.00
Mean	19.06
Standard Deviation	19.23

Table 68

Weeks to Complete Dissertation

Alternatives	
Minimum	2.00
Maximum	99.00
Mode	20.00
Mean	32.53
Standard Deviation	20.31

Table 69

Published Articles from Dissertation

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	123	35
(2) Yes	139	40
(3) No, intend to	90	26
Total	352	101*

*Rounding error

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

The items discussed in this section deal with past and present teaching experience, past and present administrative experience, salary history, satisfaction with certain aspects of their present employment, job responsibilities, and how the doctoral program contributed to performing certain job responsibilities (see Tables 70-103).

Prior to entering the doctoral program approximately 65 percent of the respondents had teaching experience at the K-12 level. The mean number of years taught at this level was 5.55. After receiving the doctorate 67 percent of the respondents had teaching experience at the K-12 level, a two percent increase over the number teaching prior to the doctorate. There was a much greater increase between the number of respondents teaching at the college level before and after the doctoral program. Forty-two percent of the respondents had taught at the college level prior to entering the doctoral program. After receiving the doctorate 76 percent of the respondents had teaching experience.

In regard to administrative experience, the graduates reported whether or not they had any administrative experience and how many years they have spent in an administrative role. Twenty-three percent of the respondents reported that they had administrative experience at the K-12 level. The number of years of experience at this level ranged from one year to 23 years. The mean number of years of K-12 administrative experience was 5.06. Thirty-five percent of the respondents had administrative experience at the college level. The mean number of years of college level administration was 4.96. The responses ranged from one to 20 years.

To determine the respondents satisfaction with their current jobs they were requested to rate the following aspects: salary, responsibilities, geographical location, administrator or supervisor, co-workers, application of their studies, and opportunity to advance. Most of these graduates (47%) were satisfied with their present salary yet it should be noted that 36 percent were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their salary.

The graduates reported their salaries, to the nearest thousand, before entering the doctoral program; of their first job after receiving the doctorate degree; and of their current job. The mean salary for the graduates on their jobs prior to entering the doctoral program was approximately 15 thousand dollars per year. Their salaries ranged from two thousand to 55 thousand per year, with 12 thousand per year the most frequent salary reported. There was an increase in the salaries reported for the first job after completing the doctoral program on all measures except for the minimum salary reported. The mean salary was 20 thousand dollars. The salaries ranged from two thousand to 59 thousand p[illegible]ear, with 17 thousand per year the most frequent amount reported. Also, t[illegible] was an increase in the salaries reported for current jobs on all measu[illegible]cept the minimum value, which was decreased. The salaries for current jobs ranged from one thousand per year to 75 thousand per year, and the most frequent amount reported was 20 thousand dollars per year. The mean salary reported was approximately 26 thousand dollars per year.

The satisfaction level with job responsibilities was overwhelmingly positive. Seventy-four percent of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with their responsibilities. The majority of the respondents (71%) are satisfied or very satisfied with the opportunities, on their present job, to apply what they learned in their doctoral program. Most of the respondents indicate there is an opportunity for advancement, with 55 percent satisfied

or very satisfied with the advancement opportunities available to them. The same positive attitude is true of their present geographical location. Seventy-three percent are satisfied or very satisfied, geographically, where they are working. Regarding the individuals they work with, 63 percent of these graduates responded that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their supervisors. In addition, 73 percent are satisfied of very satisfied with their co-workers.

These findings indicate that the graduates are generally pleased with their current employment situations. Furthermore, responses to two other questionnaire items indicate this high level of satisfaction could be attributed to the doctoral degree. Fifty-six percent of the graduates agreed or strongly agreed that their financial security improved as a result of their doctoral degree. Also, 62 percent agreed or strongly agreed that their qualifications for their current position were greater than graduates of other institutions. Seventy-one percent would recommend their OSU doctoral program to an individual in a similar position.

With respect to their job responsibilities, the graduates identified the percentage of time they spent on: (1) teaching; (2) research and evaluation; (3) service; and (4) administration (see Tables 88 to 91). The percentage of time spent on teaching by the graduates ranged from one percent to 100 percent. The mean percentage of time spent on teaching was 48.60 percent.

A third of the graduates spent ten percent of their time on research and evaluation activities. The mean percentage of time spent devoted to research and evaluation activities was 18.63 percent. Nearly a third of the graduates spent ten percent of their time involved in service activities.

The mean percentage of time devoted to service was 23.95 percent. Finally, the percentage of time spent on administrative duties ranged from one percent to 100 percent. The mean percentage of time spent on administration was 35.59 percent.

Other professional activities the graduates reported on include the number of presentations at national conferences, publications in refereed journals and whether or not they had written a proposal. Forty-six percent of the graduates reported they had presented a paper at a national conference since they had graduated (Table 99). Of those presenting papers, 42% had presented one paper since graduation (Table 100). The mean number of papers presented was 2.47 papers. Close to a third of the graduates stated they had published an article in a refereed journal (Table 101), the most frequent number of articles reported by those who had published was one. The mean number of articles was 2.47 articles. Finally, 43 percent of the respondents had written a proposal for funding purposes (Table 103).

Table 104 contains a list of job titles reported by the respondents. The list represents a wide range of jobs within the education field and some jobs in noneducation fields. Within the education field, teaching is well represented by such titles as lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and teacher. Administrative positions in the schools, school districts, and colleges and universities are quite numerous. From the job titles, such as director, coordinator, research associate, counselor, assistant to dean, assistant to the superintendent, dean, and vice president, the graduates hold positions at all levels within these institutions. In addition, various other titles, for example, marketing representative, section chief, and training officer suggest that some graduates are working in a noneducation setting.

Table 70

Teaching Experience K-12 Prior to Doctoral Program

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	23.00
Mode	3.00
Mean	5.56
Standard Deviation	4.32

Table 71

Teaching Experience K-12 Subsequent to Doctoral Program

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	33.00
Mode	3.00
Mean	6.47
Standard Deviation	5.44

Table 72

Teaching Experience College Level Prior to Doctoral Program

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	20.00
Mode	1.00
Mean	4.35
Standard Deviation	3.83

Table 73

Teaching Experience College Level Subsequent to Doctoral Program

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	25.00
Mode	2.00
Mean	5.85
Standard Deviation	4.65

Table 74

Administrative Experience K-12 Prior to Ph.D.

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	277	77
(2) Yes	81	23
Total	358	100

Table 75

Administrative Experience K-12 After Ph.D.

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	23.00
Mode	2.00
Mean	5.06
Standard Deviation	4.77

Table 76

Administrative Experience College Level Prior to Ph.D.

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	232	66
(2) Yes	122	35
Total	354	101*

*Rounding error

Table 77

Administrative Experience College Level After Ph.D.

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	20.00
Mode	1.00
Mean	4.96
Standard Deviation	4.12

Table 78

Satisfaction With Salary

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	37	10
(2) Dissatisfied	92	26
(3) Neutral	58	16
(4) Satisfied	140	39
(5) Very satisfied	29	8
Total	356	99*
Mean	3.09	
Standard Deviation	1.18	

*Rounding error

Table 79

Satisfaction With Responsibilities

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	12	3
(2) Dissatisfied	36	10
(3) Neutral	42	12
(4) Satisfied	175	50
(5) Very satisfied	87	25
Total	352	100
Mean	3.82	
Standard Deviation	1.03	

Table 80

Satisfaction With Opportunities to Advance

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	46	13
(2) Dissatisfied	64	18
(3) Neutral	52	15
(4) Satisfied	125	36
(5) Very satisfied	65	19
Total	352	101*
Mean	3.28	
Standard Deviation	1.31	

*Rounding error

Table 81

Satisfaction With Ability to Apply Studies

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	21	6
(2) Dissatisfied	37	11
(3) Neutral	44	13
(4) Satisfied	137	39
(5) Very satisfied	109	31
Total	348	100
Mean	3.79	
Standard Deviation	1.17	

Table 82

Satisfaction With Geographical Location

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	12	3
(2) Dissatisfied	31	9
(3) Neutral	51	15
(4) Satisfied	119	34
(5) Very satisfied	138	39
Total	351	100
Mean	3.97	
Standard Deviation	1.10	

Table 83

Satisfaction With Supervisors

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	33	10
(2) Dissatisfied	33	10
(3) Neutral	62	18
(4) Satisfied	137	40
(5) Very satisfied	79	23
Total	344	101*
Mean	3.57	
Standard Deviation	1.22	

*Rounding error

Table 84

Satisfaction With Co-Workers

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	7	2
(2) Dissatisfied	18	5
(3) Neutral	67	19
(4) Satisfied	147	43
(5) Very satisfied	107	31
Total	346	100
Mean	3.95	
Standard Deviation	.95	

Table 85

Improvement of Financial Security

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	36	10
(2) Dissatisfied	42	12
(3) Neutral	76	21
(4) Satisfied	124	35
(5) Very satisfied	77	22
Total	356	100
Mean	3.47	
Standard Deviation	1.24	

Table 86

Improvement of Qualifications

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Very dissatisfied	7	2
(2) Dissatisfied	20	6
(3) Neutral	97	28
(4) Satisfied	119	34
(5) Very Satisfied	103	30
Total	346	100
Mean	3.84	
Standard Deviation	.98	

Table 87

Recommend OSU

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Strongly disagree	13	4
(2) Disagree	27	8
(3) Neutral	59	17
(4) Agree	112	33
(5) Strongly Agree	133	39
Total	344	101*

*Rounding error

Table 88

Percent Time On Teaching

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Mode	50.00
Mean	48.60
Standard Deviation	30.29

Table 89

Percent Time On Research and Evaluation

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Mode	10.00
Mean	18.61
Standard Deviation	20.68

Table 90

Percent of Time on Service

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Mode	10.00
Mean	23.95
Standard Deviation	25.48

Table 91

Percent of Time on Administration

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	100.00
Mode	5.00
Mean	35.59
Standard Deviation	28.95

Table 92

Contribution of Program to Teaching

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	57	16
(2) Little or no contribution	27	8
(3) Limited contribution	63	18
(4) Moderate contribution	98	28
(5) Strong contribution	110	31
Total	355	101*
Mean	3.50	
Standard Deviation	1.41	

*Rounding error

Table 93

Contribution of Program to Research and Evaluation

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	10	3
(2) Little or no contribution	4	1
(3) Limited contribution	28	8
(4) Moderate contribution	94	26
(5) Strong contribution	226	62
Total	362	100
Mean	4.44	
Standard Deviation	.90	

Table 94

Contribution of Program to Service

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	47	14
(2) Little or no contribution	51	15
(3) Limited contribution	78	22
(4) Moderate contribution	111	32
(5) Strong contribution	61	18
Total	348	101*
Mean	3.25	
Standard Deviation	1.28	
*Rounding error		

Table 95

Contribution of Program to Administration

Alternatives	N	%
(1) Does not apply	42	12
(2) Little or no contribution	69	19
(3) Limited contribution	75	21
(4) Moderate contribution	78	22
(5) Strong contribution	91	26
Total	356	100
Mean	3.31	
Standard Deviation	1.36	

Table 96

Salary Before Ph.D. Program

Alternatives	
Minimum	2.00
Maximum	55.00
Mode	12.00
Mean	14.94
Standard Deviation	6.68

Table 97

Salary of First Job After Ph.D. Program

Alternatives	
Minimum	2.00
Maximum	59.00
Mode	17.00
Mean	20.47
Standard Deviation	8.46

Table 98

Salary of Current Job

Alternatives	
Minimum	1.00
Maximum	75.00
Mode	20.00
Mean	25.94
Standard Deviation	9.71

Table 99

Presented a Paper Since Graduation

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	178	49.
(2) Yes	169	46
Total	347	95

Table 100

Number of Papers Presented

Alternatives	N	%
1	71	42
2	48	28
3	17	10
4	9	5
5	12	7
6	3	2
8	3	2
9	7	4
Total	170	100
Mean	2.47	
Standard Deviation	2.03	

Table 101

Published in Refereed Journal

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	243	67
(2) Yes	107	29
Total	350	96*

*Rounding error

Table 102

Number of Articles Published in Refereed Journal

Alternatives	N	%
1	45	46
2	21	21
3	12	12
4	6	6
5	5	5
6	3	3
8	2	2
9	4	4
Total	98	98*
Mean	2.47	
Standard Deviation	2.08	
*Rounding error		

Table 103

Written a Contract or Proposal

Alternatives	N	%
(1) No	203	57
(2) Yes	152	43
Total	355	100

Table 104

Current Job Titles

1. Research Associate
2. Director
3. Coach
4. Assistant Director
5. Assistant Professor
6. Evaluator
7. Section Chief
8. Counselor
9. Human Resources Manager
10. Director of Elementary Education
11. Teacher Development Coordinator
12. Director of Student Services
13. Director of Library
14. Coordinator of Postsecondary Adult Programs
15. Administrator, Operations Planning
16. Executive Assistant to Superintendent
17. Public Relations Officer
18. Assistant Dean
19. Chairperson
20. Director of Educational and Personnel Development
21. Associate Professor Coordinator of General Instruction
22. Executive Director Technical College
23. Vice President/Dean of Instruction
24. Director-School System
25. Teacher
26. Assistant Director Community Education Services
27. Program Director
28. Senior Research Associate
29. Psychology Assistant
30. Executive Director of Pupil Services
31. Instructor
32. Marketing Research Associate
33. Interior Horticulturalist
34. Postdoctoral Research Fellow
35. Lecturer
36. Assistant to the Dean
37. Professor
38. Program Director
39. Psychological Consultant
40. Training Officer

SUMMARY

The survey of doctoral graduates from academic year 1978-1979 to Autumn 1982 was conducted for the purpose of collecting data on various areas of the doctoral program, graduates' past and present employment history, educational background and demographic information.

The demographic information revealed that there were slightly more male than female graduates and their ethnic background was overwhelmingly Caucasian. Approximately 13 percent of the graduates could be classified as minorities. Also, the greatest portion of the graduates were residents of Ohio.

In most cases the graduates had attended an institution other than The Ohio State University for both the bachelor's and master's degrees. At the bachelor's level the graduates major area was an area other than education. At the master's level the individuals who chose education increased, although approximately a third did not major in education. At the doctoral level almost half of the graduates had a noneducation minor.

Educational employment of the graduates prior to the doctorate and after receiving it was examined. Although a substantial number of graduates taught at the K-12 level prior to entering the doctoral program, there was a slight increase in the number subsequent to receiving the doctorate. In the case of college level teaching, few of the graduates had experience prior to entering the doctoral program. There was a substantial increase in the number after receiving the degree.

In rating certain aspects of their current employment including salary, geographical location, administrators and co-workers, opportunity to advance and opportunity to apply what they had learned, the graduates responded with high ratings. Only the salary amount had a substantial number, yet

not a majority, of negative ratings. Although there was some dissatisfaction with current salaries, the graduates' mean salary has increased substantially after completing a doctoral program. Specifically, the mean salary of these graduates increased approximately six thousand dollars from their salary prior to entering the doctoral program to their first job after completing their doctoral degree. Overall, the graduates are quite satisfied in their current employment. They rate highly the contribution of their doctoral program to their job responsibilities of teaching, research and evaluation, service, and administration. Furthermore, they feel the doctoral program has improved their financial security and their qualifications for the type of work in which they are involved.

The respondents also answered questions regarding their professional activities. Large percentages (over 30 percent) have presented at national conferences, published in refereed journals and written proposals for funding purposes since graduating. Yet, the greatest percentage of their time is spent on teaching ($\bar{X}$ = 48.60%) and/or administrative activities ($\bar{X}$ = 35.59%).

Generally, the results of this study indicate a positive view by the graduates of their academic program and the services offered to assist them with completing their program. This conclusion is based on the consistently high ratings the graduates gave to such things as their advisors' and committees' support, the usefulness of the general examinations, and their overwhelming satisfaction with their course work and instructors. However, the graduates did recommend some changes they feel should be made in the doctoral program. The three most frequently mentioned changes were: (1) increased contact with advisor; (2) more research and statistics courses; and (3) more computer training. Finally, and possibly most important they would recommend their doctoral program to others in a similar field.

Appendix A

Code # _____

79

SURVEY OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS
(M.A./Ed.S./Ph.D.)
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:
Although some questions call for specific information that may be difficult to recall, feel free to estimate or to provide your best guess. For those questions that have more than one alternative, circle the appropriate letter(s); for items that are in chart form place an "x" in the appropriate box; and for open-ended questions blanks are provided.

When in doubt, you should assume that general references to graduate programs denote the program in which you earned your highest degree.

COLLEGE DEGREES

Please indicate all degrees you have earned or are seeking by circling the appropriate number. Then answer all questions that correspond to each level you have circled.

1. B.A./B.S. Degree
   a. Institution from which you graduated: _____
   b. Major field of study: _____
   c. Minors(s): _____
   d. Cumulative grade point average (4.0 scale): _____
   e. Year of graduation: 19___

2. M.A./M.S. Degree
   a. Institution from which you graduated: _____
   b. Major field of study: _____
   c. Year you began program: 19___
   d. Year of graduation: 19___

3. Ed.S. (Specialist's) Degree

   OR

   (Note: If you have earned degrees at both levels, please answer questions for Ph.D. program only.

4. Ph.D. Degree
   a. Institution from which you graduated: _____
   b. Major field of study: _____
   c. Minor(s): _____
   d. Doctoral committee chairperson: _____
   e. Dissertation chairperson: _____
   f. Other members of the committee: _____
   g. Year you began program: 19___
   h. Quarter and year of graduation: _____

5. Please indicate how each of the following contributed to the total financial support of your graduate studies while earning your highest degree:

	None	Some (less than 1/3 of total)	Significant (1/3-2/3 of total)	Primary (over 2/3 of total)
a. full-time job				
b. part-time job				
c. graduate assistantship				
d. scholarship/fellowship				
e. loans				
f. personal resources (savings, support from relatives, etc.)				
g. other (please specify) _____				

6. Did you hold a full-time off-campus job at any time during your graduate program?
   a. no
   b. yes

7. If you responded "yes" to question #6, approximately what percent of your course work was completed under these conditions?
   a. 1-25%
   b. 26-50%
   c. 51-75%
   d. 76-99%
   e. 100%--I was employed full-time off campus throughout my entire graduate program.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

8. a. What was the title of the job you held immediately prior to enrolling in the graduate program in which you earned your highest degree? _____

   b. What was your first job following the completion of this degree? _____

   c. What is your current job title? _____

9. a. How many years of K-12 teaching experience did you have at the time you entered graduate school? _____ academic year(s)

   b. How many years of K-12 teaching experience do you have now? _____ academic year(s)

   c. How many years of college teaching experience did you have at the time you entered graduate school? _____ academic year(s)

   d. How many years of college teaching experience do you have now? _____ academic year(s)

10. Have you ever served as an administrator at the K-12 level?
    a. no
    b. yes If yes: Position(s) held _____
    Total number of years in an administrative role ____

11. Have you ever served as an administrator at the college level?
    a. no
    b. yes If yes: Position(s) held _____
    Total number of years in an administrative role ____

12. To what extent are you satisfied with each of the following characteristics of your current job?

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
a. salary					
b. job responsibilities					
c. geographical location					
d. administrators/supervisors					
e. co-workers					
f. opportunities to apply what you learned in graduate school					
g. opportunities for professional advancement					

13. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements? (References to graduate program = OSU program in which you received your highest degree.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. My sense of financial security improved as a result of my participation in an OSU graduate program.					
b. I am better qualified for my current job than graduates of comparable advanced degree programs at other institutions.					
c. I would recommend my OSU graduate program to anyone who plans to find, or already has, a job that is similar to mine.					

14. Approximately what percent of your current job assignment is devoted to each of the following areas?
    a. teaching ____%
    b. research/program evaluation ____%
    c. service ____%
    d. administration ____%
    e. development of courses, programs, or instructional materials ____%
    f. other (please specify) _____ ____%
    100%

15. To what extent did the OSU program in which you earned your highest degree contribute to the development of your abilities in each area?

	Does Not Apply	Little or no Contribution	Limited Contribution	Moderate Contribution	Strong Contribution
a. teaching					
b. research/program evaluation					
c. service					
d. administration					
e. development of courses, programs, or instructional materials					
f. other (please specify) _____					

16. What was your annual salary at each of the following times (to the nearest thousand dollars)?
a. job held at the time you entered highest degree program $_____
b. job during first year after completing this program $_____
c. current job $_____

GENERAL BACKGROUND

17. Sex
a. female
b. male

18. Ethnic background
a. American Indian/Native American
b. Asian American/Pacific Islander
c. Black/Afro American
d. Hispanic/Chicano
e. White/Caucasian
f. Other (please specify) _____

19. Age
a. 20-25
b. 26-30
c. 31-35
d. 36-40
e. over 40

20. a. Where did you live at the time you applied for admission to the OSU program in which you received your highest degree?
City: _____
State: _____
Country: _____

b. What is your current mailing address?
_____
_____
_____

GRADUATE PROGRAM OF STUDY

Question 21: Please estimate the number of courses you took in each area of study listed below. Record your response by placing an "x" in the appropriate column (3 or more courses, 1 or 2 courses, no courses).

Question 22: If you were beginning your graduate program now, how would you alter the number of courses you would take in each area so that you would be in a better position to satisfy your current professional goals?
1. Mark the column labeled "less" if you wish you had taken less course work in that area.
2. Mark the column labeled "more" if you wish you had taken more courses.
3. Leave both columns blank if you are satisfied with the number of courses you took.

21. How many courses did you take in each area?			AREA OF STUDY	22. How many courses do you wish you had taken? (Blank = satisfied with # of courses taken)	
3 or more courses	1 or 2 courses	no courses		Less	More
			FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION		
			1) comparative education		
			2) history of education		
			3) instructional media		
			4) philosophy of education		
			5) sociology of education		
			GENERAL CURRICULUM		
			6) general curriculum & instruction (secondary level)		
			7) general curriculum & instruction (elementary level)		
			8) learning systems design/ development		

GRADUATE PROGRAM OF STUDY (Continued)

How many courses did you take in each area? (Continued)			AREA OF STUDY (Continued)	How many courses do you wish you had taken? (Blank = satisfied with # of courses taken)	
3 or more courses	1 or 2 courses	no courses	SPECIALIZED AREAS	Less	More
			9) agricultural education		
			10) business education		
			11) distributive education		
			12) early childhood education		
			13) elementary education		
			14) english education		
			15) exceptional children		
			16) foreign language		
			17) health education		
			18) industrial technology education		
			19) math education		
			20) physical education		
			21) reading		
			22) science education		
			23) social studies education		
			24) teacher education		
			25) vocational & technical education		
			26) secondary subject matter areas, such as journalism (please specify)		
			SUPPORT PERSONNEL		
			27) adult/continuing education		
			28) counseling and guidance		
			29) educational administration (K-12)		
			30) higher education administration		
			31) personnel work (post secondary)		
			32) school psychology		
			RESEARCH RELATED		
			33) field-based methodology/ ethnography		
			34) measurement/evaluation		
			35) program evaluation		
			36) statistics/research design		
			OTHER		
			37) (please specify)		

23. Please identify the entry on the above list that provides the best description of your major field of study. What number(s) represent that entry? _____

24. If you were beginning your graduate program now, would you change your major field of study?
    a. no
    b. yes If yes: To what? _____
    Why would you make this change? _____

25. If you were beginning your graduate program now, would you change one or more of your minors?
    a. no
    b. yes If yes: Please describe the change you would make _____
    Why? _____

26. Approximately how many graduate courses did you take that were

	none	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	more than 12, but not all	all
a. exceptional in overall quality							
b. clearly inferior in overall quality							
c. inadequately organized (e.g., vague course outline)							
d. intellectually challenging							
e. graded on a rigorous scale							
f. offered by departments outside the College of Education							
g. offered in one of the OSU off-campus centers							

27. How many of your graduate courses were taught by an instructor who

a. was exceptionally knowledgeable							
b. used varied and stimulating instructional techniques							
c. was readily available and responsive to students							
d. was thoroughly prepared for each class							

28. If you had it to do over again, what number of courses would you take outside the College of Education?
    a. considerably more than I did
    b. some more
    c. the same number
    d. some less
    e. considerably less than I did

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF ADVANCED DEGREE PROGRAMS

A. Advisory Committee and Other Support Services

29. Was your advisory committee chairperson assigned rather than selected by you?
a. no
b. yes

30. How would you rate your advisory committee in their ability to provide meaningful assistance in each of the following areas?

	inadequate	weak	adequate	strong	exceptional	does not apply
a. assisting in planning your program of study (schedule of courses)						
b. writing and reviewing your comprehensive exams						
c. providing personal/professional comfort						
d. pressing you for professional excellence						
e. assisting you in finding a job						
f. providing constructive feedback regarding the design of your dissertation/thesis study						
g. providing guidance and constructive feedback during the execution and writing of the dissertation/thesis						

31. Did one or more College of Education faculty member who were not on your committee provide more assistance than your advisory committee in any of the areas listed above?
a. no
b. yes

If yes, please check all areas where individuals were more helpful than your committee.
____ assisting in planning your program of study (schedule of courses)
____ providing personal/professional support
____ pressing you for professional excellence
____ assisting you in finding a job
____ providing constructive feedback regarding the design of your dissertation/thesis study
____ providing guidance and feedback during the execution and writing of your dissertation/thesis

32. How would you rate the quality of services/support you received from each of the following sources?

	did not use	inadequate	weak	adequate	strong	exceptional
a. OSU Library						
b. Computer Center						
c. Education Placement Office						
d. Research Consultation						

B. General/Comprehensive Exams

33. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements regarding your general/comprehensive exams. (no exam = did not take an exam in this area)

(a-c) The comprehensive exams provided a valid measure of knowledge/skills in my	no exam	strongly disagree	disagree	neutral	agree	strongly agree
a. major field of study						
b. minor field(s) of study within the College of Education						
c. minor field(s) of study outside the College of Education						
(d-f) To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?						
d. Preparing for the set of general/comprehensive exams was a useful learning experience.						
e. My study efforts were guided by a clear sense of what would be covered on the exams.						
f. I received constructive feedback regarding strengths and deficiencies of my performance on the exams.						

Which of the following best describes the set of general/comprehensive exams that you took?

34. What was the format of the exams?
a. oral
b. written
c. both oral and written

35. Under what conditions were the written portions completed?
a. take home What number of days were you allowed to complete the exams? ____ days
b. on-campus/supervised
c. does not apply--I did not take any written exams

36. If the written portions were completed on-campus/supervised (question 35(b)), how were they administered?
    a. 1/2 day sessions — How many? _____
    b. full-day sessions — How many? _____

37. Did you pass all of the comprehensive exams in your major field of study on the first administration?
    a. no
    b. yes

38. Did you pass all exams in your minor field(s) on the first administration?
    a. no
    b. yes
    c. does not apply

39. If you were to translate the number of hours you spent preparing for your general/comprehensive exams into a 40-hour per week schedule, approximately how many work weeks did you devote to this task?
    a. less than one week
    b. 1-3 weeks
    c. 4-6 weeks
    d. 7-9 weeks
    e. 10 or more weeks

C. Dissertation/Thesis

40. Which of the following provides the best description of your dissertation/thesis?
    a. historical research
    b. case study
    c. descriptive investigation/survey
    d. ethnographic/field study
    e. correlational study
    f. experimental/quasi-experimental study (comparison of treatment groups)
    g. program evaluation
    h. other (please specify) _____

41. To what extent do you feel that your previous course work provided adequate preparation in the methodology you used? (e.g., statistics courses in preparing for correlational or experimental studies)

    I feel I was _____ to use this methodology.
    a. totally unprepared (I had no coursework that focused on this methodology.)
    b. inadequately prepared
    c. minimally prepared
    d. thoroughly prepared

42. Was at least one member of your advisory committee thoroughly versed in the research methodology you used in your dissertation/thesis study?
    a. no
    b. yes
    If yes, who?
    c. dissertation/thesis advisor
    d. another member of the committee

43. Did at least one member of your advisory committee have expertise in the theory/professional literature on which your dissertation/thesis was based?
    a. no
    b. yes
    If yes, who?
    c. dissertation/thesis advisor
    d. another member of the committee

44. To what extent were you satisfied with the quality and degree of support you received from your advisor (while planning and writing your dissertation/thesis)?
    a. very satisfied
    b. satisfied
    c. dissatisfied
    d. very dissatisfied

45. If you were to translate the number of hours you spent working on your dissertation/thesis into a 40-hour per week schedule, approximately how many work weeks were devoted to this task?
    a. From the start of the topic search to the date the proposal was formally approved? _____ weeks
    b. From the date the proposal was approved to the date of the final orals? _____ weeks

46. Have you published one or more articles that were based on your dissertation/thesis?
    a. no
    b. no, but I intend to write an article in the near future
    c. yes (please provide a reference) _____

Since completing your highest degree program at OSU, have you

47. Presented a paper at a national conference?
    a. no
    b. yes — how many? _____

48. Published an article in a refereed journal?
    a. no
    b. yes — how many? _____
    please provide at least one reference _____

49. Written a contract/grant proposal?
    a. no
    b. yes — how many written? _____
    how many funded? _____

GENERAL COMMENTS

50. What changes, if any, do you feel should be made in the graduate program in which you participated?

51. What characteristics of your graduate program do you feel have been most beneficial?

52. Do we have your permission to contact your immediate supervisor to obtain general information?
    a. no
    b. yes

    If yes, please identify your supervisor by name and give the appropriate address.

    _____

    _____

    _____

Thank you. We sincerely appreciate your cooperation in completing this survey. Please return the questionnaire in the envelope we have provided.

OSU

The Ohio State University

Office of the Dean
College of Education
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1172
Phone 614 422-5790

April 15, 1983

Dear Graduate:

We need your assistance! It won't take long and it will help us plan for the future. The College of Education is making an initial attempt to collect information regarding the status of its masters and doctoral graduates. The enclosed questionnaire contains questions that address your current job situation and your educational courses and experiences. Your response to the questionnaire will enable the college to ascertain how and what its former students are currently doing. In addition, this information will assist us in modifying our current programs to better prepare students for their professional careers.

We would appreciate you taking time from your busy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire before May 23, 1983. A postage paid return envelope had been provided for your convenience.

Your individual responses will remain strictly confidential. Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Measurement
and Evaluation Services

Robert A. Burnham
Dean

Appendix C

OSU

The Ohio State University

Office of the Dean
College of Education
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1172
Phone 614 422-5790

June 1, 1983

Dear Graduate:

We are still in need of your assistance! As mentioned in our initial correspondence we are attempting to collect information regarding the status of the College of Education's masters and doctoral graduates. Your response to the enclosed questionnaire will enable the college to ascertain how and what its graduates are currently doing. In addition, with this information we will be able to modify our current programs to better prepare our graduates.

We are aware of how busy your schedule is and we would appreciate you taking a few extra moments to complete our questionnaire. A postage paid envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. Please return the questionnaire by June 20, 1983.

Your individual responses will remain strictly confidential. Thank you for your time, interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William E. Loadman, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Measurement and Evaluation Services

Robert A. Burnham
Dean

P.S. If you have already completed a copy of the questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Appendix D_1

CHI-SQUARE BY DEPARTMENT

	Ag. Ed.	Art Ed.	Ed. Admin.	Ed. Excep.	EMC	Ed. F&R	Ed. Hum.	Indus. Tech.	Phys. Ed.	Sci. & Math	Sp. Serv.	Votech.
Frequency Observed	13	2	49	13	23	61	29	13	47	14	44	50
Frequency Expected	22	11	32	18	18	54	36	14	50	14	50	39
Contribution To Chi-Square	3.68	7.36	9.03	1.39	1.39	.91	1.36	.07	.18	0	.72	3.10

$x^2 = 29.19$; df = 11; Table Value = 24.72; $P \leq .01$

Appendix D_2

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SIZES BY ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT

Department	Population		Sample	
	N	%	N	%
Agricultural Education	41	6	13	4
Art Education	21	3	2	1
Educational Administration	63	9	49	14
Exceptional Children	34	5	13	4
Early and Middle Childhood Education	36	5	23	6
Educational Foundations and Research	105	15	61	17
Humanities Education	66	10	29	8
Industrial Technology Education	25	4	13	4
Physical Education	94	14	47	13
Science and Mathematics Education	25	4	14	4
Special Services	96	14	44	12
Vocational Technical Education	74	11	50	14
TOTAL	680*	100	358**	101***

* Total based on convocation programs

** Total excluding students who did not identify their major

*** Rounding error

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF PH.D. GRADUATES

1978-1982

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

William E. Loadman
Director

April 1984

Executive Summary

Follow-Up Survey of Ph.D. Graduates

College of Education

The Ohio State University

Overview

The following is an executive summary of Technical Report #1 of the Follow-up Study of Doctoral Graduates in The Ohio State University's College of Education. This study is on all doctoral graduates (N=636) from Autumn 1978 through Autumn 1982. The study was conducted in part to meet the standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Ohio State Department of Education's standards for evaluating upper level education students. In addition, it assists the College in evaluating and modifying its existing programs, and provides data that enables the College to ascertain the graduates' professional status.

Implementation

A detailed questionnaire, modified from one used by Michigan State University, was developed to obtain information and/or ratings on the following topics: general educational background courses taken, instructors, advisor and advisory committee, general examinations, dissertation process, campus facilities and services, work background, present work experience, research and publication record, and demographics. The questionnaire items were a combination of multiple choice, open-ended and rating scale, e.g., strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, questions.

In addition to the follow-up staff, the assistance of the college office and alumni information was necessary to conduct this study. The college office provided all the necessary graduation lists in order to identify the

correct department from which a student graduated. In addition, the alumni information office provided the updated mailing lists and labels. Each questionnaire was assigned a code number for confidentiality purposes and was recorded upon return. Subsequently, there were two mailings which resulted in a 57 percent return rate (N=365) for the doctoral graduates.

A chi-square for goodness of fit was computed to determine if the sample was representative of the population by department. The results demonstrated that the sample was not representative, primarily because of the over representation in the sample of Educational Administration and Vocational-Technical graduates; and the under representation of Art Education and Agricultural Education graduates. The non-representativeness of this sample means the results can be generalized to the sample with confidence, but cautiously to the population.

Statistical Analysis

A coding system was developed in order to store the raw data on a computer and subsequently to statistically analyze it. The raw data was transferred from the questionnaires to IBM scan sheets and ultimately to magnetic computer tapes for analysis and permanent storage. The doctoral questionnaires were analyzed using the SPSSX computer package and hand calculations. For each questionnaire item the frequency and percentage of its responses were calculated. In addition, the mean, and other measures of central tendency, standard deviation and range were computed for each item. These statistics were calculated for the total sample as well as for program areas that were represented by five or more students in the sample. Program areas with less than five students were rationally combined into larger organizational units, e,g., departments.

Results

The follow-up questionnaire yielded a large amount of data on the doctoral graduates surveyed. The results were used to develop a profile of doctoral graduates and a general description of the doctoral program in the College of Education. The following is a brief summary of findings based on these results.

The demographic information revealed that there were slightly more male than female graduates and their ethnic background was overwhelmingly Caucasian. Approximately 13 percent of the graduates could be classified as minorities. Also, the greatest portion of the graduates were residents of Ohio.

In most cases the graduates had attended an institution other than The Ohio State University for both the bachelor's and master's degrees. At the bachelor's level the graduate's major area was an area other than education. At the master's level the individuals who chose education increased, although approximately a third did not major in education. At the doctoral level almost half of the graduates had a noneducation minor.

Educational employment of the graduates prior to the doctorate and after receiving it was examined. Although a substantial number of graduates taught at the K-12 level prior to entering the doctoral program, there was a slight increase in the number subsequent to receiving the doctorate. In the case of college level teaching, few of the graduates had experience prior to entering the doctoral program. There was a substantial increase in the number after receiving the degree.

In rating certain aspects of their current employment including salary, geographical location, administrators and co-workers, opportunity to advance and opportunity to apply what they had learned, the graduates responded

with high ratings. Only the salary amount had a substantial number, yet not a majority, of negative ratings. Although there was some dissatisfaction with current salaries, the graduates' mean salary has increased substantially after completing a doctoral program. Overall, the graduates are quite satisfied in their current employment. They rate highly the contribution of their doctoral program to their job responsibilities of teaching, research and evaluation, service, and administration. Furthermore, they feel the doctoral program has improved their financial security and their qualifications for the type of work in which they are involved.

Generally, the results of this study indicate a positive view by the graduates of their academic program and the services offered to assist them with completing their program. This conclusion is based on the consistently high ratings the graduates gave to such things as their advisors' and committees' support, the usefulness of the general examinations, and their overwhelming satisfaction with their course work and instructors. However, the graduates did recommend some changes they feel should be made in the doctoral program. The three most frequently mentioned changes were: (1) increased contact with advisor; (2) more research and statistics courses; and (3) more computer training. Finally, and possibly most important they would recommend their doctoral program to others in a similar field.

The complete technical report of the doctoral graduates follow-up study can be obtained from William Loadman at (614) 422-1257. In addition, individual program area results can also be requested.