

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A FOLLOW-UP OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION
1931-56

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
CLARENCE CHARLES CLARK
Norman, Oklahoma
1957

A FOLLOW-UP OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION
1931-56

APPROVED BY

Claude Kelley

Ed Shumaker
Thas Eugene

Mary Clare Petty

Glenn R. Jorden

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation for the guidance and assistance of the members of his dissertation committee: Professor Claude Kelley, Chairman; Professors D. Ross Pugmire; William B. Ragan; Gail Shannon; and Glenn R. Snider. The writer extends thanks to Professor Mary Clare Petty for her helpful suggestions as a member of the reading committee.

To all the doctoral graduates in education from the University of Oklahoma who gave their time to the completion of the questionnaire, the writer is extremely grateful.

To his wife, Sybil England Clark, the author is indebted for continuous encouragement and helpfulness in all phases of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Limitations	4
Definition of Terms	6
Procedure Followed in This Study	7
Values of the Study	11
Related Studies	12
 II. CHARACTERISTICS OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION	 24
Years in Which Doctorates Were Conferred and Type of Degree	 24
Sex of the Graduates	29
Major Fields Selected	31
Age at Which Doctorate Was Received	36
High Schools Attended	39
Sources of Previous Academic Degrees	41
Professional Experience Prior to Receipt of the Doctorate	 50
 III. CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYMENT OF THE DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION	 57
Initial Employment after Receipt of the Doctorate	 57
Method by Which Respondents Obtained Their Initial Post-doctorate Employment	 63
Employment Status, 1956-57	66
Geographical Location of Respondents	73
Earned Income of the Respondents	73
Extent to Which Respondents Were Satisfied with Their Positions	 80

Chapter	Page
Number of Organizations in Which Respondents Have Been Employed	
IV. APPRAISAL OF THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM	83
Administration of the Doctoral Program	83
Advisement	86
Library Facilities	88
Course Offerings	88
Research Problem	91
Opinions of Respondents concerning Certain Characteristics of Graduate Study	94
Opinions of Respondents concerning the Desir- ability of Acquiring Certain Characteris- tics during Graduate Study and the Quantity They Acquired	99
Attitudes of Respondents toward Their Major Fields and Attendance at the University of Oklahoma	103
V. ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS TOWARD ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES PROVIDED THEM BY THE UNIVERSITY AFTER RECEIPT OF THE DOCTORATE	106
Services Provided by the University	106
Assistance toward Achieving Professional Success	108
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	116
Summary	116
Conclusions	123
Recommendations	126
BIBLIOGRAPHY	128
APPENDIX	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Doctor's Degrees in Education Conferred by the University of Oklahoma, 1931-56	26
2. Recipients and Respondents according to the Five-year Interval in Which the Doctorate Was Conferred	28
3. Number and Per Cent of Respondents by Year Doctorate Was Conferred	29
4. Number and Per Cent of Men and Women Receiving Doctorates in Education from the University of Oklahoma	30
5. Distribution of Recipients and Respondents by Sex	30
6. Distribution of Doctorates in Education by Major Fields of Specialization, Sex, and Year Degree Was Conferred	32
7. Distribution of Recipients by Major Fields and Year Doctorate Was Conferred, 1952-56	34
8. Number and Per Cent of Respondents according to Major Fields of Specialization	35
9. Distribution of Doctoral Graduates in Education according to age at Which Degree Was Received ...	37
10. Number of Graduates in Education Who Attended Oklahoma High Schools by Year Doctorate Was Conferred	39
11. States or Country in Which Recipients Attended High School by Year Doctorate Was Conferred	40
12. Source of Bachelor's Degrees Earned by University of Oklahoma Doctoral Graduates in Education	42

Table	Page
13. States in Which Bachelor's Degrees Were Earned by Doctoral Graduates in Education	44
14. Source of Master's Degrees Earned by University of Oklahoma Doctoral Graduates in Education	46
15. States in Which Doctoral Graduates Earned Master's Degrees by Year Doctorate Was Conferred ...	47
16. Doctoral Graduates Who Earned Master's or Bachelor's Degrees from the University of Oklahoma and Who Attended Oklahoma High Schools	48
17. Combinations of Oklahoma Institutions Attended by Recipients Prior to Receipt of the Doctorate	49
18. Number of Years Teaching Experience of Recipients Prior to Receiving the Doctorate according to major fields of specialization	51
19. Level of Teaching Experience of Recipients Prior to Receiving the Doctorate	53
20. Time Sequence of Academic Degrees Earned by Doctoral Graduates	54
21. Type of Initial Employment after Receipt of the Doctorate by Year Doctorate Was Conferred	59
22. Type of Employment Immediately before or during the Time in Which Residence Requirements Were Satisfied	60
23. Type of Initial Employment after Receipt of the Doctorate according to Age at Which Doctorate Was Received	61
24. Type of Initial Employment after Receipt of the Doctorate according to Major Fields of Specialization	62
25. Method by Which Respondents Obtained Their First College Position after Receipt of the Doctorate .	64
26. Method by Which Respondents Obtained Their First Public School Position after Receipt of the Doctorate	65

Table	Page
27. Type of Organization in Which Respondents Were Employed during the 1956-57 School Year by Year Doctorate Was Received	67
28. Type of Organizations in Which Respondents Were Employed during the 1956-57 School Year by Major Fields of Specialization	68
29. Type of College Positions Held by Respondents during the School Year of 1956-57 according to Major Fields of Specialization	70
30. Type of Public School Positions Held by Respondents during the School Year of 1956-57 according to Major Fields of Specialization	71
31. Type of Organization in Which Respondents Were Employed at Time Doctorate Was Received, Initial Position after Doctorate Was Received, and Position Held during School Year of 1956-57	72
32. Geographical Location of Respondents in 1956 according to Type of Employment	74
33. Annual Earned Income of Respondents according to the Year in Which the Doctorate Was Received ...	76
34. Annual Earned Income of Respondents according to Type of Organizations in Which They Were Employed	77
35. Annual Earned Income of Respondents Employed in College Positions according to Geographical Location	78
36. Annual Earned Income of Respondents Employed in Public School Positions according to Geographical Location	79
37. Extent to Which Respondents Were Satisfied with Their Jobs according to Type of Employment	81
38. Number of Organizations in Which Respondents Have Been Regularly Employed since Receiving the Doctorate	82

Table	Page
39. Satisfaction of Respondents with the Method Used in the Admission of Candidates to the Doctoral Program by Year Doctorate Was Received	84
40. Satisfaction of Respondents with Method Used in the Admission of Candidates to the Doctoral Program by Type of Employment	85
41. Amount of Guidance Received by Respondents during Their Doctoral Programs according to Date of Graduation	86
42. Amount of Guidance Received by Respondents during Their Doctoral Programs according to Their Major Fields	87
43. Satisfaction of Respondents with Various Aspects of the Library, 1952-56	89
44. Satisfaction of Respondents with the Quantity of Graduate Course Offerings according to Type of Employment	90
45. Nature of the Enrollment in Which Respondents Completed the Dissertation Requirement by Year Doctorate Was Conferred and Type of Degree	92
46. Nature of the Enrollment in Which Respondents Completed the Dissertation Requirement by Major Fields	93
47. Opinions of Respondents concerning the Usefulness in Their Present Positions of Certain Characteristics of Graduate Education	96
48. Opinions of Respondents concerning the Desirability of Developing Certain Characteristics during Graduate Study and the Quantity They Acquired ...	101
49. Number and Proportion of Respondents Who Would Return to the University of Oklahoma for Graduate Study	104
50. Number and Proportion of Respondents Who Would Select the Same Major Fields of Graduate Study ..	104

Table	Page
51. Opinions of Respondents concerning the Amount of Assistance toward Achieving Professional Success They Received from the University	109
52. Number and Proportion of Respondents Who Were Registered with the University Placement Office in 1956 according to Year Doctorate Was Received	110
53. Number and Proportion of Respondents Who Were Registered with the University Placement Office in 1956 according to Type of Employment, 1952-56.....	111
54. Number of Years since Contact Was Made between Respondents and University Placement Office	112
55. Number of Positions Respondents Have Obtained or Been Offered through the Active Help of the University	113
56. Number of Times Respondents Have Requested the University Placement Office to Send Their Credentials to Prospective Employers	114

A FOLLOW-UP OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION
1931-56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need for the Study

What happens to students after they leave an institution is one determinant of what the program of the institution should be. A review of educational literature will reveal numerous follow-up studies on the high school and undergraduate college levels, but the number of such studies concerned with doctoral graduates is much more limited. Recent years have seen a marked increase in the use of the follow-up technique on all levels as one means of evaluation and appraisal of educational programs.

There is considerable similarity among programs offered by the graduate schools of the nation, although the authorities in charge of such institutions exhibit a wide difference of opinion as to the major function of graduate education. The purpose of graduate study most frequently expressed by the officials of graduate schools is "to train

scholars who by their research will add to the sum-total of human knowledge."¹ Regardless of the general objectives of colleges, one of the responsibilities of a particular institution should be to prepare its students for the work society has for them to do.² The most direct way to ascertain what professional duties the graduate is called upon to perform and how well his program of study prepared him to do the work is through the utilization of the follow-up study.

Fred J. Kelly emphasizes the need for follow-up studies of doctoral graduates in Toward Better College Teaching when he writes:

This device [faculty members follow up former students after they enter upon college teaching] is thought to be valuable not only as a means of helping to improve the work of the new teacher, but also--indeed much more--as a means of helping the graduate school discover the deficiencies in its own program of preparing college teachers.³

Kelly also stresses the concern an institution should have for the success of its graduates when he continues: "No professional school can remain long indifferent to the professional success of its graduates."⁴

¹J. I. Sewall, "Toward Better Graduate Education," Journal of General Education, II (October, 1947), p. 45.

²Ernest V. Hollis, Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1945), p. 31.

³Fred J. Kelly, Toward Better College Teaching (Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency, 1950), p. 31.

⁴Ibid.

Troyer and Pace express the importance of follow-up studies in the following statement:

The function of follow-up studies as a connecting link between pre-service and in-service education is suggested by the fact that a follow-up study compels the college to look beyond its own boundaries to appraise its program in the light of the performance of men and women under conditions which the college does not itself set up.¹

Hollis points out the need for collecting opinions of graduates in planning the program of an institution when he states:

Graduate faculties engaged in planning improvements for their programs for the doctorate in philosophy have expressed a need for something more tangible than a sense of the force and direction of broad social trends that influence education. From time to time they want to gauge their judgment of proposals by the normative data of their collective experience. Many of them would also like to test the functional adequacy of graduate practice by the opinion of recent graduates and of employers of Ph.D. recipients. But the dearth of both types of material has hindered systematic work along these lines.²

No substantial follow-up study has been made of University of Oklahoma doctoral graduates in education since the first doctorate in education was granted by the University to James Henry Hodges in 1931. This investigation is a follow-up of the 134 recipients of the degrees of Doctor of Education and Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education from the University of Oklahoma. The need for this study is

¹Maurice E. Troyer and C. Robert Pace, Evaluation in Teacher Education (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944), p. 232.

²Hollis, op. cit., p. 38.

based on the following assumptions: (1) that an educational institution can plan the best possible program for its students only when it knows what is happening to its graduates professionally and (2) that an educational institution should accept a measure of responsibility for the success of its students after graduation.

Statement of the Problem

This study was a follow-up of doctoral graduates in education from the University of Oklahoma. The purposes of the study were four-fold: (1) to discover what has happened to the graduates professionally since receiving the doctorate in education; (2) to make available information concerning the educational and professional background of these doctoral graduates; (3) to determine what strengths and weaknesses the graduates identify in their programs of doctoral study; and (4) to ascertain in what ways, in the opinion of doctoral graduates, the University has been of assistance to them in achieving professional success since the doctorate was granted.

Limitations

This investigation was not intended to be a thorough evaluation of the graduate program in education at the University of Oklahoma. The only factual information obtained in this study is from the University records, while the other data are opinions of individuals who received their profes-

sional preparation in education at the University of Oklahoma. Since the findings are based on the collective opinions of the population, they should be significant and merit consideration. For a complete evaluation, appraisals are needed by individuals and groups other than those who completed the program and are now using the training in the field.

The study was concerned only with the 134 individuals who have received either the degree of Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education from the University of Oklahoma from 1931 through 1956. Doctoral graduates with only a minor in education were not included in this study.

This investigation was limited to (1) certain characteristics of doctoral graduates in education, (2) characteristics of professional employment of the graduates since receiving the doctorate, (3) the opinions of the graduates as to the strengths and weaknesses of the doctoral program they completed, and (4) the opinions of the doctoral graduates as to the professional assistance they have received from the University after graduation.

No attempt was made to evaluate the content of specific courses, or to appraise individual faculty members or their methods of teaching.

No attempt was made in this study to determine the kind of graduate program the University should offer or the kinds and amount of services the University should offer its

graduates. The study simply furnishes certain facts and opinions of the graduates which may serve as a background for further study of the doctoral program in education and the services offered to graduates.

Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of terms as used in this study:

Recipient: An individual who received either the degree of Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education from the University of Oklahoma.

Respondent: A recipient who completed and returned the questionnaire.

Graduate work: The college work beyond the bachelor's degree accepted for the doctoral degree by the University of Oklahoma Graduate College.

Major field: The particular area of graduate work selected by a student for specialization in his professional and academic preparation. This term and the term "field of specialization" were used synonymously.

Supporting field: The area of graduate work selected by a student with less intensive concentration than in the major field.

Available recipient: A recipient who is considered to have received a questionnaire since it was not returned undelivered by the postal service.

Procedure Followed in This Study

Sources of Data

The data were obtained from the following sources: office of the Co-ordinator of Graduate Studies of the College of Education, office of the Dean of the Graduate College, Office of Admissions and Records, and information forms sent to the recipients of the doctorate in education who were still living and whose location could be determined.

University Records. Present addresses of the graduates were obtained from the office of the University of Oklahoma Alumni Association and from members of the College of Education faculty. The records and files of final examination announcements in the offices of the Dean of the Graduate College and Co-ordinator of Graduate Studies in Education were used to determine the persons who had received the degree of Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education from the University of Oklahoma between 1931 and 1956. Final examination announcements and permanent record cards furnished information relative to high school attended, home addresses, graduate and undergraduate training, areas of specialization, academic degrees, educational and professional experience prior to receipt of the doctorate, and personal data.

Additional data needed were obtained through the use of a questionnaire sent to each person included in this study.

The Questionnaire. A careful examination of the literature pertaining to follow-up studies was made. After reviewing studies involving the use of follow-up technique and instruments used in other studies of this nature, a tentative questionnaire was constructed. Some features of the inventory used in a study at the University of Minnesota, "A Follow-up Study of Minnesota Ph.D.'s,"¹ were incorporated into the questionnaire. The first questionnaire was examined by the chairman of the writer's doctoral committee. The instrument was revised, then reviewed by members of the committee. The questionnaire was again revised incorporating the suggestions and criticisms of the committee members. It was then printed in final form and mailed to the persons included in the investigation. A copy of the instrument is included in the Appendix.

The first page of the inventory was designed to obtain personal information concerning the graduates. This section provided the only personal identification of the respondent. The graduates participating in the study were informed that the first page of the instrument, which was the personal information blank, would be detached as soon as it was returned and that the remaining sections would be

¹Harold E. Mitzel and Robert J. Keller, "A Follow-up Study of Minnesota Ph.D.'s: Their General Characteristics," A University Looks at Its Program, ed. Ruth E. Eckert and Robert J. Keller (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954), Chapter 18, pp. 157-168.

identified by code number only. The recipients were advised in the cover letter sent with each questionnaire that the personal data sheets were also to provide information to be used in the compilation of a directory of doctoral graduates which each would receive.

Inventories were sent to 127 of the 134 individuals who had received either the degree of Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education from the University of Oklahoma. Seven of the 134 were known to be deceased.

Two weeks after the questionnaires were mailed, follow-up postal cards were sent to recipients who had not responded. Two letters were returned undelivered and one graduate was in Europe and did not return in time for this study. Completed inventories were received from 90 doctoral graduates which was 72.6 per cent of the 124 who received the questionnaires.

Treatment of the Data

The personal information blank was detached and the remaining sections were coded as the completed questionnaires were received. "McBee Keysort" cards were attached to the top and one side of the instrument and the holes punched so that the returned inventories could be separated into the following groups:

1. Date of graduation: (1931-36) (1937-41) (1942-46)

(1947-51) (1952-56).

2. Major area of specialization: General Education, Educational Administration, Secondary Education, Elementary Education, Educational Guidance, Special Education, Business Education, and other.

3. Present position: College or University, Public or Private Secondary or Elementary School, Business or Industry, Private Practice, Government, and other.

4. First position: College or University, Public or Private Secondary or Elementary School, Business or Industry, Private Practice, Government, and other.

5. Age at time doctorate was conferred: 29 years or younger, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, and 50 or older.

6. Years of teaching experience in secondary or elementary school prior to receiving the doctorate: none, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16 or more.

7. Years of teaching experience in college or university prior to receiving the doctorate: none, 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16 or more.

8. Number of supporting fields of graduate work outside of education: none, 1, or 2.

9. Type of doctorate: Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy.

10. Sex.

11. Annual income for 1956-57: less than \$4,000; \$4,000 to \$5,999; \$6,000 to \$7,999; \$8,000 to \$10,999;

\$11,000 to \$13,999; \$14,000 or more.

12. College from which master's degree was received: University of Oklahoma, other Oklahoma college, or out-of-state college.

13. College from which bachelor's degree was received: University of Oklahoma, other Oklahoma college, or out-of-state college.

14. High school attended: Oklahoma or out-of-state.

15. Present location: Oklahoma or out-of-state.

16. Whether or not student held a Graduate Assistantship, Research Assistantship, or Teaching Assistantship during graduate work.

Presentation of Data and Findings

The general method of approach used in this study was the normative descriptive-survey. This problem did not demand involved statistical procedures; therefore, the data and findings were presented in tabular and written descriptive form and expressed most frequently in sums or percentages.

Values of the Study

This study provides information which has not been available previously but can now be used by the University to appraise and improve its graduate program in education and its services to graduates. The information and findings should be of value in the following ways: (1) to the admin-

istration and faculties in planning new programs and policies or in supporting those already in existence; (2) to the placement office in improving services and assistance to doctoral graduates; (3) to classroom teachers in developing new or more effective teaching methods and materials for teaching graduate students or to substantiate present methods and materials; (4) to advisors and doctoral committee members in the advisement and guidance of doctoral students; and (5) to future doctoral graduates in planning their programs of study. The data also might prove both interesting and useful to the doctoral graduates who supplied the information.

Related Studies

An examination of the literature revealed many follow-up studies; however, only a few of them were concerned with recipients of the doctorate or with graduate students. There were other surveys of an evaluative nature that dealt with graduate programs in general and are related somewhat to this study. Investigations which were related either as to method or purpose were quite numerous, but studies related to personnel were very limited. Only those studies which appeared to be the most important and the most directly related to this investigation were included.

Haggerty made one of the early studies in 1927 which dealt with the professional training of college and university teachers. A questionnaire was sent to college instructors

teaching freshman and sophomore students; deans of colleges and heads of departments responsible for appointing and directing the work of such instructors; and deans of graduate schools. He found that the typical teacher of freshmen and sophomores had little professional training for his work other than the study of the subject which he attempted to teach. These teachers expressed the opinion that in about two-thirds of their problems they could have been helped by formal course instruction and advised that such professional training for graduate students preparing for college teaching be offered.¹

Another investigation by Haggerty in 1928 concerning occupations of Ph.D. recipients included 5,789 persons from four private and three public universities. He reported 72.5 per cent were engaged in education, primarily teaching; 16.4 per cent in research work; 3 per cent in government service; and the remainder in professions, business, and unknown.²

Martin conducted an investigation which included a follow-up of persons who had received Ph.D. degrees from the University of Missouri between 1905 and 1929. Information blanks returned from 78 doctoral graduates revealed that 84.4

¹M. E. Haggerty, "The Professional Training of College Teachers," The North Central Association Quarterly, II (June, 1927), pp. 108-123.

²M. E. Haggerty, "Occupational Destination of Ph.D. Recipients," Educational Record, IX (October, 1928), pp. 209-218.

per cent of them were teachers or administrators in colleges or universities; 2.4 per cent were teachers or administrators in schools below college level; 4.8 per cent were engaged in research work; and 8.4 per cent were employed in other types of work. Martin stated that "practically all of the 14 state universities that are members of the Association of American Universities give independent investigation and research as the primary function of the graduate school."¹

Isle reports an extensive follow-up study at Stanford University. His investigation was a part of Stanford's participation in the nation-wide study of teacher education sponsored by the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education. The study was concerned with the institution's teacher-education practices and the follow-up of graduates was used as one means of securing an evaluation of the practices. Part of the inquiry included all doctor's degree graduates from 1930 to 1940. The study sought to establish the location and occupation of the graduates and to obtain their opinions concerning the teacher-education program at Stanford. One of the most persistent criticisms made by the graduates was that there was too much emphasis upon theory and too little attention to its practical application

¹Charles W. Martin, The Training of College Teachers, Bulletin of the Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, XXXI (Kirksville, Missouri: Northeast State Teachers College, December, 1931), p. 79.

in their training at Stanford. The graduates felt that an important need in Stanford's services was for a more effective, a more extensive, and a more realistic placement service.¹

Speight reported findings from a questionnaire study of university and college faculty members in New York state concerning their opinions of the relevance of their graduate studies to their professional work. He attempted to discover whether intensive specialization in graduate study had contributed to or impaired their success in college teaching. From the 123 respondents, he found 64 per cent clearly felt that their graduate preparation was relevant to a satisfactory degree and that 36 per cent were to some extent critical of their graduate programs. Seventy-three per cent felt that graduate schools should provide instruction, discussion, or practical experiences in the area of higher education.²

Pressey surveyed the biographies of persons who had received the doctorate within 10 years of the publication date of the following volumes: American Men of Science (1938), Leaders in Education (1941), and The Directory of American Scholars (1943). Ages at the time of receiving the

¹Walter W. Isle, "The Stanford University Follow-up Inquiry: A Study of Stanford's Teacher Preparation Services" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1942).

²Harold E. B. Speight, "Who Shall Train the College Teacher?" Journal of Higher Education, XIV (February, 1943), pp. 91-96.

the doctoral degree in education reported by Pressey were: 20 to 24 years, none; 25 to 29 years, 12; 30 to 34 years, 40; 35 to 39 years, 41; 40 to 44 years, 48; and 45 or older, 59. The median age was found to be 42.8 years of age. Pressey pointed out an interesting observation in that education was the only field in which there were no graduates younger than 25 years of age at the time the doctorate was conferred.¹

Hollis prepared a report for the Commission on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education dealing with doctoral programs and graduate study. The investigation included 22,509 persons still living in September, 1940, who had received the Doctor of Philosophy degree during the decade 1930-40. Ninety-four of the 96 graduate schools that awarded the Doctor of Philosophy degree at that time participated in the study. Only a small section of the report was devoted to the recipients of the Doctor of Education degree. In his comparison of the two degrees, Hollis found that the number of institutions conferring the Doctor of Education degree increased from 10 in 1930 to 20 in 1940, and that the number conferring the Doctor of Philosophy in Education decreased from 40 to 37 for the same years. Hollis also reported that research was the major concern of only 6 per cent of either group. On nearly all points of comparison, Hollis could find

¹Sidney L. Pressey, "Some Data on the Doctorate," Journal of Higher Education, XV (April, 1944), pp. 191-197.

little difference between the two degrees.¹

A follow-up study of former graduate students of the College of Education of the University of Illinois was conducted by Sharpe. The purposes of the study were (1) to improve the liaison between the College of Education and its graduates, (2) to ascertain what these graduates were doing and what problems they had encountered, and (3) to learn how the graduates felt about the graduate program. A questionnaire was sent to 2,025 individuals who had earned a master's degree, or had earned three or more units beyond the master's degree, between 1939 and 1948. Replies were received from 64.7 per cent of the graduates. Some of the implications for the College of Education drawn from the responses were: facilitate the application of theory, develop a functional guidance program, provide closer student-staff relationship, develop a more integrated program, and extend the field services.²

Reed made a study of criticisms of the American graduate school from 1900 to 1945. He drew the following conclusions: (1) basically the problems that attracted the attention of the critics at the beginning of the century continue

¹Hollis, op. cit.

²Donald M. Sharpe, "A Follow-up Study of Former Graduate Students of the College of Education, University of Illinois" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1949).

to be the problems in 1945; (2) the graduate school has failed to change to meet the changing conditions of society; (3) criticisms of the graduate school cannot be blamed on any faction or movement, they stem from a wide variety of sources; (4) the need for reconciliation between the two major functions of teaching and research becomes even more imperative; and (5) graduate school problems urgently need to be studied.¹

Garrison made a follow-up investigation of the doctoral graduates in education from the University of Missouri. The findings revealed that a total of 197 individuals had received the doctorate in education from the University of Missouri from 1916 through 1950 and that more than half of these degrees were conferred in the eight year period 1943 through 1950.

Although the Doctor of Education degree was not conferred by the University of Missouri until 1936, 64.5 per cent of the recipients received this degree. He found that only 6.6 per cent of the doctorates were women. Seventy-five per cent of the recipients had received the master's degree from the University of Missouri. Five-sixths of the graduates had held assistantships or fellowships sometime during the course of their graduate study. Garrison also found that 67.2 per cent of the respondents were employed in colleges

¹Glenn A. Reed, "Criticisms of the American Graduate School, 1900-1945" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1950).

or universities. Approximately one-half of the respondents felt that their graduate program gave them the needed preparation for their professional work and problems, while about 45 per cent thought their graduate training had done "fairly well" in this respect. Less than five per cent indicated that their graduate work had been of "very little" or "no" value.¹

A study undertaken at the University of Florida in 1951 and reported by Kidd included 561 questionnaire replies from in-service college teachers. The 561 teachers who replied to the questionnaire represented 52 teaching fields. The preparation they reported included graduate degrees from 119 institutions located in 39 states, the District of Columbia, and five foreign countries. Kidd reports 65 per cent of the Ph.D. recipients found employment in colleges or universities and of these, three-fifths teach at the undergraduate level. A majority of college teachers viewed with favor an internship of apprentice teaching for prospective college teachers. Those who had had such experiences valued it more highly for beginning teachers than those without the experience.²

¹Lloyd L. Garrison, "A Study of Doctoral Graduates in Education, University of Missouri" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1951).

²Rex C. Kidd, "Improving Preservice Education of Undergraduate College Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, III (March, 1952), pp. 53-57.

Mitzel and Keller reported a follow-up study of University of Minnesota Doctors of Philosophy in which questionnaires were returned by 86.6 per cent of the graduates. Of the 1,315 doctorates conferred by the University of Minnesota between July 1, 1935, and June 30, 1949, 14.5 per cent were earned in education. The median age at which the doctorate in education was conferred was 33 years, while the median age for the total group was 30 years. They found that 41.4 per cent of the doctorates received either the bachelor's or master's degree or both from the University of Minnesota as compared to 49 per cent in the field of education alone.¹

Eckert found in a study of graduate students in education at the University of Minnesota that 38 per cent of those who earned the master's degree between 1935 and 1944 had majored in educational administration; 21 per cent majored in "education" (work in at least three fields of education); 18 per cent specialized in curriculum and instruction; 16 per cent majored in educational psychology; and 7 per cent had concentrated in industrial, agricultural, or home economics education. The study revealed that three-fourths of the master's degree candidates had followed the program which did not require a thesis. Doctor of Philosophy degrees granted to education students were rather evenly divided among candidates with majors in "education," educational administration,

¹Mitzel and Keller, op. cit., pp. 157-168.

and educational psychology.¹

Vilhauer published his study of doctoral graduates in education at New York University as a doctoral dissertation in five volumes totaling 1,978 pages. The study was made of 234 graduates to discover relationships between various aspects of doctoral teacher-education and elements of school experience; attitudes of the graduates toward their doctoral teacher-education program and reasons underlying the attitudes expressed; and to make comparisons between the Doctors of Philosophy, Doctors of Education, men, and women. She drew the following conclusions from the study: (1) Preparation for teaching careers represented by the Doctors of Education and Doctors of Philosophy programs has proved highly functional in the school experiences of the graduates who earned doctoral degrees in the School of Education of New York University during the years 1935-43; (2) satisfaction with the kind of doctorate earned was slightly greater among the Doctors of Philosophy than among the Doctors of Education, but the latter were more often found employed in the field of their doctoral specialization; (3) a smaller percentage of the women than of the men considered the doctorate a worth-

¹Ruth E. Eckert, "Graduate Students in Education," A University Looks at Its Program, ed. Ruth E. Eckert and Robert J. Keller (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954), Chapter 19, pp. 169-175.

while professional investment.¹

A study of faculty members who were engaged in professional teacher education was made by Roblee. The findings from the investigation are expressed by describing a hypothetical, typical professor who began a professional teacher education career between the academic years 1950-51 through 1954-55. The study revealed the following: there were more than twice as many men as women in the group; the typical professor was between the ages of 31-40, a graduate of a medium-size or small public high school (only one in 20 graduated from a private high school); less than one-fourth of the respondents pursued undergraduate professional elementary school program; and the "professor's" first college assignment was usually the teaching of credit courses in methodology.²

The related studies tended to be of two general types: (1) follow-up studies of persons, usually college teachers, regardless of the institution from which they earned the degree; and (2) follow-up studies of graduates from a particular

¹Marie C. Vilhauer, "A Study of Doctoral Teacher-Education as It Relates to the School Experiences of Men and Women Graduates Who Earned Doctorates in the School of Education of New York University during the Period 1935-1943" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1954).

²Dana Bush Roblee, "A Career-line Study of the Professorship in Teacher Education Institutions" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1956).

college.

A number of generalizations may be made concerning characteristics of doctoral graduates in education and programs of study in education offered by graduate schools from the results of previous investigations, but particularizations about one institution are possible only through a study of that institution. The uniqueness of this follow-up study is that it is concerned with the doctoral graduates in education from the University of Oklahoma and with the program of graduate study at the University of Oklahoma.

CHAPTER II

CHARACTERISTICS OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION

The characteristics of the doctoral graduates in education from the University of Oklahoma are reported in this chapter as a background for further descriptions and analyses. Other characteristics of the personnel included in this study will be presented in subsequent chapters as they relate directly to the discussion.

The degree of either Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education has been conferred on 134 individuals by the University of Oklahoma. Since much of the information reported in this chapter was secured from sources other than the respondents, most of the data will include all recipients of the doctorate in education from the University.

Years in Which Doctorates Were Conferred and Type of Degree

The first doctorate in education was conferred by the University of Oklahoma in 1931. Of the 134 degrees conferred, 117 or 87.3 per cent were Doctor of Education and 17

or 12.7 per cent were Doctor of Philosophy. No Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education was granted by the University of Oklahoma between 1942 and 1952. Table 1 shows the number and type of doctorates in education conferred each year by the University of Oklahoma. Since 1931 there has been only one year (1948) in which a doctorate in education was not conferred. Approximately one-half of the doctorates were granted during the five year period, 1952 through 1956, when 66 individuals received the degree, whereas 68 received the doctorate in the 21 years prior to 1952.

Little difference exists between the requirements for the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education and Doctor of Education at the University of Oklahoma. Students working toward either degree must satisfy the same requirements for full graduate standing and complete a minimum of 90 semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree. Of the 90 hours, a maximum of 30 may be credited to research for the dissertation on a Doctor of Philosophy program and a maximum of 15 hours on a Doctor of Education program.

For the Doctor of Philosophy degree, the student must possess "ability to read two modern foreign languages usable as tools of research."¹ One of these must be French or German. The Doctor of Education candidates "are required to

¹The University of Oklahoma Bulletin, Issue for the Graduate College for 1956-57 (Norman, Oklahoma: The University Press, September, 1956), p. 35.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF DOCTOR'S DEGREES IN EDUCATION CONFERRED
BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, 1931-56

Year	Doctor of Education	Doctor of Philosophy	Total Degrees
1931	1	-	1
1932	-	3	3
1933	1	1	2
1934	2	1	3
1935	4	1	5
1936	5	1	6
1937	3	1	4
1938	-	1	1
1939	2	-	2
1940	2	1	3
1941	4	1	5
1942	2	-	2
1943	6	-	6
1944	1	-	1
1945	3	-	3
1946	5	-	5
1947	2	-	2
1948	-	-	-
1949	1	-	1
1950	10	-	10
1951	3	-	3
1952	13	-	13
1953	11	2	13
1954	9	1	10
1955	11	2	13
1956	16	1	17
Total	117	17	134

demonstrate proficiency in two of the following tools of research: (1) statistics, (2) methods of research, (3) a modern foreign language related to the dissertation topic."¹ Candidates for either degree must have 10 semester hours of foreign language to satisfy one of the requirements for full graduate standing, or they may satisfy the requirement through a reading examination in a foreign language.

Respondents in this study constituted 67.5 per cent of all doctoral graduates in education from the University of Oklahoma and 72.6 per cent of those who received questionnaires. Table 2 shows the number and per cent of the respondents by years in which the doctorate was conferred in intervals of five years. The percentage of recipients who responded ranged from 50 per cent for the 1931-36 graduates to 77.3 per cent for the 1952-56 group. Each five-year group is about evenly represented by the percentage of respondents available, i.e., recipients living and located. Of the living graduates who could be located, the 1947-51 interval had the lowest percentage of respondents with 62.5 per cent whereas the 1952-56 recipients were highest with 77.3 per cent.

Of the recipients who received the doctorate during the depression years of 1931 to 1941, 54.3 per cent responded; those who received the doctoral degree during the World War II years of 1942-1946 showed a 58.8 per cent response;

¹Ibid.

TABLE 2

RECIPIENTS AND RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO THE FIVE-YEAR INTERVAL
IN WHICH THE DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED^a

Year	Number of Recipients	Recipients Deceased or not Located	Number of Available Recipients	Number of Respondents	Per Cent of Returns from all Recipients	Per Cent of Returns from Available Recipients ^b
1931-36	20	6	14	10	50.0	71.4
1937-41	15	2	13	9	60.0	69.2
1942-46	17	2	15	10	58.8	66.6
1947-51	16	-	16	10	62.5	62.5
1952-56	66	-	66	51	77.3	77.3
Total	134	10	124	90	67.5	72.6

^aSix years are included in the first interval to account for all the years in the study. Only one degree was conferred in 1931.

^bAvailable recipients are graduates to whom questionnaires were sent and were not returned undelivered.

and 74.4 per cent of the recipients who earned the doctorate in the postwar period of 1947 to 1952 returned questionnaires.

Because of the increased number of doctorates conferred during the interval of 1952-56, this group makes up 56.15 per cent of the respondents as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF RESPONDENTS BY
YEAR DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED

Years	Number of Respondents	Per Cent of Respondents
1931-36	10	11.11
1937-41	9	10.0
1942-46	10	11.11
1947-51	10	11.11
1952-56	51	56.67
Total	90	100.00

Sex of the Graduates

An examination of Table 4 reveals that only 20 women have received the doctoral degree in education whereas 114 men have received it. During the depression years of 1931 to 1941, 28 recipients of the doctorate were men and 7 were women. During the World War II years of 1942 to 1946, no women received the doctor's degree in education from the University.

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF MEN AND WOMEN RECEIVING
DOCTORATES IN EDUCATION FROM THE
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Years	Men		Women		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-36	15	75.0	5	25.0	20	100.0
1937-41	13	86.67	2	13.33	15	100.0
1942-46	17	100.0	-	---	17	100.0
1947-51	11	68.75	5	31.25	16	100.0
1952-56	58	87.27	8	12.73	66	100.0
Total	114	85.08	20	14.92	134	100.0

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF RECIPIENTS
AND RESPONDENTS BY SEX

Sex	Number of Recipients	Recipients Deceased or not Located	Number of Respondents	Per Cent of Returns from Available Recipients
Women	20	1	14	73.7
Men	114	9	76	72.4
Total	134	10	90	72.6

From 1947 to 1951, 68.75 per cent of the doctoral candidates in education were men as compared with 87.27 per cent from 1952 to 1956.

The percentage of questionnaires returned by women graduates who were living and could be located was 73.7. The percentage of available men recipients who returned the inventories was 72.4, according to Table 5.

Major Fields Selected

Some of the earlier graduates' major fields were recorded as "general education," "school supervision," and "school measurements," but for this investigation they have been re-evaluated into comparable areas of concentration as used in the present programs. The following major fields are used to describe the various areas of concentration for this study: educational administration, secondary education, elementary education, educational guidance, educational psychology, special education, business education, health education, industrial education, and music education.

Table 6 shows the number and sex of graduates in each major field by year the doctorate was conferred. Educational administration, secondary education, elementary education, and educational psychology were the only areas used as major fields of study prior to 1943. It was not until 1952 and later that the fields of educational guidance, special education, health education, industrial education, and music

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF DOCTORATES IN EDUCATION BY MAJOR FIELDS OF
SPECIALIZATION, SEX, AND YEAR DEGREE WAS CONFERRED

Major Field	Year Doctorate was Conferred, and Sex										Total of All Recipients	
	31-36		37-41		42-46		47-51		52-56			
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
Educational Administration	11	-	7	-	6	-	6	-	10	-	40	-
Secondary Education	2	3	3	-	7	-	3	1	18	4	33	8
Elementary Education	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	7	1	10	3
Educational Guidance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	5	-
Educational Psychology	1	1	1	2	1	-	-	-	3	-	6	3
Special Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-
Business Education	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	3	9	1	13	4
Health Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	2
Industrial Education	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-
Music Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-

education were selected as areas of concentration by the doctoral candidates. Earlier doctoral programs of study seem to have been broader and more general than the fields selected by graduates today. No women were included in the 40 who chose educational administration. Eight of the 20 women recipients majored in secondary education, and only three of them specialized in elementary education.

The tendency for the programs to be more specialized is indicated in Table 7. Ten areas of concentration were used by doctoral graduates who completed their programs of study in 1952 and 1953, while only six areas were used as major fields from 1931 through 1951. Educational administration and secondary education majors constituted 72.0 per cent of the graduates prior to 1952, but only 48.5 per cent since 1952.

Administration was the most popular selection for a major field prior to 1952 with 44.1 per cent of the graduates choosing it, but as the new fields of specialization were developed, administration majors dropped to 15.1 per cent of graduates the next five years. Secondary education was the most consistent choice including 20 of the 68 earlier graduates or 29.4 per cent and 22 of the last 66 graduates or 33.4 per cent.

Health education and elementary education fields had the highest percentage of respondents returning the inventories. Table 8 shows that all three of the graduates in health

Education were selected as areas of concentration by the doctoral candidates. Earlier doctoral programs of study seem to have been broader and more general than the fields selected by graduates today. No women were included in the 40 who chose educational administration. Eight of the 20 women respondents majored in secondary education, and only three of them specialized in elementary education.

The tendency for the programs to be more specialized is indicated in Table 7. Ten areas of concentration were used by doctoral graduates who completed their programs of study in 1952 and 1953, while only six areas were used as major fields from 1931 through 1951. Educational administration and secondary education majors constituted 72.0 per cent of the graduates prior to 1952, but only 48.5 per cent since 1952.

Administration was the most popular selection for a major field prior to 1952 with 44.1 per cent of the graduates choosing it, but as the new fields of specialization were developed, administration majors dropped to 15.1 per cent of graduates the next five years. Secondary education was the most consistent choice including 20 of the 68 earlier graduates or 29.4 per cent and 22 of the last 66 graduates or 33.4 per cent.

Health education and elementary education fields had the highest percentage of respondents returning the inventories. Table 8 shows that all three of the graduates in health

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF RECIPIENTS BY MAJOR FIELDS AND
YEAR DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED, 1952-56

Major Field	Year Doctorate Was Conferred					Total				All	
						1952-56		1931-51		Recipients	
	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	(N=66)		(N=68)		(N=134)	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Ed. Adm.	2	4	2	1	1	10	15.1	30	44.1	40	29.9
Sec. Ed.	4	3	3	4	8	22	33.4	19	27.9	41	30.6
Elem. Ed.	1		2	2	3	8	12.2	5	7.4	13	9.7
Ed. Guid.	2			1	2	5	7.6	-	---	5	3.7
Ed. Psych.	1			1	1	3	4.5	6	8.8	9	6.7
Spec. Ed.		2				2	3.0	-	---	2	1.5
Bus. Ed.	2	1	3	2	2	10	15.2	7	10.3	17	12.7
Ind. Ed.	1			1		2	3.0	1	1.5	3	2.2
Health Ed.		2		1		3	4.5	-	---	3	2.2
Music Ed.		1				1	1.5	-	---	1	0.8

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO
MAJOR FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

Major Field	Number of Recipients	Recipients Deceased or not Located	Number of Available Recipients	Number of Respondents	Per Cent of Returns from All Recipients in Major Field	Per Cent of Returns from Available Recipients
Ed. Adm.	40	5	35	28	70.0	80.0
Sec. Ed.	41	3	38	25	61.0	65.8
Elem. Ed.	13	1	12	11	84.6	91.7
Ed. Guid.	5	0	5	4	80.0	80.0
Ed. Psych.	9	1	8	5	55.6	62.5
Spec. Ed.	2	-	2	-	---	---
Bus. Ed.	17	-	17	12	70.6	70.6
Health Ed.	3	-	3	3	100.0	100.0
Ind. Ed.	3	-	3	2	66.6	66.6
Music Ed.	1	-	1	-	---	---
Total	134	10	124	90	67.5	72.6

education responded, that 91.7 per cent of the twelve living elementary education graduates returned questionnaires, and that 80 per cent of the thirty-five in educational administration responded. Special education and music education with no respondents were the only fields showing less than 50 per cent respondents.

Age at Which Doctorate Was Received

There was a wide range of ages at which the graduates received the doctorate in education. Table 9 shows that the youngest graduate was 28 years of age and the oldest was 62. The doctorate has been conferred on four persons who were 60 years of age or older and two persons who were younger than 30 years of age. The median age for the total group was 41 years. The median age for the graduates who received the doctorate before 1952 was 42 years compared to the graduates of 1952 whose median age was 40 years. Pressey found the median age of graduates who represented a number of institutions to be 42.8 years.¹ Mitzel and Keller discovered the median age of doctoral graduates in education from the University of Minnesota to be 33 years as compared to the age of 30 which was the median in all fields.²

¹Pressey, op. cit., p. 192.

²Mitzel and Keller, op. cit.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION
ACCORDING TO AGE AT WHICH DEGREE WAS RECEIVED

Age	Year Degree Was Conferred					Total No.
	1931-36 No.	1937-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-51 No.	1952-56 No.	
28					1	1
29					1	1
30				2	3	5
31	1		1		6	8
32		1			2	3
33	1			1	3	5
34			1	1	4	6
35		3			2	5
36	1				3	4
37			3	1	4	8
38	2	1			1	4
39			1	3	2	6
40	1		1		6	8
41	3		1		3	7
42		1	3	2	4	10
43			1	1	2	4
44			1	1	2	4
45		1		1	4	6
46	2	2		1	2	7

TABLE 9--Continued

Age	Year Degree Was Conferred					Total No.
	1931-36 No.	1937-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-51 No.	1952-56 No.	
47	2	1			1	4
48	1	1			1	3
49	1	1	1		2	5
50		1			1	2
51	1					1
52	2					2
53		1	1	1	2	5
54		1	2			3
55					1	1
56						0
57					1	1
58						0
59				1		1
60	1					1
61	1				1	2
62					1	1

Median Age of Total Graduates = 41

Median Age of Graduates 1931-51 = 42

Median Age of Graduates 1952-56 = 40

High Schools Attended

Slightly over half of the doctoral graduates in education from the University of Oklahoma attended Oklahoma high schools. Table 10 shows that 57.5 per cent came from high schools in Oklahoma and 42.5 per cent came from high schools in other states. Broken down into five-year periods, the ones who received the doctorate in 1931-36 and from 1942-46 were the only periods in which more graduates came from out-of-state schools than Oklahoma high schools. The post World War II periods, 1947-51 with 81.3 per cent and 1952-56 with 63.6 per cent, had a rather substantial increase in Oklahoma high-school trained graduates. Only 35 per cent of the first 20 doctoral graduates were from Oklahoma high schools.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF GRADUATES IN EDUCATION WHO ATTENDED OKLAHOMA
HIGH SCHOOLS BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED

Year Degree Was Conferred	High School Attended			
	Oklahoma		Out-of-State	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-36	7	35.0	13	65.0
1937-41	8	53.3	7	46.7
1942-46	7	41.2	10	58.8
1947-51	13	81.3	3	18.7
1952-56	42	63.6	24	36.4
Total	77	57.5	57	42.5

TABLE 11

STATES OR COUNTRY IN WHICH RECIPIENTS ATTENDED
HIGH SCHOOL BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED

State	Year Doctorate Was Conferred			Total	
	1931-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-56 No.	No.	Per Cent
Oklahoma	15	7	55	77	57.5
Texas	5	2	4	11	8.1
Arkansas	2	3	2	7	5.2
Kansas	2	1	4	7	5.2
Kentucky	2	1	3	6	4.5
New York	1		3	4	3.0
Louisiana	2			2	1.5
Nebraska			2	2	1.5
North Carolina			2	2	1.5
Pennsylvania	1		1	2	1.5
Wisconsin	1	1		2	1.5
California			1	1	.75
Florida			1	1	.75
Indiana	1			1	.75
Iowa	1			1	.75
Michigan	1			1	.75
Missouri			1	1	.75
Ohio		1		1	.75
Oregon			1	1	.75

TABLE 11--Continued

State	Year Doctorate Was Conferred			Total	
	1931-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-56 No.	No.	Per Cent
Tennessee			1	1	.75
Utah		1		1	.75
West Virginia	1			1	.75
India			1	1	.75
Total	35	17	82	134	100.00

Table 11 shows the 22 states and one foreign country in which the recipients attended high school. Texas high schools supplied 11 which was 8.1 per cent of the doctoral graduates. Seven or 5.2 per cent attended high schools in both Arkansas and Kansas. Of the doctoral graduates who attended high schools outside of Oklahoma--57 in number--45.6 per cent came from neighboring states of Texas, Kansas, Arkansas and Missouri. One graduate was from India.

Sources of Previous Academic Degrees

The source of bachelor's degrees earned by doctoral graduates in education is shown in Table 12. Of the 138 bachelor's degrees earned by the 134 graduates, 26 or 18.9 per cent of the degrees had been earned at the University of Oklahoma; 62 or 44.9 per cent from other Oklahoma colleges;

TABLE 12

SOURCE OF BACHELOR'S DEGREES EARNED BY UNIVERSITY
OF OKLAHOMA DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION

Institution	Year Graduate Received Doctorate					Total	
	31-36 No.	36-41 No.	42-46 No.	47-51 No.	52-56 No.	No.	Per Cent
University of Oklahoma	8	3	1	4	10 ^a	26	18.9
Central State College			2	5	7	14	10.2
Southeastern State College			1	1	5	7	5.1
Northeastern State College		3 ^b		2	2	7	5.1
Oklahoma A&M College			1		5	6	4.4
East Central State College	2	1	1		2	6	4.4
Southwestern State College			1		4	5	3.6
Northwestern State College		1			4	5	3.6
Phillips University	1		1		2	4	2.9
Oklahoma Baptist University	1			1	1	3	2.2
Oklahoma College for Women		1			1	2	1.5
Oklahoma City University			1			1	.7
Tulsa University		1				1	.7

TABLE 12--Continued

Institution	Year Graduate Received Doctorate					Total	
	31-36 No.	36-41 No.	42-46 No.	47-51 No.	52-56 No.	No.	Per Cent
Bethany Peniel College					1	1	.7
Out-of-state Colleges	9 ^c	6	9 ^c	3	23	50	36.2

^aOne individual earned two bachelor's degrees from the University of Oklahoma.

^bOne individual earned two bachelor's degrees from Northeastern State College.

^cOne individual earned two bachelor's degrees from an out-of-state college.

and 50 or 36.2 per cent from out-of-state institutions. Fourteen bachelor's degrees had been earned at Central State College which was more than any two other Oklahoma institutions outside of the University itself.

The 20 states in which doctoral graduates received bachelor's degrees are shown in Table 13. Twenty-one of the bachelor's degrees earned by recipients were from colleges in one of the neighboring states of Kansas, Arkansas, Texas, and Missouri.

A somewhat different picture is presented by Table 14 as to the source of the master's degrees earned by doctoral graduates. Of the 135 master's degrees earned, 83 or 61.5

TABLE 13

STATES IN WHICH BACHELOR'S DEGREES WERE EARNED
BY DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION

State	Year Doctorate Was Conferred			Total	
	1931-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-56 No.	No.	Per Cent
Oklahoma	22 ^a	9	57 ^a	88	63.8
Kansas	1	1	5	7	5.0
Arkansas	1	2	2	5	3.6
New York	2		3	5	3.6
Texas	1		4	5	3.6
Missouri	1	2 ^b	1	4	2.9
Kentucky			3	3	2.2
Nebraska		1	2	3	2.2
Tennessee		1	2	3	2.2
California			2	2	1.5
Indiana	2			2	1.5
Michigan	2			2	1.5
Wisconsin	1	1		2	1.5
Iowa	1 ^c			1	.7
Louisiana	1			1	.7
Massachusetts	1 ^c			1	.7
Ohio		1		1	.7
Pennsylvania	1			1	.7

TABLE 13--Continued

State	Year Doctorate Was Conferred			Total	
	1931-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-56 No.	No.	Per Cent
South Dakota			1	1	.7
Washington			1	1	.7
Total	37	18	83	138	100.0

^aOne individual earned two bachelor's degrees from an Oklahoma College.

^bOne individual earned two bachelor's degrees from an out-of-state college.

^cOne individual earned a bachelor's degree from a college in Iowa and a college in Massachusetts.

per cent of the degrees were earned at the University of Oklahoma; 15 or 11.1 per cent at other Oklahoma colleges; and 37 or 27.4 per cent at out-of-state institutions. This indicates that nearly two-thirds of the doctoral graduates had practically all of their graduate work at the University of Oklahoma.

Out-of-state colleges where master's degrees were earned by the graduates were more distant than colleges where bachelor's degrees were earned. The states in which the master's degrees were earned are shown in Table 15. Seven master's degrees were granted by New York colleges. Texas,

TABLE 14

SOURCE OF MASTER'S DEGREES EARNED BY UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION

Institution	Year Graduate Received Doctorate										Total N=135 Per No. Cent	
	31-36		37-41		42-46		47-51		52-56			
	N=20		N=15		N=17		N=16		N=67			
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent		
University of Oklahoma	13	65.0	11	73.3	11	64.7	12	75.0	36 ^a	53.8	83	61.5
Oklahoma A&M College					2	11.8	3	18.7	5	7.4	10	7.4
Phillips University	1	5.0							4	5.9	5	3.7
Out-of-State Colleges	6	30.0	4	26.7	4	23.5	1	6.3	22	32.9	37	27.4

^aTwo individuals earned master's degrees from both the University of Oklahoma and Phillips University.

One recipient did not receive a master's degree.

TABLE 15

STATES IN WHICH DOCTORAL GRADUATES EARNED MASTER'S
DEGREES BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED

State	Year Doctorate Was Conferred			Total No.
	1931-41 No.	1942-46 No.	1947-56 No.	
Oklahoma	25	13	60	98
New York	3	1	3	7
Texas	1		4	5
Colorado	1		3	4
Kansas	1		3	4
Arkansas		1	2	3
Illinois	1		1	2
Michigan	1		1	2
Tennessee			2	2
Kentucky			1	1
Indiana	1			1
Iowa	1			1
Massachusetts		1		1
Mississippi			1	1
Nebraska			1	1
North Carolina			1	1
Wisconsin		1		1
Total	35	17	83	135

Colorado, Kansas and Arkansas combined had granted 16 of the 37 out-of-state master's degrees. Four recipients earned master's degrees in Colorado, although none earned his bachelor's degree from there.

According to Table 16, two-thirds of the 1931-51 doctoral graduates earned their master's at the University of Oklahoma, but only a few over one-half received it at the University during the latter period. The percentage of recipients completing requirements for the bachelor's degree at the University of Oklahoma decreased from 29.3 to 13.6 for the same periods. Recipients who were Oklahoma high-school graduates increased from 51.5 per cent to 63.6 per cent for the two groups.

TABLE 16

DOCTORAL GRADUATES WHO EARNED MASTER'S OR BACHELOR'S DEGREES FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA AND WHO ATTENDED OKLAHOMA HIGH SCHOOLS

	Year Doctorate Was Conferred			
	1931-51		1952-56	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Earned Master's Degree at the University of Oklahoma	45	66.2	36	54.5
Earned Bachelor's Degree at the University of Oklahoma	16	29.3	9	13.6
Attended Oklahoma High School	35	51.5	42	63.6

TABLE 17

COMBINATIONS OF OKLAHOMA INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED BY
RECIPIENTS PRIOR TO RECEIPT OF THE DOCTORATE

Combination of Institutions Attended	Year Doctorate Was Conferred	
	1931-51 No.	1952-56 No.
Oklahoma High School, Bachelor's degree from University of Oklahoma	(N=68) 10	(N=66) 9
Oklahoma High School, Bachelor's degree from other Oklahoma College	23	31
Oklahoma High School, Master's degree from University of Oklahoma	18	24
Oklahoma High School, Master's degree from other Oklahoma College	5	10
Bachelor's and Master's Degrees from University of Oklahoma	15	8
Bachelor's and Master's Degrees from other Oklahoma Colleges	6	9
Oklahoma High School, Bachelor's and Master's degrees from University of Oklahoma	9	8

Table 17 presents various combinations of Oklahoma institutions attended by graduates prior to receipt of the doctorate. Twenty-three, or 17.2 per cent, of the graduates received their bachelor's, master's and doctor's degrees from the University of Oklahoma; of these, 15 received their doctorates during the period 1931 through 1951 and only 8 from 1952 through 1956. It is significant to note that 8 of the

15 earlier recipients had some graduate work at other institutions but none of the 8 later graduates had any work outside of the University of Oklahoma. For an individual to do all graduate work at one institution is considered by some not to be the best practice; however, of the 134 recipients, 23 earned their bachelor's, master's and doctor's all from the University of Oklahoma; 17 of the 23 finished an Oklahoma high school.

Professional Experience Prior to
Receipt of the Doctorate

In general, the recipients had a rich background of teaching and professional experience before they received the doctorate. Data concerning such experience were available on all but one of the graduates. Only one person had no field experience of an educational nature and five had only one year of teaching experience prior to receipt of the doctoral degree.

Candidates for the Doctor of Education degree must file evidence of two years of successful experience in work related to the area of specialization before admission to candidacy at the University of Oklahoma.¹ No experience is necessary for the Doctor of Philosophy in education.

Table 18 reveals the number of recipients, number of

¹The University of Oklahoma Bulletin, Issue for the Graduate College for 1956-57 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, September, 1956), p. 35.

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF RECIPIENTS PRIOR TO RECEIVING
THE DOCTORATE ACCORDING TO MAJOR FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

Field	Level of Experience										No Teaching Experience	Both Levels of Teaching Experience
	Below College					College						
	None	1-5	6-10	11-15	16 or More	None	1-5	6-10	11-15	16 or More		
Ed. Adm.	2	7	6	12	13	19	12	4	5			19
Sec. Ed.	5	9	12	9	5	16	8	6	5	5		19
Elem. Ed.		3	6	3	1	8	2	3				5
Ed. Guid.	2	1	1		1	1	2	2				2
Ed. Psych.	2	2	2	2	1	1	5			3		6
Spec. Ed.	1	1				2					1	0
Bus. Ed.	4	6	3	3	1	2	7	4	4			11
Health Ed.	1	1	1			1		1	1			1
Ind. Ed.			2		1	2				1		1
Music Ed.		1					1					1
Total	17	31	33	29	23	52	37	20	15	9	1	65

years and level of teaching experience prior to receiving the doctorate. It was impossible to make a distinction between a school year and a calendar year from the basic data. Eight individuals whose only college teaching was in summer terms were not included as having college experience in this table. Administrative positions in the schools were regarded as teaching experience. The number of years teaching experience of the recipients regardless of level and prior to receiving the doctorate is also shown in Table 18.

The number and per cent of recipients and the extent of their experience are shown in Table 19. The fact that nearly one-half of the doctoral graduates had teaching experience on both college and pre-college levels should affect the type of program and instruction which is planned for them. Only one or .7 of one per cent of the graduates had no teaching experience and 12 per cent had only experience teaching college students.

Table 20 discloses the number of years between the receipt of the bachelor's and master's degree, between receipt of the master's and doctor's degree, and between receipt of the bachelor's and doctor's degree. One of the 134 recipients was included only in the last column since he did not receive a master's degree. The first bachelor's degree and the first master's degree received by those persons who held more than one of these degrees were used in making the computations.

TABLE 19

LEVEL OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF RECIPIENTS
PRIOR TO RECEIVING THE DOCTORATE

Extent of Experience	Year Doctorate Was Conferred										Total N=133 Per No. Cent	
	1931-36		1937-41		1942-46		1947-51		1952-56			
	N=20		N=15		N=17		N=15 ^a		N=66			
	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent		
No Teaching Experience									1	1.5	1	.7
Below College Experience Only	10	50.0	5	33.3	7	41.2	3	20.1	26	39.3	51	38.4
College Experience	1	5.0	2	13.3	1	5.9	2	13.3	10	15.2	16	12.0
Both College and Below College Experience	9	45.0	8	53.4	9	52.9	10	66.6	29	44.0	65	48.9

^aInformation was not available on one recipient.

TABLE 20

TIME SEQUENCE OF ACADEMIC DEGREES
EARNED BY DOCTORAL GRADUATES

Time in Years	Between Bachelor's and Master's Degrees		Between Master's and Doctor's Degrees		Between Bachelor's and Doctor's Degrees	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1	15	11.2				
2	7	5.2	6	4.5		
3	11	8.2	10	7.5		
4	18	13.5	10	7.5	1	.7
5	8	6.0	11	8.3	4	3.0
6	9	6.7	15	11.3	2	1.5
7	14	10.5	10	7.5	8	6.0
8	10	7.5	10	7.5	2	1.5
9	11	8.2	5	3.8	7	5.1
10	8	6.0	7	5.3	11	8.2
11	4	3.0	7	5.3	2	1.5
12	4	3.0	7	5.3	2	1.5
13			3	2.3	6	4.5
14	1	.7	8	6.0	10	7.5
15	3	2.3	8	6.0	5	3.7
16	1	.7	2	1.5	13	9.7
17	1	.7	2	1.5	7	5.1
18	4	3.0	2	1.5	7	5.1

TABLE 20--Continued

Time in Years	Between Bachelor's and Master's Degrees		Between Master's and Doctor's Degrees		Between Bachelor's and Doctor's Degrees	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
19			2	1.5	6	4.5
20			1	.7	6	4.5
21	1	.7	2	1.5	5	3.7
22					6	4.5
23	3	2.3	1	.7	4	3.0
24	1	.7	1	.7	3	2.3
25			1	.7	3	2.3
26					2	1.5
27			1	.7	3	2.3
28			1	.7	1	.7
29						
30					1	.7
31					5	3.7
32						
33						
34					1	.7
35						
36					1	.7
Total	134		133 ^a		134	
Median	6 years		8 years		16 years	

^aOne recipient did not receive a master's degree.

The median number of years between the receipt of the bachelor's degree and the master's degree was 6 years while the range of time between the two degrees was from 1 year to 24 years. The median number of years between the time the master's degree was received and the doctorate was 8 years and the range was from 2 years to 28 years. The median number of years to elapse between receipt of the bachelor's degree and the doctorate was 16 years.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYMENT OF THE DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATION

A general picture of the employment status of the respondents since receiving the doctorate is presented in this chapter. An analysis is made of the type of positions in which the respondents were employed immediately after receipt of the doctorate and during the school year of 1956-57.

Respondents who were employed in any capacity which dealt with the education of public school children were included in the "public school" group, i.e., State Superintendents of Instruction, State Department of Education employees, County Superintendents, etc. All respondents who were employed by colleges or universities, including those who were associated with the laboratory schools, were considered to hold college positions.

Initial Employment After Receipt of the Doctorate

Many of the respondents held full-time jobs or had a leave of absence during their graduate work. It was not always possible to differentiate between positions obtained

before requirements were completed for the doctorate or immediately after receipt of the doctorate.

The types of schools or other organizations in which the respondents were employed in their first positions after receiving the doctorate are presented in Table 21. The initial employment status is shown according to the time of receipt of the doctoral degree.

More of the respondents were initially employed after receipt of the doctorate in colleges and universities than in all other types of employment combined. Of all respondents, 66.7 per cent were employed in colleges and universities, 23.3 per cent were in public schools, and only 10 per cent in all other types of employment. Of the respondents who received their doctorates during the period of 1947-55, 79.1 per cent were initially employed on the college level after receiving the doctoral degree. Possibly the post-war increase in college enrollment accounted for the need for so many in higher education. Over one-half of the 1956 doctoral respondents were employed by institutions of higher learning.

Table 22 reveals that 41 respondents or 45.6 per cent were employed in colleges and universities before or during their last residence work and that 37 or 41.1 per cent were employed in public schools. Only 12 of the 90 respondents were not in educational work during or just preceding their final work in residence.

TABLE 21

TYPE OF INITIAL EMPLOYMENT AFTER RECEIPT OF THE DOCTORATE
BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS CONFERRED

Type of Position	Year Doctorate Was Conferred									
	1931-41		1942-46		1947-55		1956		Total	
	N=19		N=10		N=48		N=13		N=90	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College or University	11	57.9	4	40.0	38	79.1	7	53.8	60	66.7
Public School System	4	21.1	5	50.0	7	14.6	5	38.5	21	23.3
Business or Industry	2	10.5							2	2.2
Government	2	10.5	1	10.0	2	4.2	1	7.7	6	6.7
Other					1 ^a	2.1			1	1.1

^aEmployed by religious organization.

TABLE 22

TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT IMMEDIATELY BEFORE OR DURING THE TIME
IN WHICH RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS WERE SATISFIED

Type of Employment	Respondents	
	No.	Per Cent
College or University	41	45.6
Public School	37	41.1
Business or Industry	3	3.3
Government	3	3.3
Other	6	6.7
Total	90	100.0

The types of schools or other organizations in which respondents were employed in their initial positions after receipt of the doctoral degree according to age at which the doctorate was received are shown in Table 23. Little difference is seen in ages of the graduates with regard to type of school in which they were initially employed. The oldest respondent to enter government work was 46 years of age at the time the doctorate was received.

The types of schools in which respondents were employed in initial position after receipt of the doctorate are presented in Table 24. It will be noted that all business education and health education majors were on the college

TABLE 23

TYPE OF INITIAL EMPLOYMENT AFTER RECEIPT OF THE DOCTORATE
ACCORDING TO AGE AT WHICH DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED

Age in Years	Type of School or Organization									
	College N=60		Public N=21		Business N=2		Government N=6		Other N=1	
	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent
25-29	1	1.7								
30-34	14	23.3	2	9.5	1	50.0	1	16.7		
35-39	15	25.0	3	14.3			1	16.7	1 ^a	100.0
40-44	14	23.3	9	42.9			3	50.0		
45-49	12	20.0	5	23.8			1	16.7		
50 or older	4	6.7	2	9.5	1	50.0				

^aEmployed by a religious organization.

level. Four of the five respondents who specialized in educational psychology were employed in colleges while three of the four respondents who majored in educational guidance were employed on the college level after the doctorate was conferred. Less than one-half of the elementary education majors and only about one-third of the educational administration majors accepted public school post-doctoral employment. Only one-half of the eight areas of specialization represented supplied doctoral graduates for the public schools. Of the respondents who had selected secondary education as their

TABLE 24

TYPE OF INITIAL EMPLOYMENT AFTER RECEIPT OF THE DOCTORATE
ACCORDING TO MAJOR FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

Type of Employment	Major Field of Specialization															
	Ed. Adm.		Sec. Ed.		Elem. Ed.		Ed. Guid.		Ed. Psych.		Bus. Ed.		Health Ed.		Ind. Ed.	
	Per		Per		Per		Per		Per		Per		Per		Per	
	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent
College	16	57.1	15	60.0	6	54.5	3	75.0	4	80.0	12	100.0	3	100.0	1	50.0
Public School	10	35.7	5	20.0	5	45.5	1	25.0								
Business or Industry	1	3.6													1	50.0
Government	1	3.6	4	16.0					1	20.0						
Other			1	4.0												
Total	28	100.0	25	100.0	11	100.0	4	100.0	5	100.0	12	100.0	3	100.0	2	100.0

major field, 60 per cent were initially employed in colleges and universities, 20 per cent in public schools, and 20 per cent in government and other services.

Method by Which Respondents Obtained Their
Initial Post-doctorate Employment

The methods by which respondents reported they obtained their first college position after receipt of the doctorate are shown in Table 25. Of the 60 respondents who were initially employed in college work after receiving the doctoral degree, 31 or 51.6 per cent held the position before or during their graduate work. Thirteen or 21.6 per cent reported they obtained the position through their own initiative. Four or 6.7 per cent made their job contacts through their major advisor; two or 3.4 per cent through a faculty member of the College of Education; and seven or 11.7 per cent through the University Placement Office. Of the college employed respondents who received the doctorate between 1931 and 1941, 72.7 per cent held the position before or during their doctoral work, but only 41.7 per cent of the 1942-1956 graduates who responded held their initial post-doctorate college position during graduate study.

Table 26 shows the methods by which respondents obtained their initial post-doctorate public school positions. The percentage of each method is given only for the totals because of the small numbers involved. The percentage for each reported method by which respondents obtained their

TABLE 25

METHOD BY WHICH RESPONDENTS OBTAINED THEIR FIRST
COLLEGE POSITION AFTER RECEIPT
OF THE DOCTORATE

Method by Which the Position Was Obtained	Year Doctorate Was Received						Total Per No. Cent
	1931-41		1942-51		1952-56		
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	
Held position before or dur- ing graduate work	8	72.7	5	41.7	18	48.7	31 51.6
Job contact made through major advisor	1	9.1			3	8.1	4 6.7
Job contact made through a faculty member of the College of Education					2	5.4	2 3.4
Job contact made through the University Placement Bureau			2	16.7	5	13.5	7 11.7
Job contact made through own initia- tive	2	18.2	4	33.3	7	18.9	13 21.6
Other			1 ^a	8.3	2 ^b	5.4	3 5.0
Total	11	100.0	12	100.0	37	100.0	60 100.0

^aPlacement office of another institution.

^bThrough faculty members of other institutions.

TABLE 26

METHOD BY WHICH RESPONDENTS OBTAINED THEIR FIRST
PUBLIC SCHOOL POSITION AFTER RECEIPT
OF THE DOCTORATE

Method by Which the position Was Obtained	Year Doctorate Was Received			Total Per No. Cent	
	1931-41 No.	1942-51 No.	1952-56 No.		
Held position be- fore or during graduate work		5	6	11	52.3
Job Contact made through major advisor	1			1	4.8
Job contact made through a fac- ulty member of the College of Education			1	1	4.8
Job contact made through the Uni- versity Place- ment Office			1	1	4.8
Job contact made through own initiative	2	1	3	6	28.5
Other	1			1	4.8
Total	4	6	11	21	100.0

initial post-doctorate public school positions are nearly the same as reported for the first college positions. Few over one-half held the position during or before graduate work and about one-fourth obtained their positions by making job

contacts through their own initiative.

Employment Status, 1956-57

The employment status of the respondents at the time of this study according to the type of schools or organizations is shown in Table 27. During the school year of 1956-57, 54 of the 90 or 60.0 per cent of the respondents were employed in college positions and 22 or 24.5 per cent were employed in public school positions. No private elementary or secondary schools were represented by the respondents. By 1956 5.6 per cent of the respondents who had received doctoral degrees in education were retired. Of the five retired respondents four received their doctorates prior to 1947 and had reached retirement age; one had been granted the doctorate after 1947 and left the profession to become a housewife. Only 10 per cent of the respondents were employed in other positions. Of the respondents who received the doctorate during the period of 1947-56, 68.9 per cent were employed by institutions of higher learning in 1956, and only 41.4 per cent of the respondents who received the degree prior to 1947 were employed in college positions.

Table 28 reports the 1956 employment status of the respondents according to major fields of specialization. All of the respondents who had specialized in educational psychology and health education were employed in college positions in 1956. Of the 12 business education respondents 11 or

TABLE 27

TYPE OF ORGANIZATION IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE
EMPLOYED DURING THE 1956-57 SCHOOL YEAR
BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED

Type of School or Organization	Year Doctorate Was Conferred				Total	
	Prior to 1947		1947-56			
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College	12	41.4	42	68.9	54	60.0
Public School	9	31.1	13	21.3	22	24.5
Business or Industry	2	6.9	2	3.3	4	4.4
Private Practice	1	3.4			1	1.1
Government or Public Service	1	3.4	3	4.9	4	4.4
Retired	4	13.8	1	1.6	5	5.6
Total	29	100.0	61	100.0	90	100.0

91.7 per cent held college positions while one had retired. There is little change in the number of respondents who were employed in the various types of schools and organizations in 1956 from their initial post-doctorate positions. Twelve or 42.8 per cent of the respondents who selected educational administration as a major field of specialization were employed in college positions during 1956-57 as compared with

TABLE 28

TYPE OF ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE
EMPLOYED DURING THE 1956-57 SCHOOL YEAR
BY MAJOR FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

Type of School or Organi- zation	Major Field of Specialization									
	Ed. Adm.		Sec. Ed.		Elem. Ed.		Ed. Guid.		Ed. Psych.	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College or Organiza- tion	12	42.8	14	56.0	6	54.5	2	50.0	5	100.0
Public School	11	39.3	6	24.0	4	36.4	1	25.0		
Business or Industry	2	7.1					1	25.0		
Private Practice	1 ^a	3.6								
Government	1	3.6	3	12.0						
Retired	1	3.6	2	8.0	1	9.1			1	8.3
Total	28	100.0	25	100.0	11	100.0	4	100.0	5	100.0

^aPracticing psychologist.

56.0 per cent of the secondary education majors and 54.5 per cent of the elementary education majors.

The type of college positions held by respondents during the 1956-57 school year according to major fields of specialization are given in Table 29. Of the 54 respondents who were employed in college positions, over one-half were teachers and 18.5 per cent were chairmen of departments. All others constituted only one-fourth of the positions held by respondents who were employed in college work. Over one-fourth of the college employed respondents were working in an area which was one of their supporting fields; 11 were teaching and 4 were chairmen of departments.

The types of public school positions in which respondents were employed during the school year of 1956-57 according to major fields of study are presented in Table 30. Secondary-school principals constituted 27.3 per cent and classroom teachers 18.3 per cent of the respondents who were employed in public school positions. Respondents from only four of the eight areas of specialization were employed in public school positions. Over 80 per cent of the respondents held positions which were of an administrative nature.

The positions held by respondents immediately before or during graduate study, immediately after receipt of the doctorate, and during the 1956-57 school year according to type of schools or organizations in which they were employed are shown in Table 31. The number of respondents to hold

TABLE 29

TYPE OF COLLEGE POSITIONS HELD BY RESPONDENTS DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR
OF 1956-57 ACCORDING TO MAJOR FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

Type of Position	Major Field of Specialization								Total Per Cent	
	Ed. Adm.	Sec. Ed.	Elem. Ed.	Ed. Guid.	Ed. Psych.	Bus. Ed.	Health Ed.	Ind. Ed.		
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	Cent
Vice President					1				1	1.8
Dean	1	2							3	5.6
Chairman of Department	3	2	1		1	2		1	10 ^a	18.5
Teacher	5	8	4	1	2	7	3		30 ^b	55.6
Registrar				1		1			2	3.7
Student Personnel					1	1			2	3.7
Personnel and Placement	1								1	1.8
Director of Stu- dent Teaching	1	1							2	3.7
Principal of Lab. School	1	1	1						3	5.6
Total	12	14	6	2	5	11	3	1	54	100.0

^aFour respondents were Chairmen of Departments in supporting field.

^bEleven respondents were teaching in supporting field.

TABLE 30

TYPE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL POSITIONS HELD BY RESPONDENTS
DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR OF 1956-57 ACCORDING
TO MAJOR FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION

Type of Position	Major Field of Specialization				Total	
	Ed. Adm. No.	Sec. Ed. No.	Elem. Ed. No.	Ed. Guid. No.	No.	Per Cent
State Superintendent of Public Instruction	1				1	4.5
State Department of Education	3				3	13.6
County Superintendent			1		1	4.5
District Superintendent	2				2	9.1
Secondary Principal	1	4		1	6	27.3
Elementary Principal	1		1		2	9.1
Supervisor or Co-ordinator	1			2	3	13.6
Teacher	2	2			4	18.3
Total	11	6	4	1	22	100.0

TABLE 31

TYPE OF ORGANIZATION IN WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE EMPLOYED
AT TIME DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED, INITIAL POSITION
AFTER DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED, AND POSITION
HELD DURING SCHOOL YEAR OF 1956-57

Type of Organization	Immediately be- fore or at the Time Doctorate Was Conferred		Immediately af- ter Doctorate Was Conferred		During School Year of 1956-57	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College or University	41	46.6	60	66.7	54	60.0
Public School	37	42.1	21	23.3	22	24.5
Business or Industry	3	3.4	2	2.2	4	4.4
Private Practice	1	1.1			1	1.1
Government	3	3.3	6	6.7	4	4.4
Retired					5	5.6
Other	5	5.5	1	1.1		
Total	90	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0

positions in colleges increased from 41 or 46.6 per cent before or during the time of doctoral study, to 60 or 66.7 per cent immediately after the doctorate was conferred. The proportion of college employed respondents during 1956-57 school year was 60.0 per cent as compared with 66.7 per cent of the respondents who held college positions immediately after

receiving the doctorate. This was due mostly to respondents retiring from the profession. A majority of the respondents who entered college positions after the doctorate was conferred held positions in public schools previously.

Geographical Location of Respondents

The geographical location of respondents during the school year of 1956 and 1957 according to the type of organization in which they were employed is shown in Table 32. Nearly one-half, 47.9 per cent, were employed in Oklahoma. Ten or 11.1 per cent of the respondents were living in Texas, 10 per cent in California, 8.9 per cent in Kansas, and less than 4 per cent in any other one state. Of 54 college-employed respondents, 40.8 per cent held positions in Oklahoma and 59.0 per cent of the public-school employed respondents resided in Oklahoma.

The 90 respondents were employed in 17 states and the Territory of Alaska. Respondents of only four states and Alaska were employed in public school positions.

Earned Income of the Respondents

The annual earned incomes as reported by the respondents for the 1956-57 school year are presented in Table 33. Respondents were asked to include salary, consultation work, royalties and fees received for professional or technical services. Five retired respondents were not included in the computation. More than one-half of the respondents reported

TABLE 32

GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS IN 1956
ACCORDING TO TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Location	Type of Employment								Total	
	College		Public School		Retired		Other			
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Oklahoma	22	40.8	13	59.0	4	80.0	4	44.5	43	47.9
Texas	7	13.1	2	9.1			1	11.1	10	11.1
California	4	7.5	4	18.2	1	20.0			9	10.0
Kansas	7	13.1					1	11.1	8	8.9
Alabama	1	1.8					2	22.2	3	3.4
Colorado	2	3.7							2	2.2
Illinois	2	3.7							2	2.2
New Mexico			2	9.1					2	2.2
New York	2	3.7							2	2.2
Alaska			1	4.6					1	1.1
Arizona	1	1.8							1	1.1

TABLE 32--Continued

Location	Type of Employment								Total	
	College		Public School		Retired		Other			
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Georgia							1	11.1	1	1.1
Kentucky	1	1.8							1	1.1
Louisiana	1	1.8							1	1.1
Minnesota	1	1.8							1	1.1
Missouri	1	1.8							1	1.1
Ohio	1	1.8							1	1.1
Wyoming	1	1.8							1	1.1
Total	54	100.0	22	100.0	5	100.0	9	100.0	90	100.0

TABLE 33

ANNUAL EARNED INCOME OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO THE
YEAR IN WHICH THE DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED

Annual Income ^a	Year Doctorate Was Received						Total Per Cent	
	31-36	37-41	42-46	47-51	52-55	1956		
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
\$ 4,000- 4,999	2				1	1	4	4.7
5,000- 5,999	1				4	3	8	9.4
6,000- 6,999	1		3	3	13	7	27	31.7
7,000- 7,999	1	2	4	3	10	2	22	25.9
8,000- 8,999	1	3		1	5	10	10	11.8
9,000-11,999	1		2	2	4		9	10.6
12,000-14,999		2	1				3	3.5
15,000 or more		1			1		2	2.4
Total	7	8	10	9	38	13	85 ^b	100.0

^aIncome from salary, consultation work, royalties and fees received for professional or technical services.

^bThe five retired respondents were not included.

TABLE 34

ANNUAL EARNED INCOME OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO TYPE
OF ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH THEY WERE EMPLOYED

Annual Income	Type of Organization							
	College		Public School		Government		Other	
	N=54		N=22		N=4		N=5	
	Per		Per		Per		Per	
	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent
\$ 4,000- 4,999	1	1.8	3	13.7				
5,000- 5,999	7	13.0	1	4.5				
6,000- 6,999	21	38.9	5	22.7	1	25.0		
7,000- 7,999	14	25.9	4	18.2	2	50.0	2	40.0
8,000- 8,999	5	9.3	4	18.2	1	25.0		
9,000-11,999	4	7.4	3	13.7			2	40.0
12,000-14,999	2	3.7	1	4.5				
15,000 or more			1	4.5			1	20.0

their annual income to be between \$6,000 and \$7,000. Twenty-four or 28.3 per cent earned \$8,000 or more annually and two reported their income to be \$15,000 or more. Twelve or 14.1 per cent of the respondents' annual incomes ranged between \$4,000 and \$5,000. More than two-thirds of the 1956 graduates who responded were earning \$6,000 or more annually but none was above \$8,000.

Annual earned income of respondents according to type of organization in which they were employed is shown in Table

34. The salaries of the public-school employed respondents averaged a little higher than incomes of those who were college employed. Respondents employed in non-educational positions tended to receive higher salaries than do those employed by educational institutions.

Table 35 shows the annual earned income of respondents employed in college positions according to their geographical location. The only respondent employed by institutions of higher learning who reported earning less than \$5,000 annually was in Oklahoma. Salaries for college employed respondents in Oklahoma were slightly lower on the average than for Texas,

TABLE 35

ANNUAL EARNED INCOME OF RESPONDENTS EMPLOYED IN COLLEGE
POSITIONS ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

Geographical Location	Annual Earned Income								Total Per No. Cent	
	\$4,000		\$6,000		\$8,000		\$12,000			
	to		to		to		or			
	5,999		7,999		11,999		more			
	Per		Per		Per		Per			
No. Cent	No. Cent	No. Cent	No. Cent	No. Cent	No. Cent	No. Cent	No. Cent			
Oklahoma	5	22.7	16	72.8	1	14.3			22	100.0
Texas	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3			7	100.0
Kansas			7	100.0					7	100.0
California			4	100.0					4	100.0
Other	2	14.3	3	21.4	7	50.0	2	14.3	14	100.0

Kansas, and California. Respondents employed in the 13 states included in the "other" group earned considerably more than those who resided in the four named states. Only two respondents employed in college positions earned \$12,000 or more annually.

Earned income of public-school employed respondents according to their geographical locations can be seen in Table 36. A wide range of annual earned income for respondents employed in Oklahoma public schools existed since the positions varied from classroom teachers to State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

TABLE 36

ANNUAL EARNED INCOME OF RESPONDENTS EMPLOYED
IN PUBLIC SCHOOL POSITIONS ACCORDING
TO GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION

Annual Earned Income	Geographical Location			
	Oklahoma	Texas	California	New Mexico
	No. Per Cent	No. Per Cent	No. Per Cent	No. Per Cent
\$ 4,000- 5,999	3 23.1	1 50.0		
6,000- 6,999	5 38.4			
7,000- 7,999	1 7.7	1 50.0	2 50.0	
8,000-11,999	3 23.1		2 50.0	2 100.0
12,000 or more	1 7.7			

Extent to Which Respondents Were
Satisfied with Their Positions

An attempt was made to discover how pleased the doctoral graduates were with the positions they held at the time this study was made. Respondents were asked to check one of the following degrees of satisfaction: (a) thoroughly satisfied, no desire to change jobs at this time; (b) satisfied but would consider a change; (c) somewhat dissatisfied, would change if I could; and (d) thoroughly dissatisfied. The five retired respondents were not included in the computation.

Table 37 presents the extent to which the respondents were satisfied with their jobs according to type of organization in which they were employed. Over one-half, 54.1 per cent, of the respondents were thoroughly satisfied with their jobs and 41.2 per cent were satisfied. Only 4.7 per cent were somewhat dissatisfied and no respondent was thoroughly dissatisfied. The graduates who were employed in colleges and public schools tended to be more thoroughly satisfied than those employed in other types of organizations.

Number of Organizations in Which Respondents
Have Been Employed

More than one-half of the respondents have been regularly employed in only one organization since receiving the doctoral degree in education as shown in Table 38. Of the 89 graduates for which information was available, 87.6 per cent had been employed in fewer than three educational and

TABLE 37

EXTENT TO WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE SATISFIED WITH
THEIR JOBS ACCORDING TO TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Extent of Satisfaction ^b	Type of Employment								Total Group N=85 ^a Per No. Cent	
	College N=54		Public School N=22		Government N=4		Others N=5			
	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent		
Thoroughly satisfied, no desire to change jobs at this time	32	59.2	11	50.0	1	25.0	2	40.0	46	54.1
Satisfied but would consider a change	21	38.9	10	45.4	3	75.0	1	20.0	35	41.2
Somewhat dissatisfied, would change if I could	1	1.9	1	4.6			2	40.0	4	4.7

^aThe five retired respondents were not included.

^bNo respondents reported thorough dissatisfaction.

TABLE 38

NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS HAVE BEEN
REGULARLY EMPLOYED SINCE RECEIVING THE DOCTORATE

Number of Organizations	Year Doctorate Was Received								Total Group	
	1931-41		1941-51		1952-55		1956			
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1	6	31.6	10	52.6	21	55.2	13	100.0	50	56.2
2	4	21.1	9	47.4	15	39.5			28	31.4
3	4	21.1			2	5.3			6	6.7
4	2	10.5							2	2.3
5	2	10.5							2	2.3
6	1	5.2							1	1.1
Total	19	100.0	19 ^a	100.0	38	100.0	13	100.0	89	100.0
Mean	2.6		1.5		1.5		1.0		2.2	

^aInformation was not available for one respondent.

non-educational organizations. The mean number of organizations in which respondents were regularly employed was 2.2. Summer sessions of employment were not included in the computations presented in Table 38.

CHAPTER IV

APPRAISAL OF THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM

The preceding chapters have related facts regarding some of the basic characteristics of the doctoral graduates in education and their professional experiences. This chapter is concerned principally with opinions and attitudes of the respondents regarding selected phases or aspects of their graduate program in education at the University of Oklahoma. No attempt is made to compare the relative importance of the various aspects of the program included here nor to evaluate the complete program.

The appraisal of different aspects of the graduate program by the respondents is described separately as well as in related groups. These various phases or aspects are not to be viewed as rigid divisions but as component parts of the total program.

Administration of the Doctoral Program

Selection and Admission

The respondents, in general, were satisfied with the method and procedure used in the selection and admission of

candidates to the doctoral program. Table 39 shows that 4.1 per cent of the respondents felt that the method of selection and admission of students to the program was very satisfactory; 56.6 per cent, satisfactory; and only 2.3 per cent, unsatisfactory. Of the 90 respondents, only two individuals, both employed in college positions, were dissatisfied with the admission and selection procedures, as shown in Table 40.

TABLE 39

SATISFACTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH THE METHOD USED IN
THE ADMISSION OF CANDIDATES TO THE DOCTORAL
PROGRAM BY YEAR DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED

Year Doctorate Was Received	Degree of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-41	10	52.6	8	42.1	1	5.3
1942-51	10	50.0	10	50.0		
1952-56	17	33.3	33	64.8	1	2.3
Total	37	41.1	51	56.6	2	2.3

Few respondents made comments concerning the admission and selection of candidates other than that they were pleased, but their constructive criticism is summarized in two following observations: "The first qualifying examination should come earlier in the program" and "I believe the

TABLE 40

SATISFACTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH METHOD USED IN
THE ADMISSION OF CANDIDATES TO THE DOCTORAL
PROGRAM BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Type of Employment	Degree of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College ^a	24	40.7	33	55.8	2	3.5
Public School	8	36.3	14	63.7		
Other	5	55.6	4	44.4		

^aFive retired respondents are included in the college group because they held college positions at the time of retirement.

Graduate Records Exam should be used." There was probably basis for this criticism as the selection procedure has undergone a change within the past five years. The qualifying examinations include the Graduate Records Examination¹ and it is given early in the candidate's program.

"A printed list of requirements, in the order in which they are to be satisfied" was the type of comment made by a few respondents. One individual said he was advised chiefly by other doctoral candidates as to requirements and

¹The Graduate Record Examinations (Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, n. d.).

"due dates" for completing certain requirements.

Advisement

Table 41 presents the amount of guidance the respondents felt they received during their graduate programs according to the year the doctorate was received. A large majority of the respondents reported they received all or almost all the help they needed. Seven of the respondents who received the doctorate between 1952 and 1956 were the only graduates to report they had "some" guidance. This might be accounted for by the fact that the number of doctoral graduates in education for that five-year period was only two fewer than the total for the 21 previous years.

TABLE 41

AMOUNT OF GUIDANCE RECEIVED BY RESPONDENTS
DURING THEIR DOCTORAL PROGRAMS ACCORDING
TO DATE OF GRADUATION

Date of Graduation	Amount of Guidance					
	All or Almost All That Was Needed		Considerable but Not Enough		Some	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-41	18	94.7	1	5.3		
1942-51	20	100.0				
1952-56	42	82.3	3	3.3	7	13.8
Total	80	88.9	4	3.3	7	7.8

The amount of guidance received by respondents according to their major fields of specialization is shown in Table 42. The areas of specialization which are selected by most of the graduates are the areas in which the respondents indicate they received only "some" guidance. This also shows that the number of students to be advised tends to affect the amount of guidance given to each individual.

TABLE 42

AMOUNT OF GUIDANCE RECEIVED BY RESPONDENTS
DURING THEIR DOCTORAL PROGRAMS ACCORDING
TO THEIR MAJOR FIELDS

Major Field	Amount of Guidance					
	All or Almost All That Was Needed		Considerable but not Enough		Some	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Ed. Adm.	26	92.8	1	3.6	1	3.6
Sec. Ed.	23	92.0			2	8.0
Elem. Ed.	6	54.5	2	18.2	3	27.3
Ed. Guid.	4	100.0				
Ed. Psych.	4	80.0			1	20.0
Bus. Ed.	12	100.0				
Health Ed.	3	100.0				
Ind. Ed.	2	100.0				

A considerable number of respondents who completed their graduate work after 1952 made comments as illustrated by the following: "Doctoral candidate's advisors are too busy--they need a reduced load to properly guide and advise dissertation work"; "The faculty members who bear the major responsibility of advisement should be given more time for advisement"; "the advisement program could be improved by allowing more time to professors who had doctoral candidates."

Library Facilities

An important part of any educational program is the library facilities. To appraise library facilities, the graduates were asked to indicate how well pleased they were with its various aspects. Because of the emphasis placed on the improvement of library facilities in recent years, only the 1952-56 respondents were considered.

The degree of satisfaction of the respondents who received the doctorate after 1951 is indicated in Table 43. A large majority of the respondents were satisfied or thoroughly satisfied with all four aspects of the library. The greatest dissatisfaction was with the file of back numbers of periodicals, as expressed by 10 respondents or 19.6 per cent.

Course Offerings

The University of Oklahoma, like most institutions, is constantly striving to improve the course offerings in

TABLE 43
SATISFACTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH VARIOUS
ASPECTS OF THE LIBRARY, 1952-56

Aspects of the Library	Degree of Satisfaction					
	Thoroughly Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Supply of Books	23	45.1	24	47.1	4	7.8
Supply of Periodicals	23	45.1	23	45.1	5	9.8
File of Back Numbers of Periodicals	18	37.3	22	43.1	10	19.6
Service	29	56.8	17	33.4	5	9.8

the various areas; therefore, courses offered have no doubt undergone many changes during the 26 years that are included in this study. Much of the work required for the doctorate is basically the same. The responses from the graduates concerning the satisfaction with quality and quantity of course offerings showed little difference when compared as to year the doctorate was received.

Table 44 reports the degree of satisfaction of respondents with the quantity of course offerings according to type of position in which they are employed. The college-employed respondents indicated the most dissatisfaction with

TABLE 44

SATISFACTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH THE QUANTITY
OF GRADUATE COURSE OFFERINGS ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Type of Employment	Degree of Satisfaction					
	Thoroughly Satisfied		Satisfied		Somewhat Dissatisfied	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College ^a	25	41.5	27	44.8	8	13.7
Public School	10	47.6	10	47.6	1	4.8
Others	3	33.3	6	66.7		
Total	38	42.2	43	47.8	9	10.0

^aFive retired respondents are included with college group since they were employed in college positions at the time of retirement.

13.7 per cent so reporting. Only one other respondent was somewhat dissatisfied. Of all respondents, 90 per cent were either satisfied or thoroughly satisfied with the quantity of course offerings.

Frequent opinions expressed by the respondents as to ways in which the course offerings were most satisfactory and commendable were: "enough courses were offered each semester to make planning a schedule reasonably easy"; "good variety and good instruction"; "a very wide selection was available"; "they met my interests and needs."

One respondent who held a full-time position at a near-by college during his doctoral study commented: "I was able to get the courses that would fit into my teaching assignment." Another respondent who was in his first year of college teaching stated: "Many courses were very functional: i.e., I can use them now."

Research Problem

The dissertation experience is generally considered one of the major segments in the doctoral program. This is shown by the proportion of the program which may be used for the research problem. One-third of the Doctor of Philosophy and one-sixth of the Doctor of Education programs may be devoted to a thesis problem. Although more emphasis seems to be placed on research in the Doctor of Philosophy degree program than in the program for the Doctor of Education, the only noticeable difference between the respondents was the nature of enrollment during the dissertation experiences. Data concerning the enrollment of the respondents according to the type of doctoral degree earned are presented in Table 45. Of the earlier graduates a larger per cent of Doctor of Philosophy respondents tended to attend full-time while the greater per cent of Doctor of Education respondents were enrolled part-time. Nearly three-fourths of all respondents completed their dissertation problems in absentia.

Table 46 shows the number and percent of respondents

TABLE 45

NATURE OF THE ENROLLMENT IN WHICH RESPONDENTS COMPLETED
THE DISSERTATION REQUIREMENT BY YEAR DOCTORATE
WAS CONFERRED AND TYPE OF DEGREE

Year Doctorate Was Received	Doctor of Education				Doctor of Philosophy				All Respondents			
	Full-time		Part-time or Absentia		Full-time		Part-time or Absentia		Full-time		Part-time or Absentia	
	Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent	
	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent	No.	Cent
1931-36	3	50.0	3	50.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	6	60.0	4	40.0
1937-41	1	16.7	5	83.3	1	33.3	2	66.7	2	22.2	7	77.8
1942-46	2	20.0	8	80.0					2	20.0	8	80.0
1947-51			10	100.0							10	100.0
1951-56	13	27.1	35	72.9	1	33.3	2	66.7	14	27.4	37	72.6
Total	19	23.7	61	76.3	5	50.0	5	50.0	24	26.7	66	73.3

TABLE 46

NATURE OF THE ENROLLMENT IN WHICH RESPONDENTS
COMPLETED THE DISSERTATION REQUIREMENT
BY MAJOR FIELDS

Major Field	Type of Enrollment			
	Full-time		Part-time or Absentia	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Ed. Adm.	11	40.7	17	59.3
Sec. Ed.	5	20.0	20	80.0
Elem. Ed.	4	36.4	7	63.6
Ed. Guid.			4	100.0
Ed. Psych.	2	40.0	3	60.0
Bus. Ed.	2	16.7	10	83.3
Health Ed.			3	100.0
Ind. Ed.			2	100.0
Total	24	26.7	66	73.3

in the various major fields to complete their dissertation in full-time attendance and part-time, or in absentia. Educational administration had the largest per cent of respondents to complete their thesis in full-time residence, with 40.7 per cent. The major fields which tend to attract public school employees also show a greater proportion who attend full-time. This may be influenced by what was shown in a

previous chapter, that more respondents who were employed in public school positions resign their jobs to complete the requirement for the doctorate than do college employed respondents.

The most frequently made suggestions as to how the dissertation experience may be made more valuable to the student were the following: (1) selection of a research problem earlier in the doctoral program, (2) more assistance from the advisor in selecting and identifying a worth-while problem, (3) additional instruction in educational research, and (4) hold regularly scheduled seminars for students who are working on dissertations.

Opinions of Respondents concerning Certain Characteristics of Graduate Study

The graduates included in this study were asked their opinions about certain abilities, attitudes, or understandings which many students develop in connection with their doctoral programs. The respondent was instructed to indicate the usefulness of each competency in terms of his present position. The extent of usefulness was measured by the following items: (1) essential if constantly used, (2) valuable if often used, and (3) unimportant if seldom used.

In Table 47 the characteristics of graduate education have been categorized into five areas related to: (1) professional development, (2) general educational development, (3) research, (4) administrative and professional relation-

ships, and (5) teaching. The opinions of the respondents as to the usefulness of these characteristics in terms of their present duties are expressed in per cent of usable responses. In this particular section, 13 questionnaires could not be used because of incompleteness, exclusion, and errors in execution. This elimination reduced the number of respondents included in Tables 47 and 48 to fifty who were college employed, 17 in public schools, and 10 in other types of occupations, for a total of 77 in all. State Department of Education officials and employees were classified with the "other" types of organizations due to the nature of their professional duties.

Abilities Related to Professional Development

Part A of Table 47 shows the opinions of respondents as to the usefulness of certain characteristics of graduate education which are related to professional development. Three of the five listed abilities considered valuable or essential by all college employed respondents were: extensive knowledge in your supporting fields, acquaintance with professional journals in field of specialization, and possession of a satisfying philosophy of education. A larger per cent of the respondents employed in public schools judged fewer abilities to be essential in their work than the other two groups. Only 1.3 per cent of all respondents felt a possession of a satisfying philosophy to be unimportant.

TABLE 47

OPINIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING THE USEFULNESS OF CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Characteristics of Graduate Education	Opinions as		
	Essential		
	College	Public School	Total Group

TABLE 47

OPINIONS CONCERNING THE USEFULNESS IN THEIR PRESENT POSITIONS OF CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Opinions as to Usefulness in Present Position								
Essential			Valuable			Unimportant		
College	Public School	Total Group	College	Public School	Total Group	College	Public School	Total Group

A. Abilities Related to Professional Development

1. Thorough understanding of major graduate field	84.0	58.8	72.8	te	84.0	58.8	72.8	12.0	35.3	22.1	4.0	5.9	5.2
2. Extensive knowledge in your supporting field(s)	64.0	41.2	55.9		64.0	41.2	55.9	36.0	52.9	40.3	0.0	5.9	3.9
3. Acquaintance with professional journals in field of specialization	76.0	58.8	68.9	s	76.0	58.8	68.9	24.0	35.3	27.3	0.0	5.9	3.9
4. Ability to serve as consultant on problems in major fields	62.0	52.9	61.1		62.0	52.9	61.1	36.0	35.3	33.8	2.0	11.8	5.2
5. Possession of a satisfying philosophy of education	84.0	82.3	78.0		84.0	82.3	78.0	16.0	17.6	20.8	0.0	0.0	1.3

B. Abilities and Knowledge Related to General Educational Development

1. Extensive knowledge in fields other than major or supporting fields	20.0	11.8	19.5	an	20.0	11.8	19.5	58.0	82.3	57.2	12.0	5.9	10.4
2. Reading knowledge of a foreign language	0.0	5.9	1.3	e	0.0	5.9	1.3	16.0	5.9	18.2	84.0	88.2	80.6
3. Ability to speak in public effectively	62.0	76.4	65.0		62.0	76.4	65.0	38.0	17.6	32.5	0.0	5.9	2.6

C. Abilities Related to Research

1. Ability to do research	50.0	41.2	49.4		50.0	41.2	49.4	40.0	47.0	40.3	10.0	11.8	10.4
2. Ability to supervise research programs	30.0	23.5	31.2		30.0	23.5	31.2	58.0	76.4	53.3	12.0	0.0	11.7

TABLE 47--Continued

TABLE 47--Continued

Characteristics of Graduate Education	Opinions as			Opinions as to Usefulness in Present Position								
	Essential			Essential			Valuable			Unimportant		
	College	Public School	Total Group	College	Public School	Total Group	College	Public School	Total Group	College	Public School	Total Group
<u>D. Administrative and Professional Relationships</u>												
1. Sense of professional obligation and ethics	92.0	82.3	84.5	92.0	82.3	84.5	8.0	17.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
2. Ability to work with others in professional endeavor	88.0	82.3	84.5	88.0	82.3	84.5	12.0	17.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	1.3
3. Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues	86.0	64.7	81.9	86.0	64.7	81.9	14.0	29.4	15.6	0.0	5.9	2.6
4. Skill in delegating work or responsibilities to others	58.0	70.6	62.4	58.0	70.6	62.4	42.0	11.8	32.5	0.0	17.6	5.2
5. Ability to appraise the professional contributions of others	54.0	52.9	53.3	54.0	52.9	53.3	46.0	41.2	45.5	0.0	5.9	1.3
<u>E. Abilities Related to Teaching</u>												
1. Ability to teach or train others	74.0	58.8	70.2	74.0	58.8	70.2	26.0	41.2	28.6	0.0	0.0	1.3
2. Ability to lead discussions effectively	66.0	76.4	70.2	66.0	76.4	70.2	34.0	17.6	28.6	0.0	5.9	1.3

Abilities and Knowledge Related to General Educational Development

The usefulness of characteristics related to general educational development is appraised by the respondents in part B of Table 47. The most nearly unanimous opinion of the respondents concerning the abilities in this section was in a negative direction. Of the college employed respondents, 84.0 per cent considered a reading knowledge of a foreign language to be unimportant, and 88.2 per cent of the public school group felt the same way. The ability in the general education division which was thought to be used constantly or most often was the ability to speak in public effectively.

Abilities Related to Research

Opinions of the respondents concerning the usefulness of abilities to supervise or to do research are presented in part C of Table 47. Fifty per cent of the college employed group and 41.2 per cent of the respondents who work in public schools felt the ability to do research was essential, while the same occupational groups had only 30.0 per cent and 23.5 per cent, respectively, who listed the ability to supervise research as essential.

Administrative and Professional Relationships

A sense of professional obligation and ethics, the ability to work with others in professional endeavor, and ~~the ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues were~~

ranked consistently more useful by all occupational groups than any other characteristics. Part D of Table 47 shows that these three characteristics were connected with administrative and professional relationships. Of the public school employed respondents, 17.6 per cent felt that skill in delegating work or responsibilities to others was unimportant in their present positions.

Abilities Related to Teaching

A smaller per cent of respondents considered abilities associated with teaching to be more essential than most other characteristics. This is shown in part E of Table 47. Since this study is of a select group of individuals concerned mainly with teaching and teacher-education, one might expect an extremely high per cent of respondents to consider these particular abilities essential in terms of their work. This apparently was a false assumption. Of the respondents who work in colleges, 74.0 per cent thought ability to teach or train others to be absolutely essential and only 66.0 considered the ability to lead discussions effectively to be as useful.

Opinions of Respondents concerning the Desirability of Acquiring Certain Characteristics during Graduate Study and the Quantity They Acquired

The respondents were asked to designate those characteristics which they felt should be acquired during graduate

study, regardless of whether they acquired them or not. The opinion of the graduate as to the extent to which he had developed these attitudes, abilities, and skills during his graduate work was also requested. The quantity acquired was indicated by: (1) much, (2) some, and (3) little or none.

Part A of Table 48 shows that all respondents felt that a thorough understanding of major graduate fields should be acquired during graduate study. The opinions of the respondents as to the amount they acquired varied considerably. While no college employed respondent felt he acquired little or none, 5.9 per cent of those employed in public schools thought they received little. The acquisition of ability to serve as consultant on problems in major fields was considered desirable by 87.1 per cent of all respondents but nearly one-fifth reported acquiring "little or none."

The characteristic that was least desirable by all groups was a reading knowledge of a foreign language, shown in section B, Table 48. Only 2.0 per cent of college employed and 5.9 per cent of public school employed respondents considered it desirable for the graduate program. Of all respondents, 72.8 per cent felt they acquired "little or none" foreign language. Part B also reveals that 90.0 per cent of the respondents employed on the college level and 82.3 per cent, respectively, felt they had acquired little or none.

TABLE 48

OPINIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING THE DESIRABILITY OF DEVELOPING
CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS DURING GRADUATE STUDY
AND THE QUANTITY THEY ACQUIRED

TABLE 48

OPINIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING THE DESIRABILITY OF DEVELOPING
CERTAIN CHARACTERISTICS DURING GRADUATE STUDY
AND THE QUANTITY THEY ACQUIRED

Characteristics	Opinion					Opinions Expressed in Per Cent											
	Desirable					Desirable		Acquired									
				College				College			Public School			Total Group			
	College	Public School	Total Group	Much	Some	Public School	Total Group	Much	Some	Little or None	Much	Some	Little or None	Much	Some	Little or None	
<u>A. Abilities Related to Professional Development</u>																	
1. Thorough understanding of major graduate field	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	22.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	22.0	0.0	64.7	29.4	5.9	76.7	22.1	1.3	
2. Extensive knowledge in your supporting field	96.0	88.2	94.9	72.0	28.0	88.2	94.9	72.0	28.0	0.0	47.0	52.9	0.0	68.9	31.2	0.0	
3. Acquaintance with professional journals in field of specialization	94.0	100.0	96.2	66.0	32.0	100.0	96.2	66.0	32.0	2.0	64.7	35.3	0.0	66.3	32.5	1.3	
4. Ability to serve as consultant on problems in major field	86.0	82.3	87.1	22.0	56.0	82.3	87.1	22.0	56.0	22.0	58.8	29.4	11.8	29.9	50.7	19.5	
5. Possession of a satisfying philosophy of education	94.0	88.2	92.3	54.0	44.0	88.2	92.3	54.0	44.0	2.0	58.8	41.2	0.0	55.9	40.3	3.9	
<u>B. Abilities and Knowledge Related to General Educational Development</u>																	
1. Extensive knowledge in fields other than major or supporting fields	40.0	58.8	45.5	12.0	58.0	58.8	45.5	12.0	58.0	20.0	11.8	76.4	11.8	18.2	61.1	19.5	
2. Reading knowledge of a foreign language	2.0	5.9	6.5	4.0	26.0	5.9	6.5	4.0	26.0	70.0	0.0	11.8	88.2	1.3	26.0	72.8	

TABLE 48--Continued

TABLE 48--Continued

Characteristics	Desirable			Opinion				Opinions Expressed in Per Cent								
	Desirable			Desirable				Acquired								
				College				College			Public School			Total Group		
	College	Public School	Total Group	Much	Some	Public School	Total Group	Much	Some	Little or None	Much	Some	Little or None	Much	Some	Little or None
3. Ability to speak in public effectively	90.0	82.3	88.4	10.0	56.0	82.3	88.4	10.0	56.0	34.0	17.6	47.0	35.3	16.9	48.1	35.1
<u>C. Abilities Related to Research</u>																
1. Ability to do research	92.0	88.2	89.7	56.0	44.0	88.2	89.7	56.0	44.0	0.0	47.0	52.9	0.0	55.9	41.6	2.6
2. Ability to supervise research programs	80.0	70.6	75.4	26.0	60.0	70.6	75.4	26.0	60.0	14.0	23.5	70.6	5.9	28.6	57.2	14.3
<u>D. Administrative and Professional Relationships</u>																
1. Sense of professional obligation and ethics	90.0	100.0	92.3	52.0	40.0	100.0	92.3	52.0	40.0	8.0	58.8	41.2	0.0	55.9	37.7	6.5
2. Ability to work with others in professional endeavor	92.0	88.2	91.0	50.0	40.0	88.2	91.0	50.0	40.0	10.0	52.9	47.0	0.0	49.4	42.9	7.8
3. Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues	100.0	100.0	100.0	58.0	34.0	100.0	100.0	58.0	34.0	8.0	47.0	41.2	11.8	50.7	41.0	7.8
4. Skill in delegating work or responsibilities to others	74.0	82.3	78.0	10.0	60.0	82.3	78.0	10.0	60.0	30.0	17.6	70.6	11.8	14.3	59.8	26.0
5. Ability to appraise the professional contributions of others	94.0	100.0	96.2	28.0	62.0	100.0	96.2	28.0	62.0	10.0	29.4	70.6	0.0	28.6	65.0	6.5
<u>E. Abilities Related to Teaching</u>																
1. Ability to teach or train others	84.0	88.2	84.5	40.0	50.0	88.2	84.5	40.0	50.0	10.0	17.6	70.6	11.8	36.4	49.4	14.3
2. Ability to lead discussions effectively	96.0	94.1	94.9	20.0	74.0	94.1	94.9	20.0	74.0	6.0	23.5	64.7	11.8	24.7	65.0	10.4

The ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues was thought to be desirable by all respondents, as shown in Table 48, Part D, but only 50.7 per cent of them felt they acquired much of the ability during their graduate program; 41.0 per cent acquired some and 7.8 per cent considered they developed the ability "little or none."

Part E of Table 48 shows that 84.5 per cent of all respondents considered the ability to teach as desirable to acquire in the graduate program yet 14.3 per cent reported they acquired "little or none," and 49.4 per cent reported they acquired "some." The ability to lead discussions effectively was reported to be acquired "much" by only 24.7 per cent of all the respondents.

Attitudes of Respondents toward Their
Major Fields and Attendance at
the University of Oklahoma

The attitudes of the respondents toward the University of Oklahoma and the graduate program in education are reflected somewhat in the answers given to the following question: "If you had your graduate program to do over, would you come to the University of Oklahoma?" The results of the question are shown in Table 49. A majority of the respondents appeared to be very well pleased with the University and the Graduate College.

Another question was asked: "If you had your graduate program to do over, would you select the same major

TABLE 49

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD RETURN
TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA FOR GRADUATE STUDY

Year Doctorate Was Received	Would Return		Would not Return		Uncertain	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-41	15	78.9			4	21.1
1942-51	17	85.0	2	10.0	1	5.0
1952-56	42	82.3	3	5.9	6	11.8
Total	74	82.2	5	5.6	11	12.2

TABLE 50

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD SELECT
THE SAME MAJOR FIELDS OF GRADUATE STUDY

Major Field	Would Select Same		Would not Select Same		Uncertain	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Ed. Adm.	22	78.5	5	17.9	1	3.6
Sec. Ed.	19	76.0	3	12.0	3	12.0
Elem. Ed.	9	81.8			2	18.2
Ed. Guid.	4	100.0				
Ed. Psych.	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0
Bus. Ed.	8	66.6	2	16.7	2	16.7
Health Ed.	3	100.0				
Ind. Ed.	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Total	69	76.7	12	13.3	9	10.0

fields?" The tabulated results are given in Table 50.

Slightly over three-fourths of the respondents would select the same major fields if they were starting their graduate study over again; 13.3 per cent stated that they would not take the same major fields; and 10 per cent were uncertain about it.

CHAPTER V

ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS TOWARD ASSISTANCE AND SERVICES PROVIDED THEM BY THE UNIVERSITY AFTER RECEIPT OF THE DOCTORATE

Services Provided by the University

The major services of a state university are naturally directed toward the schools and citizens of the state in which the university is located and by whom it is supported. There is also a measure of responsibility for an institution to furnish services to the students it trains. This obligation is accepted by the University of Oklahoma. However, as in most large institutions, there seem to be no definite lines marking the divisions of responsibilities for the various departments and agencies. According to the University of Oklahoma Bulletin, the University Employment Service of which placement service is a part, "provides . . . a centralized record and referral service for alumni and former students."¹ In another section of the same bulletin, the

¹University of Oklahoma Bulletin, Catalog Issue for 1955-56 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, June 15, 1956), p. 45.

following is stated:

The College of Education, co-operating with the Teacher Placement Division of the University Employment Service, assists qualified students in locating and securing teaching positions. This service is available, also to alumni and other former students.¹

Who then accepts the responsibility of securing positions for the University trained teachers, whether they receive a bachelor's degree, master's degree, or doctor's degree? There is no organized department in the College of Education for such a purpose; therefore, only incidental assistance could be expected from the College of Education. Considerable help in placing doctoral graduates is furnished by individual faculty members when they learn of an existing vacancy. The Placement Office maintains a file of requests for personnel sent to them by institutions in need of teachers which may be used by graduates who are registered. Little organized effort seems to be made in assisting doctoral graduates in education to achieve professional promotion. Graduates may be aided in obtaining better positions without knowledge of who assisted them. If that happens to be the case, then to promote good relationship between alumni and the institution, some procedure should be devised to inform the graduates of the efforts put forth by the University.

Practically the only service mentioned by the respondents dealt with securing a position of professional promotion. Many respondents, most of whom were employed outside of

Oklahoma, commented about the lack of interest the University has taken in their professional well-being. One out-of-state respondent stated: "This is the first time the University has contacted me and showed an interest in what has happened to me." The opinions and attitudes of the respondents concerning the services and assistance provided them by the University will be presented in this chapter.

Assistance toward Achieving Professional Success

Table 51 shows the opinions of respondents concerning the quantity of assistance toward achieving professional success they have received from the University of Oklahoma. Generally speaking, they express a wide range of opinions. Very little difference exists between the period in which the doctorate was conferred except for the one year of 1956. The respondents who had been in the "field" less than one year were the most critical of the help provided. There seemed to be a vast difference of opinion in the feelings by the respondents about the help received. Only a small per cent in each period felt they had received "considerable, but not as much as expected" or "some help," while the two extremes, "all or almost all that was expected" and "little or none," had large percentages.

An explanation for some of the negative feeling toward the assistance provided by the University may be seen in Table 52. Of the 90 respondents, less than one-half are

TABLE 51

OPINIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING THE AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE
TOWARD ACHIEVING PROFESSIONAL SUCCESS THEY
RECEIVED FROM THE UNIVERSITY

Year Doctorate Was Received	Quantity of Assistance							
	All or Almost All That Was Expected		Considerable but not as Much as Was Expected		Some		Little or None	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-41 N=15	8	53.3			1	6.6	6	40.0
1942-51 N=19	9	47.3	1	5.3	1	5.3	8	42.1
1952-55 N=38	18	47.3	3	7.9	4	10.6	13	44.2
1956 N=11	3	27.3	1	9.1	1	9.1	6	54.5
Total	38	45.7	5	6.1	7	8.5	33	30.7

TABLE 52

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REGISTERED
WITH THE UNIVERSITY PLACEMENT OFFICE IN 1956
ACCORDING TO YEAR DOCTORATE WAS RECEIVED

Year Doctorate Was Received	Registered ^a with University Placement Office		Not Registered with University Placement Office	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1931-41	2	10.5	17	89.5
1942-51	8	40.0	12	60.0
1952-55	23	60.5	15	39.5
1956	10	76.0	3	23.0
Total	43	47.7	47	52.3

^aInformation concerning the active or inactive status of the registrant was not available.

registered with the University Placement Office. Registering with the Placement Office is an individual responsibility and the respondents have little reason for criticism if they have not done so.

The number and proportion of respondents of the 1952-56 group who were registered with the University Placement Office according to type of employment is shown in Table 53. The college employed respondents constituted the largest per cent registered with 65.8. Approximately one-half of the public school employed respondents and other occupational

TABLE 53

NUMBER AND PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE REGISTERED
WITH THE UNIVERSITY PLACEMENT OFFICE IN 1956
ACCORDING TO TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT, 1952-56

Type of Employment	Registered with University Placement Office		Not Registered with University Placement Office	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
College	25	65.8	11	34.2
Public School	6	54.5	5	45.5
Other	2	50.0	2	50.0

groups were registered.

Table 54 reveals the number of years since contact about employment was made between respondents and the University Placement Office. There exists little difference in the length of time which elapsed since either of these agencies made contact with each other. Six of the 23 respondents who were recipients of the doctorate between 1952 and 1955 report that the Placement Office has never made contact with them concerning employment, although they are registered with the office.

The number of positions respondents have obtained or been offered through the active help of the University Placement and the College of Education faculty members are

TABLE 54

NUMBER OF YEARS SINCE CONTACT WAS MADE BETWEEN RESPONDENTS
AND UNIVERSITY PLACEMENT OFFICE

Years since Contact Was Made	Respondent Made Contact with Placement Office				Placement Office Made Contact with Respondent			
	31-41 N=2	42-51 N=8	52-55 N=23	1956 N=10	31-41 N=2	42-51 N=8	52-55 N=23	1956 N=10
Less than 2	1	2	11	9	1	2	8	7
More than 2 but less than 5		2	7	1		1	6	2
More than 5 but less than 10		1	3			3	2	
More than 10		1	1			1	1	
Never	1	2	1		1	1	6	1

N=Number registered with the University Placement Office.

TABLE 55

NUMBER OF POSITIONS RESPONDENTS HAVE OBTAINED
OR BEEN OFFERED THROUGH THE ACTIVE^a
HELP OF THE UNIVERSITY

From Whom Help Was Received	Prior to 1952 ^b					1952 to 1956, incl.				
	Number of Positions					Number of Positions				
	0	1	2	3	4 or more	0	1	2	3	4 or more
University Placement Office ^c	31	2			1	34	8	3	2	4
College of Education Faculty Members	28	4			2	37	3	4	1	6

^aRespondents were asked not to include as active their listing of an individual as a reference unless it was significant to his being offered a position. They were also asked not to include the sending of credentials by the placement office at the respondent's request as active help.

^bInformation was not supplied by five respondents.

^cOnly 10 respondents reported that they were registered with the University Placement Office in 1956.

listed in Table 55. The respondents who received the doctorate between 1952-56 seem to have profited more than other groups in its relation with the University Placement Office and the College of Education. A large majority of the respondents report they have been offered no positions through the active help of the Placement Office or the College of Education. Of the respondents who received the doctorate

TABLE 56

NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENTS HAVE REQUESTED THE
UNIVERSITY PLACEMENT OFFICE TO SEND THEIR
CREDENTIALS TO PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYERS

Estimated Number of Times Sent	Year Doctorate Was Conferred	
	Prior to 1952 Number of Respondents	1952 to 1956, incl. Number of Respondents
0	25 ^a	17 ^b
1	1	6
2	5	6
3	2	9
4	2	5
5		4
6 or more	2	4
Total	37 ^a	51 ^b

^aOnly 10 respondents reported that they were registered with the University Placement Office in 1956 (see Table 55).

^bOnly 33 respondents reported that they were registered with the University Placement Office in 1956 (see Table 55).

prior to 1952, 31 report no help from the Placement Office and 28 report no help from the College of Education. Of the 51 respondents who received the doctor's degree between 1952 and 1956, 34 report no help from the Placement Office and 37 report no help from the College of Education.

In Table 56 is shown the number of times the respondents estimated that they had requested the Placement Office to send their credentials to prospective employers. Those who are registered have availed themselves of this service quite often.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this follow-up study were (1) to discover what has happened to the graduates professionally since receiving the doctorate in education from the University of Oklahoma, (2) to make available information concerning the educational and professional background of these doctoral graduates, (3) to determine what strengths and weaknesses the graduates identify in their programs of doctoral study, and (4) to ascertain in what ways, in the opinion of doctoral graduates, the University has been of assistance to them in achieving professional success since the doctorate was granted.

Summary

Personnel Included in the Study

Personnel reported on in this study included not only the 90 respondents to a questionnaire, but all recipients of the doctoral degree in education when information was available for them. This study was not intended to be a complete evaluation of the graduate education program at the University

of Oklahoma. The data are mainly the opinions of respondents to a questionnaire sent to the 134 individuals who have received either the degree of Doctor of Education or Doctor of Philosophy with a major in education from the University of Oklahoma through the year 1956. Additional data were obtained from records in the various offices of the University.

Characteristics of Doctoral Graduates in Education

From the time the first doctorate in education was conferred by the University of Oklahoma in 1931 through 1956, 87.3 per cent of the degrees were Doctor of Education and 12.7 per cent were Doctor of Philosophy. Nearly one-half of these 134 doctoral degrees were received during the five-year period 1952-56. Twenty women and 114 men have received the doctorate in education from the University.

Ten areas of specialization had been selected as major fields by the recipients. Educational administration and secondary education were major fields of specialization for 72 per cent of the doctoral graduates. Prior to 1952 only six areas of specialization were selected while 10 were used for major fields between 1952 and 1956.

The age of the graduates on receipt of the doctorate ranged from 28 years to 62 years and the median age was 41. The median age at graduation of those who received the doctorate prior to 1952 was 42 years and of the 1952-56 graduates the median age was 40 years. One-fourth of the graduates

were between 40 and 44 years of age at the time the doctorate was conferred; nearly one-fifth of them were from 45 to 49 years of age; 15 per cent, 50 years or older; and 41.7 per cent, under 40 years.

The subjects included in this investigation came from high schools in 22 states and one foreign country; however, over one-half of them attended Oklahoma high schools. Nearly two-thirds of the recipients earned their bachelor's degree at 14 Oklahoma institutions. The University of Oklahoma awarded bachelor's degrees to 26 or 18.9 per cent of them while 50 or 36.2 per cent had earned the first degree at institutions in 19 other states. The 83 doctorates who also earned their master's degrees at the University of Oklahoma constituted 61.5 per cent of the recipients. This means that nearly two-thirds of the doctoral graduates earned practically all of their graduate education at the University.

Most of the graduates had a rich background of teaching experience prior to receipt of the doctorate. Only one person had no teaching experience before he received the doctor's degree and five had only one year of such experience. Records revealed that slightly less than one-half of the doctoral graduates had previously taught in both college and public schools.

Two-thirds of the respondents were employed by colleges and universities in their initial positions after receiving the doctoral degree. Educational work constituted

90 per cent of the first positions after receipt of the doctorate for the respondents and 6 per cent were employed by the federal government. Of the respondents who received the doctorate between 1931 and 1941, 72.7 per cent held their post-doctorate positions before or during their graduate work but of those who received the doctorate between 1952 and 1956 less than one-half did.

In 1956, 60 per cent of the respondents were employed in college positions and 24.5 per cent in public schools. Of the respondents who received the doctorate before 1947, 41.4 per cent were currently employed in institutions of higher learning and 31.1 in public schools.

More than one-half of the respondents have been regularly employed in only one organization since receiving the doctorate. The mean number of institutions and other organizations in which respondents were regularly employed was 2.2. Only 12.4 per cent of the respondents have changed places of employment more than two times.

The respondents were located in 17 states and Alaska in 1956. Slightly less than one-half were living in Oklahoma. Thirteen of the respondents were employed in Oklahoma public schools and 22 of them in Oklahoma colleges. Only 4 of the 85 currently employed respondents were somewhat dissatisfied with their positions while 81 were satisfied or thoroughly satisfied.

Respondents' Opinions Concerning the
Graduate Education Program

The respondents, generally, were well pleased with their graduate study at the University of Oklahoma. There were, however, some criticisms directed at various parts of the doctoral program which appear to be worthy of careful consideration.

Only 2 respondents, both of them college employed, were critical of the method used in selection and admission of candidates for doctoral study. Satisfaction with the admission procedure was expressed by 97.7 per cent of the responding graduates.

Ten of the 11 respondents who felt they had not received enough guidance were in the doctoral program after 1952. Respondents who had selected elementary education as their major fields were least satisfied with the amount of guidance they received. Of those in elementary education, 18.2 per cent expressed "considerable but not enough," and 27.3 per cent expressed "some" guidance.

Dissatisfaction with the files of back numbers of periodicals were expressed by one-fifth of the respondents who received the doctorate after 1952, while less than 10 per cent of the same group were somewhat dissatisfied with other aspects of the library.

Most of the respondents were satisfied with the quantity and quality of courses they had in their graduate study.

"Somewhat dissatisfied" was reported by 13.7 per cent of the college employed respondents and 4.8 per cent of those employed in public schools. Comments made by many of the respondents were highly complimentary as to the quality of instruction.

A considerable number of respondents considered their dissertation experience a valuable one. Many respondents felt that their advisors and committees had been very helpful with the research problems. Others wished for more help in selection and identification of a dissertation problem. Beginning the research problem earlier in the program was the most frequent suggestion for improving the experience.

Respondents' Opinions Concerning Certain Characteristics of Graduate Education

Competencies considered most essential and valuable to the respondents in their present positions were those associated with administrative and professional relationships, teaching, and professional development. Knowledge and abilities related to general educational development and research were not felt to be as important as the others. The reading knowledge of a foreign language was considered unimportant by 84.0 per cent of the college employed respondents and 88.2 per cent of those working in public schools. The amount of foreign language acquired by the respondents during graduate study was "much," 1.3 per cent; "some," 26.0 per cent; and "little or none," 72.8 per cent.

The ability to speak effectively in public was felt to be unimportant by only 2.6 per cent of the respondents and was considered desirable to perfect in graduate study by 88.4 per cent. However, 35.1 per cent reported they improved "little or none"; 48.1 per cent, "some"; and only 17.9 per cent, "much."

Attitudes toward Their Graduate Study

Most of the respondents apparently were well pleased with graduate study at the University of Oklahoma. Of the 90 respondents, 82.2 per cent reported they would return to the University of Oklahoma if they had to repeat graduate study; 12.2 per cent were uncertain; and only 5.6 per cent would not return.

The percentage of respondents who would select the same major fields if they had their graduate program to do over was 76.7 per cent; 10 per cent, uncertain; and 13.3 per cent would not select the same fields.

Assistance toward Achieving Professional Success

Some respondents expressed considerable disappointment at the lack of concern they feel the University has shown for their professional success since receiving the doctorate. No doubt some of the responsibility for the lack of help must be accepted by the graduate. Over one-half of the respondents reported that they had not received "all or

almost all" the help that was expected and 30.7 per cent of this group felt they had received "little or no" assistance. Part of this feeling may be explained in the fact that only 47.7 per cent of the respondents were registered with the University Placement Office; however, many of those who were dissatisfied were also registered with the Placement Office.

Of the respondents who received the doctorate prior to 1952, 31 reported receiving no help from the Placement Office in obtaining or being offered a position; 28 felt that the College of Education had been of no assistance in securing employment. Of those who received the doctorate between 1952 and 1956, 34 said they had not obtained or been offered a position through the help of the Placement Office, while 37 had received no positions through the help of the College of Education.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings presented in this study, the following conclusions appear to be warranted:

1. A large majority of the doctoral candidates earned the Doctor of Education degree and relatively few Doctor of Philosophy degrees with a major in education were conferred. Only a very small per cent of doctoral graduates in education were women.

2. An indication that plans for pursuing the doctorate in education were decided upon by the recipients after

considerable experience in teaching and that much of the work was earned in summer sessions and part-time enrollment is shown by the following: the median age at receipt of the doctorate was 41 years; the median time which elapsed between receipt of the bachelor's degree and the doctor's degree was 16 years; the median number of years teaching experience was 14 years.

3. Although 54.5 per cent of the recipients of the doctorate after 1952 received their master's degree from the University of Oklahoma, it is a marked decrease from the number who received the doctorate prior to 1952. The proportion of recipients who received the doctorate between 1952 and 1956 and who attended Oklahoma high schools increased considerably over the previous years. Nearly two-thirds of the doctoral graduates had practically all of their graduate work at the University of Oklahoma.

4. Over one-half of the candidates for the doctorate had experience teaching both in college and in public schools prior to receipt of the doctoral degree. Of the 134 graduates, 87.3 per cent taught in public schools and 69.4 per cent taught on the college level prior to receipt of the doctorate.

5. A majority of the graduates were initially employed in college or university positions after they received the doctor's degree. A larger proportion of the respondents ~~who graduated after 1951 were employed in college positions~~

than those who received the doctorate earlier.

6. A large majority of the doctoral graduates were engaged in educational work, primarily administrative and teaching. Only 10 per cent of the respondents were employed by organizations other than public schools and colleges. Of the 54 who were employed in college positions in 1956, 17.8 per cent were teaching in one of their supporting fields.

7. Approximately one-half of the graduates were employed in Oklahoma, chiefly in Oklahoma colleges. The others were located in 16 states and Alaska, with the greatest concentration in Texas, California, and Kansas.

8. In general, the respondents were satisfied with the various aspects of their graduate programs of study at the University of Oklahoma.

9. Characteristics of the graduate program which respondents reported as being most useful to them in their work were abilities related to professional development, administrative professional relationships, and abilities related to teaching.

10. A reading knowledge of a foreign language was reported to be unimportant in their present positions by 80.6 per cent of the respondents. The only other characteristics which were not considered essential in terms of their present positions by at least one-half of the respondents were (1) extensive knowledge in fields other than major or

supporting fields, (2) ability to do research, and (3) ability to supervise research programs.

11. Ability to speak in public effectively was considered to be useful in present positions and desirable on their graduate programs by a large majority, yet only a small per cent acquired much during their doctoral program.

12. Apparently little assistance in obtaining employment and promotions has been given the graduates by the University. Most of the graduates who needed help report they have received "little or none" from the University.

Recommendations

In view of the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed in connection with the doctoral program of study at the University of Oklahoma:

1. That the Graduate College carefully examine the value to the student in satisfying certain deficiencies for "full graduate standing" after the bachelor's or master's degrees have been awarded. It is especially recommended that the foreign language requirement be abolished unless it is directly related to the candidate's field of interest.

2. That increased attention be given to the importance of doctoral graduates being proficient in public speaking.

3. That more time be provided for advisement of candidates by considering the number of doctoral advisees in

determining faculty load.

4. That the doctoral candidate be permitted to select and begin the dissertation problem earlier in his doctoral program.

5. That consideration be given to making the tools of research a functional part of the dissertation experience.

6. That attention and consideration be given to more thorough evaluation of the course offerings with a view to making them more meaningful to doctoral students and decreasing the possibility of overlapping and duplication of materials.

7. That preparation for college teaching be considered a primary function of the doctoral program.

8. That the College of Education and the University Placement Office be more closely co-ordinated to assist the doctoral graduate in securing professional employment and promotions.

9. That an appropriate department of the University be charged with the responsibility of carrying on a continuous follow-up of doctoral graduates in an effort to assist them in achieving professional success after they leave the University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Eckert, Ruth E. Outcomes of General Education: An Appraisal of the General College Program. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

Eckert, Ruth E., and Keller, Robert J. A University Looks at Its Program. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Edwards, Marcia. A Report to the Carnegie Foundation. Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1944.

Hollis, Ernest V. Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1945.

Klapper, Paul. College Teaching. New York: World Book Company, 1920.

Pace, C. Robert. They Went to College. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1941.

Pressey, Sidney L. Research Adventures in University Teaching. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1927.

Starr, Richard J. The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Troyer, Maurice E., and Pace, C. Robert. Evaluation in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

West, Leonard J. College and the Years After. New York: Board of Higher Education, College of the City of New York, 1952.

Bulletins and Monographs

- Frazier, Benjamin W. Teacher Training 1926-1928 (Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 17). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1929.
- Hutchinson, Emilie J. Women and the Ph.D. (The North Carolina College for Women Bulletin No. 2). Greensboro, N.C.: The North Carolina College for Women, December, 1929.
- Kelly, Fred J. Toward Better College Teaching (Federal Security Agency, Office of Education Bulletin No. 13). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950.
- Martin, Charles W. The Training of College Teachers (Bulletin of the Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Vol. XXXI). Kirksville, Missouri: Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, December, 1931.
- University of Oklahoma Bulletin, Catalog Issue for 1955-56. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, June 15, 1956.
- University of Oklahoma Bulletin, Issue for the Graduate College for 1956-57. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, September, 1956.
- Woody, Clifford. Requirements for the Degrees of Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Doctor of Education (The National Society of College Teachers of Education Monograph I). Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Ann Arbor Press, 1947.

Articles and Periodicals

- Blegen, Theodore C. "Graduate Schools and the Education of College Teachers," Educational Record, XXVIII (January, 1948), pp. 12-25.
- Bowden, A. O. "Quo Vadis, Ph.D.?" Journal of Education, CIX (June, 1929), pp. 671-674.
- Eckert, Ruth E. "A New Design for the Training of College Teachers," Junior College Journal, XVIII (September, 1947), pp. 25-33.
- Eckert, Ruth E. "Graduate Students in Education," in A University Looks at Its Program, ed. Ruth E. Eckert and Robert J. Keller (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954), Chapter 19, pp. 169-175.

- Fleege, Urban H. "The Program of General Education and the Graduate School," Journal of General Education, III (October, 1948), pp. 26-33.
- Haggerty, M. E. "The Professional Training of College Teachers," The North Central Association Quarterly, II (June, 1927), pp. 108-123.
- Haggerty, M. E. "Occupational Destination of Ph.D. Recipients," Educational Record, IX (October, 1928), pp. 209-218.
- Kidd, Rex C. "Improving Preservice Education of Undergraduate College Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, III (March, 1952), pp. 53-57.
- Lee, Charles A. "Requirements for the D.Ed. and Ph.D. Degrees," Educational Forum, XIV (May, 1950), pp. 449-452.
- Mitzel, Harold E., and Keller, Robert J. "A Follow-up Study of Minnesota Ph.D.'s: Their General Characteristics," in A University Looks at Its Program, ed. Ruth E. Eckert and Robert J. Keller (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954), Chapter 18, pp. 157-168.
- Pace, C. Robert. "Preparation of College Teachers," Review of Educational Research, XIX (June, 1949), pp. 230-234.
- Pressey, Sidney L. "Some Data on the Doctorate," Journal of Higher Education, XV (April, 1944), pp. 191-197.
- Quanbeck, Martin. "A Study of the Alumni of Ten Minnesota Colleges," Journal of Teacher Education, IV (December, 1953), pp. 295-299.
- Sewall, J. I. "Toward Better Graduate Education," Journal of General Education, II (October, 1947), pp. 45-52.
- Speight, Harold E. B. "Who Shall Train the College Teacher?" Journal of Higher Education, XIV (February, 1943), pp. 91-96.
- Stoke, Harold W. "Some Observations on Graduate Study," Journal of Higher Education, XXV (June, 1954), pp. 287-291.
- Umstattd, J. G. "Courses on College Teaching," Journal of Higher Education, XXV (February, 1954), pp. 76-113.

Walters, Raymond. "Statistics of Attendance in American Universities and Colleges, 1948," School and Society, LX (December, 1948), pp. 419-430.

Weigle, Richard D. "Record of St. John's Graduates, 1937-52," School and Society, LXXVI (July 5, 1952), pp. 5-9.

White, Lucien. "What's Wrong with the Ph.D. Language Requirement?" Journal of Higher Education, XXV (March, 1954), pp. 150-152.

Unpublished Material

Aberle, John Wayne. "An Evaluation of a College's Curriculum in Business." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

Briggs, Edward. "A Follow-up Study of a Group of University of Wisconsin Graduates Ten Years after Graduation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1953.

Chatburn, Cecil Handy. "An Evaluation of the Program of Boise Junior College by Its Graduates." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, State College of Washington, 1956.

Clark, Selby G. "A Study of Doctoral Programs in Schools of Education in the United States." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, State College of Washington, 1953.

Clements, William Howard. "Relationship of Selected Characteristics of Graduate Students to Later Success." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1955.

Emery, Clifton W. "A Follow-up Study of Doctoral Graduates in Student Personnel Administration at Teachers College." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1950.

Garrison, Lloyd Lee. "Study of Doctoral Graduates in Education, University of Missouri." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1951.

Harris, Kenneth Earl. "A Five Year Occupational History of the 1947 Class of Stanford Graduates." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

- Hobkirk, James S. "A Follow-up Service of Teacher Education Institutions." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1951.
- Isle, Walter W. "The Stanford University Follow-up Inquiry: A Study of Stanford's Teacher Preparation Services." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1942.
- Kaske, Erma. "An Evaluation of the Curriculum through the Graduates of the College." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1951.
- McIntosh, Stephen Blake. "A Follow-up Study of Selected Registrants in the Bureau of Educational Placement at Indiana University with Special Emphasis Directed toward the Non-teaching Group." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Indiana, 1954.
- McLeish, John A. B. "A Study of Doctoral Programs in Education in New York State." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1952.
- McNaughton, Daniel Charles. "An Evaluation of the Teacher-Education Program of the Stanford School of Education." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1942.
- Quanbeck, Martin. "A Study of Teacher Education in the Lutheran Colleges of Minnesota Based on a Follow-up of Graduates." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1953.
- Reed, Glenn A. "Criticisms of the American Graduate School, 1900-1945." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1950.
- Roblee, Dana Bush. "A Career-line Study of the Professorship in Teacher Education Institutions." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1956.
- Russell, Karl A., Jr. "A Study of Teacher Placement in One Hundred Seventy-two Education Institutions." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Indiana, 1951.
- Sharpe, Donald M. "A Follow-up Study of Former Graduate Students of the College of Education, University of Illinois." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1949.

Smith, Richard Avery. "Maturity of Education as a Profession." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1956.

Sponberg, Harold Eugene. "A Study of the Organization and Administration of the Teacher Placement Services in Ten Selected Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State College, 1952.

Stewart, Cecil Claire. "A Follow-up Investigation of a Group of Junior College Graduates." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1942.

Vilhauer, Marie C. "A Study of Doctoral Teacher-Education as It Relates to the School Experiences of Men and Women Graduates Who Earned Doctorates in the School of Education of New York University during the Period 1935-1943." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1954.

Wentz, George. "A Study of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in Institutions of Higher Learning in the United States." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Houston, 1954.

Other Sources

The Graduate Record Examinations. Princeton: N.J.: Educational Testing Service, n.d.

APPENDIX

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman, Oklahoma

May 3, 1957

I am making a study of graduates who have received from the University of Oklahoma the degrees of Doctor of Education and Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Education. This study will include the 134 Doctor's degrees in Education that have been conferred by the University from 1931 through 1956. A response from each of you is very important. The information that you provide will enable the University to be of greater assistance to its doctoral graduates and students.

The first page, which will provide the only personal identification included in the questionnaire, will be detached as soon as it is returned. The other sections of the inventory will be identified by code number only. The data will be combined and used statistically so that the identity of no individual will be revealed in the study. Information from the first page will be used in the compilation of a directory and in the study of inventory responses in relation to these characteristics.

You will be sent a copy of the directory which will be compiled from the information received. Your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Clarence C. Clark, Instructor
College of Education

POST CARD REMINDER

College of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
May 22, 1957

Dear Dr. _____:

Over 60% have responded to the "Study of Doctoral Graduates in Education, University of Oklahoma."

We are eager to have your reaction included in this study and to have your correct address listed in the directory to be distributed to the graduates. Won't you please complete and return the questionnaire sent you recently?

Sincerely,

C. C. Clark
Instructor in Education

PERSONAL HISTORY BLANK FOR A STUDY OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
DOCTORAL GRADUATES WITH MAJORS IN EDUCATION
1931-56

INSTRUCTIONS: Please furnish the following information for a directory and for a study of Doctoral Graduates in Education at the University of Oklahoma. The directory will include Ed. D. and Ph. D. degrees in Education conferred by the University of Oklahoma from 1931 through 1956.

- Mr.
A. Name: Mrs. _____
Miss (Last Name) (First Name) (Middle Name)
(A married woman should also indicate her maiden name)
- B. Address: _____
(Street or P.O. Box) (City) (State)
- C. Educational History:
- (a) Doctorate Major Fields: 1 _____
2 _____ 3 _____
- (b) Master's Degree: 1. Major _____
2. Minor _____
- (c) Bachelor's Degree: 1. Major _____
2. Minor _____
- D. Has your thesis been published in whole or in part?
(a) Yes (whole) _____ No _____
(b) (part) _____
(c) Where? _____
- E. From what position did you resign or take leave to complete your last work in residence; or what position did you hold if you were employed full time during your last work in residence?
- (a) Employer: _____
(Institution, School, or Firm)
- (b) Address: _____
(City) (State)
- (c) Inclusive Dates: _____
- (d) Title of Position: _____
- (e) Resigned: _____ Leave of absence: _____
Held full-time employment: _____

Please describe below your employment record since receiving the Doctor's degree:

F. Present Position.

- (a) Title of Position: _____
(b) Employer: _____
(Institution, School, or Firm)
(c) Date begun: _____

G. Other Positions Held Since Receiving Doctor's Degree.

- (a) Title of Position (b) Employer (c) Inclusive Dates

H. Please list below all books and other publications of yours since receiving the Doctor's degree. (Attach bibliography if convenient.)

- (a) Books, monographs, pamphlets: _____

- (b) Articles in periodicals including reviews: _____

- (c) Editing: _____

SURVEY OF UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA DOCTORAL GRADUATES

WITH MAJORS IN EDUCATION, 1931-56

The information requested in the following items will be treated confidentially. Personal information from the preceding section will be used only in coded form and detached from this section before responses are summarized. Hence, please omit your name and personal references from this section of the inquiry. Please consider each question thoughtfully and state your opinions frankly. Only in this way will your responses contribute to a better understanding of strengths and weaknesses of the graduate programs in education. Most items can be answered with a check (✓) or a brief phrase, but additional comments are most welcome.

I. Characteristics of Your Employment

The usefulness of graduate education naturally depends in part upon its relation to positions subsequently held. Hence, some facts about the nature of your first and present positions are needed to interpret your responses. (If you are unemployed or a full-time housewife, answer only items 1, 4, 5, and 6 in this section.)

1. Employment Status. Check (✓) the phrase which best describes your present employment status.

- ☐ a. Employed full time.
- ☐ b. Employed part time. ☐ % of full time.
- ☐ c. Retired, not seeking employment.
- ☐ d. Unemployed temporarily.
- ☐ e. Unemployed because of physical reasons.
- ☐ f. Full-time housewife.
- ☐ g. Other. Please specify: _____

2. Earned Income. Check (✓) the interval which includes your present annual income from your job or profession. Include salary, consultation work, royalties and fees received for professional or technical services.

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. Less than \$3,000. | <input type="checkbox"/> f. \$7,000 to \$7,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. \$3,000 to \$3,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> g. \$8,000 to \$8,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. \$4,000 to \$4,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> h. \$9,000 to \$11,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. \$5,000 to \$5,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> i. \$12,000 to \$14,999. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. \$6,000 to \$6,999. | <input type="checkbox"/> j. \$15,000 or more. |

3. Type of Present Employment. Check (✓) the type of your present employment.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. College or University. | Government or public service: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Public school system | <input type="checkbox"/> f. Municipal. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Private elementary or secondary school. | <input type="checkbox"/> g. State. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Business or industry. | <input type="checkbox"/> h. Federal. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. Private practice. | <input type="checkbox"/> i. Other. Please specify: _____ |

4. Job Satisfaction. How well pleased are you with your present position? Check (✓) below.

- ☐ a. Thoroughly satisfied. No desire to change jobs at this time.
- ☐ b. Satisfied but would consider a change.
- ☐ c. Somewhat dissatisfied. Would change if I could.
- ☐ d. Thoroughly dissatisfied.

5. Type of First Employment after Receiving the Doctor's degree. Check (✓) the type of your first employment after receiving the Doctor's degree and list the position you held.

- ☐ a. College or University. _____
- ☐ b. Public school system. _____
- ☐ c. Private elementary or secondary school. _____
- ☐ d. Business or industry. _____
- ☐ e. Private practice. _____
- ☐ f. Government or public service. _____
- ☐ g. Other. Please specify. _____

II. Evaluation of Your Doctoral Program

In this section you are asked to evaluate the doctoral program you completed at the University of Oklahoma. Please consider each item thoughtfully and express frankly your opinions and judgments on the questions asked.

6. In your opinion, how satisfactory was the method and procedure used in the selection and admission of candidates to the doctoral program?

- ☐ a. Very satisfactory. ☐ b. Satisfactory.
- ☐ c. Unsatisfactory.

7. How much guidance and help did you receive during your graduate work from your adviser or advisory committee?

- ☐ a. All or almost all that I needed.
- ☐ b. Considerable, but not enough.
- ☐ c. Some. ☐ d. Little or none.

8. How well pleased were you with the quantity of course offerings in terms of your particular needs and interests?

- ☐ a. Thoroughly satisfied. ☐ c. Somewhat dissatisfied.
☐ b. Satisfied. ☐ d. Thoroughly dissatisfied.

9. How well pleased were you with the quality of course offerings in terms of your particular needs and interests?

- ☐ a. Thoroughly satisfied. ☐ c. Somewhat dissatisfied.
☐ b. Satisfied. ☐ d. Thoroughly dissatisfied.

10. In what respect were the course offerings most satisfactory and commendable?

11. In what respect was there greatest need for improving the course offerings?

12. What suggestions do you have for making the dissertation experience more valuable?

13. Check (✓) below how well pleased you were with the library.

	Thoroughly Satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Thoroughly Dissatisfied
a. Supply of books . . .				
b. Supply of periodicals				
c. File of back numbers of periodicals . . .				
d. Service				

14. Which problems or difficulties, if any, encountered in your first position might have been avoided by appropriate instruction at the graduate level?

15. If you had your graduate program to do over, would you come to the University of Oklahoma?

Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

Comments:_____

16. If you had your graduate program to do over, would you select the same major fields?

Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____

17. What suggestions do you have for improving the administration of the doctoral program? (Such as admission to graduate study, advisement, approval of dissertation problem, general and final examinations, etc.)

III. Characteristics of Your Doctoral Program Experience

18. How did you meet the credit requirements for the Doctor's degree after you completed the Master's degree? (If you did not receive a Master's degree, consider the work for your last sixty semester hours.) Check (✓) below one or more of the appropriate blanks.

___a. One semester.	___f. Saturday classes.
___b. Two semesters.	___g. Late afternoon or night classes.
___c. Three semesters.	___h. Transferred credit.
___d. Four semesters.	___i. Other. Please specify:
___e. Summer sessions.	_____

19. How did you complete your dissertation?

___a. Full-time residence. ___b. Part-time residence.
 ___c. Absentia. d. If you completed your dissertation in absentia, what problems did you encounter that you would not had you completed it in residence?

The following items describe abilities, attitudes, or understandings which many students develop in connection with their doctoral program. Some items are required and appear in all programs. Others are optional. Please check (✓) in the first column those characteristics which you feel should be acquired during graduate study, regardless of whether you acquired them or not. Indicate the usefulness of each of these competencies to you in terms of your present position by checking (✓) in column "Ess" if it is essential or constantly used; "Val" if valuable or often used; and "Unimp" if unimportant or seldom used. Also indicate with a check (✓) in one of the three columns at the far right, the extent to which you acquired or developed these competencies during your graduate program.

	Should be Acquired during Graduate Program	Usefulness in Present Position			Acquired during Graduate Program		
		Ess	Val	Unimp	Much	Some	Little or None
20. A thorough understanding of your major graduate field							
21. Extensive knowledge in your supporting field(s)							
22. Extensive knowledge in fields other than major or supporting fields							
23. Ability to do research							
24. Ability to supervise research programs .							
25. Ability to teach or train others . . .							

	Should be Acquired during Graduate Program	Usefulness in Present Position			Acquired during Graduate Program		
		Ess	Val	Unimp	Much	Some	Little or None
26. Reading knowledge of a foreign language. Name of language: _____ .							
27. Sense of professional obligation and ethics							
28. Ability to work with others in professional endeavor . .							
29. Acquaintance with professional journals in field of specialization . .							
30. Ability to organize and present ideas to colleagues							
31. Skill in delegating work or responsibilities to others . .							
32. Ability to appraise the professional contributions of others							
33. Ability to lead discussions effectively							
34. Ability to speak in public effectively							

35. Ability to serve as consultant on problems in major fields							
36. Possession of a satisfying philosophy of education							
37. Others, please specify: _____							
_____							

Experiences in Your Graduate Program. Check (✓) below the particular experience you had in your graduate program and evaluate each in terms of its contribution to your professional development. If you did not have the experience, indicate how helpful you think the experience would have been to your professional development.

	Did you Have the Experience		Professional Value Check (✓) one		
	Yes	No	Most Helpful	Helpful	Little or No Value
38. Graduate Assistantship <u>not</u> involving teaching					
39. Graduate Assistantship involving teaching . .					
40. Internship					
41. Apprentice College Teaching					
42. Others. Please specify: _____ . .					
_____ . .					

Page 147 lacking in numbering only.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

IV. Services of the University of Oklahoma to Its Doctoral Graduates in Education

In this section you are asked to evaluate the assistance given you by the University of Oklahoma since you received the Doctor's degree.

43. Check (✓) the method or methods by which you obtained your first position after receiving the Doctor's degree. If you accepted a position after completing requirements for the degree but did not officially graduate or before you completed your thesis, and you remained in the same position after receiving the degree, consider it as your first position.
- ☐ a. Held the position before or during graduate work.
 - ☐ b. Job contact made through major advisor.
 - ☐ c. Job contact made through a faculty member of the College of Education.
 - ☐ d. Job contact made through a faculty member of another department of the University.
 - ☐ e. Job contact made through the University Placement Office.
 - ☐ f. Job contact made through private employment agency.
 - ☐ g. Job contact made through own initiative.
 - ☐ h. Other. Please specify: _____
44. Are you now registered with the University of Oklahoma Placement Office?
- Yes _____ No _____
- a. If you are registered, when did you last contact the Placement Office concerning your desire for a position?
- ☐ 1. Less than two years ago.
 - ☐ 2. More than two but less than five years ago.
 - ☐ 3. More than five but less than ten years ago.
 - ☐ 4. More than ten years ago.
 - ☐ 5. Never.
- b. If you are registered, when did the Placement Office last contact you concerning a position?
- ☐ 1. Less than two years ago.
 - ☐ 2. More than two but less than five years ago.
 - ☐ 3. More than five but less than ten years ago.
 - ☐ 4. More than ten years ago.
 - ☐ 5. Never.

45. How many positions, to your knowledge, have you obtained or been offered through the active help of the University of Oklahoma College of Education or an individual faculty member of the College of Education? (Do not include your listing an individual as a reference unless it was significant to your being offered a position.)
- _____positions.
46. How many positions, to your knowledge, have you obtained or been offered through the active help of the University Placement Office? (Do not include sending your credentials at your request.)
- _____positions.
47. Approximately, how many times have you requested the University of Oklahoma Placement Office to send your credentials to prospective employers?
- _____times, approximately.
48. In general, how well pleased are you with the services that have been made available to you by the University since you received the Doctor's degree?
49. What services has the University made available or rendered to you which are most satisfactory and commendable?
- _____
- _____
- _____
50. What services could the University make available to you which would be or would have been useful to you since receiving the Doctor's degree?
- _____
- _____
51. In your opinion, how much assistance toward achieving professional success has the University or University faculty members given you since receiving the Doctor's degree?
- _____a. All or almost all that I expected.
- _____b. Considerable, but not as much as I expected.
- _____c. Some.
- _____d. Little or none.
52. What kinds of assistance toward achieving professional success have you received?

53. Additional comments you may wish to make which have not adequately been included elsewhere:
