

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN  
STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE FROM  
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

By

CLANE ALAN KIRTLEY

Bachelor of Science  
Southwestern Oklahoma State University  
Weatherford, Oklahoma  
1956

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1962

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1980

Thesis  
1980D  
Kulf  
cop. 2



A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN  
STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE FROM  
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thesis Approved:

*Bronk E. Van Doren*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*James M. [unclear]*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Kenneth P. Sandvold*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Bill F. Elson*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman N. Decker*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

1064666

## PREFACE

This follow-up study was conducted to gather information concerning the characteristics, experiences, and opinions of the doctoral graduates in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University. Specifically, the research was to obtain information about pre-training (personal), training experiences, post-training experiences, and an evaluation of training experiences.

The choice of this study was made primarily for two reasons: One, no follow-up studies had been made at Oklahoma State University of doctoral graduates in student personnel and guidance; Two, Dr. Frank McFarland and Dr. James Seals encouraged this study.

A special thank you is given to the graduates who took of their time to make this a unique survey in which one hundred percent of the population participated. Deep gratitude and appreciation is expressed to:

Dr. Frank McFarland, without his interest, concern, and individual attention, this study would not have been made nor completed. Like many other graduate students, I cannot thank him enough.

Dr. James Seals, a long-time friend, who provided encouragement, support, and generous time and advice.

Dr. Bill Elsom, whose kindness and individual help and concern cannot be measured.

Dr. Kenneth Sandvold, who was always considerate and helpful.

Carolyn Chopp, whose selfless concern and personal dedication

brought this dissertation along like no one else could.

Dr. E. E. Vineyard, who broke down barriers and encouraged me many ways to do this.

Dr. Jerry Burson, who more than anyone else continually urged me to complete this document.

Kay Frazier, who carried a burden in the office for me and encouraged me to finish.

My father and mother, who supported me, had faith in me, and prayed for me.

My wife, Ladine, my children, Kurt, Mike, Gary, and Kari, who sacrificed for me in many ways.

My Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                       | 1    |
| Statement of the Problem . . . . .                              | 4    |
| Purpose of the Study . . . . .                                  | 4    |
| Significance of the Study . . . . .                             | 5    |
| Specific Areas of the Study . . . . .                           | 6    |
| Assumptions . . . . .   | 7    |
| Limitations . . . . .   | 8    |
| Definition of Terms . . . . .                                   | 8    |
| Organization of the Study . . . . .                             | 9    |
| II. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .                                | 11   |
| An Overview of the Research . . . . .                           | 11   |
| A Summary of Research . . . . .                                 | 16   |
| III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURES . . . . .                            | 20   |
| Introduction . . . . .  | 20   |
| Sources of Data and Types of Information<br>Collected . . . . . | 20   |
| Construction of the Questionnaire . . . . .                     | 21   |
| Technique . . . . .   | 23   |
| Analysis of Data . . . . .                                      | 24   |
| IV. COMPENDIUM OF THE SURVEY . . . . .                          | 25   |
| Pre-training Information (Includes Personal<br>Data) . . . . .  | 26   |
| Training Experiences . . . . .                                  | 31   |
| Post-training Experiences . . . . .                             | 41   |
| Evaluation of Training Experiences . . . . .                    | 53   |
| V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .             | 73   |
| Summary of the Study . . . . .                                  | 73   |
| Findings of the Study . . . . .                                 | 74   |
| Recommendations from the Study . . . . .                        | 79   |
| Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .                  | 81   |
| A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                               | 83   |

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| APPENDIX A - OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY SURVEY OF Ed.D<br>GRADUATES STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE . . . . . | 85   |
| APPENDIX B - CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .   | 94   |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. A Comparison of Graduates by Sex and Distribution<br>by the Year Graduated . . . . .  | 22   |
| II. Age Distribution of Graduates . . . . .  | 27   |
| III. Marital Status of Graduates . . . . .   | 28   |
| IV. Factors Which Influenced Graduates Choice of<br>Oklahoma State University . . . . .  | 28   |
| V. Methods Used to Finance Graduate Study . . . . .  | 29   |
| VI. The Graduates Location of Present Employment in<br>Relation to that Prior to Enrollment in the<br>Graduate Program . . . . . | 30   |
| VII. Some of the Graduates Work Experiences Outside of<br>Education (Men) . . . . .  | 31   |
| VIII. Some of the Graduates Work Experiences Outside of<br>Education (Women) . . . . .   | 32   |
| IX. Ages of the Graduates at the Time of Completion<br>of Their Degrees . . . . .  | 32   |
| X. Mean of Years Required to Complete Academic<br>Degrees . . . . .  | 33   |
| XI. Location of Awarding Institution . . . . .   | 34   |
| XII. The Graduates Major While Pursuing the Master's<br>Degree . . . . .   | 34   |
| XIII. The Graduates Major While Pursuing the Bachelor's<br>Degree . . . . .  | 35   |
| XIV. Graduates Occupational Objective at Entry into<br>Each of His Degree Programs . . . . .                                     | 37   |
| XV. Number of Graduates Whose Occupational Objectives<br>Changed During Their Study for Each of Their<br>Degrees . . . . .       | 38   |



| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| XVI. The Graduates Years of Work Experience Between the Bachelor's Degree and the Master's Degree . . . . .                          | 39   |
| XVII. The Graduates Years of Work Experience Between the Master's Degree and the Ed.D Degree . . . . .                               | 40   |
| XVIII. Mean of Years of the Graduates for Different Work Experiences Between the Bachelor's Degree and the Master's Degree . . . . . | 41   |
| XIX. Mean of Years of the Graduates for Different Work Experiences Between the Master's Degree and the Ed.D Degree . . . . .         | 42   |
| XX. Reasons for Graduate Leaving Student Personnel Work . . . . .  | 42   |
| XXI. Table Showing Salary Ranges . . . . .   | 43   |
| XXII. Approximate Number of Counselees Worked with Each Week . . . . .   | 44   |
| XXIII. Listing of First Three Jobs Held by Graduates After Graduation . . . . .  | 45   |
| XXIV. Number of Years of Tenure for First Three Jobs Held by Graduates After Graduation . . . . .                                    | 46   |
| XXV. Number of Years on Each of the First Three Jobs Held by the Graduate . . . . .  | 47   |
| XXVI. Areas in Which the Graduates are Presently Employed . . . . .  | 48   |
| XXVII. Titles of Present Positions . . . . .   | 49   |
| XXVIII. Publishing Information About the Graduates . . . . .   | 50   |
| XXIX. Number of National Professional Organizations to Which Graduates Belong . . . . .  | 50   |
| XXX. Number of States Worked in Since Completion of the Ed.D Degree . . . . .  | 51   |
| XXXI. Graduates Present Employment by States . . . . .   | 52   |
| XXXII. Ways to Improve the Ed.D Degree Program in Student Personnel and Guidance . . . . .   | 54   |
| XXXIII. Areas of Greatest Value to the Graduate . . . . .  | 55   |

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| XXXIV. The Graduates Ratings of the Practical Utility<br>of Course Work Taken at Oklahoma State<br>University . . . . .         | 56   |
| XXXV. Degree that Graduates are Involved in Selected<br>Tasks or Functions in Their Position . . . . .                          | 59   |
| XXXVI. Degree that Graduates were Involved in Selected<br>Tasks or Functions in Past Positions . . . . .                        | 61   |
| XXXVII. Degree that Graduates were Prepared for Selected<br>Tasks or Functions . . . . .  | 64   |
| XXXVIII. Rating of the Staff and Instruction Received . . . . .   | 67   |
| XXXIX. Means Showing Ranking of Satisfactions with the<br>Assistance Given by Oklahoma State University<br>Professors . . . . . | 68   |
| XL. Means Showing Rating of the Student Personnel and<br>Guidance Faculty . . . . .   | 68   |
| XLI. Ratings of Counseling Practicum . . . . .  | 69   |
| XLII. Rating of Fellow Students . . . . .   | 69   |
| XLIII. Ratings of Supervised Experiences in Higher<br>Education Student Personnel . . . . .                                     | 70   |
| XLIV. Rating of Internship in Student Personnel Service . . .   | 71   |
| XLV. Graduates Comments . . . . .   | 71   |
| XLVI. Areas in Student Personnel and Guidance the<br>Graduates Would Like to See Improved . . . . .                             | 72   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

History shows marked differences of opinions concerning the ideal educational preparation of student personnel workers. These differences in viewpoint were among educational institutions, professional organizations and associations, as well as within those groups.

More recently there has been a movement toward reduction of some of these differences and cooperation to give shape and direction to student personnel preparation programs. There has been earnest exchange and progress in communication on an inter-organization or association basis in analyzing the problems associated with educational preparation of student personnel leaders.

As early as 1937 and 1949, formal statements of purpose for the student personnel profession were formulated under the direction of the American Council on Education. They were known as the Student Personnel Point of View.<sup>1</sup>

In 1968, the American Personnel and Guidance Association's (APGA) Professional Preparation and Standards Committee approved a statement of guidelines for graduate programs in preparation of student personnel workers in higher education which had been prepared cooperatively by the Commission of Professional Development of the Council of Student Personnel Associations (COSPA) and the Interdivisional Committee of the APGA.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of the document was to provide guidelines for

evaluating existing preparation programs and for assisting in the development of new programs.

In 1971, COSPA prepared a proposal for professional preparation of college student development educators after restudying the profession's point of view of education, its purposes and functions, methods of implementation, required competencies, and professional preparation for student development educators.<sup>3</sup>

COSPA published a statement in July 1972 concerning student development services in higher education.<sup>4</sup> In discussing competencies, it was indicated that there is not a training program that is regarded to be more perfect or better than another for educating Student Development Specialists.

The COSPA statement of 1971 went on to say all preparation programs should contain intense and concentrated instruction in the development of the skills required, training and execution of the respective roles, and consideration of various approaches to organization.<sup>5</sup> Each program could vary in emphasis, sequences, and methods of instruction and yet each could provide professional excellence.

During the last third of the twentieth century, curricular innovation is necessary in graduate programs that prepare persons for student development services. Professionals will be needed initially who can give aggressive leadership even in the face of excised organizations, declining budgets, diversifying student bodies, changing job titles, often hostile public opinion and yet, at the same time, be open and supportive professional persons.

The goal of a professional program should be the training of persons who, in addition to having a high level of self-development, also

have competence to work with others in their self-development.

Specific objectives should be interpreted from general goals in terms of the skills needed for operating in the professional role of the student development specialist whose primary proficiency will be based in great measure on the methods and content of education.

Development of a beginning professional who has the basic values and competencies for facilitating student development should be the goal of the student personnel and guidance program at the master's degree level. The objective of the specialist or sixth-year program should provide for acquiring more sophisticated levels of competencies and an introduction to new roles in specific settings for student development. At the doctoral level, particular attention should be given to cover the full range of values, competencies, and roles needed for leadership in the field and the larger society.

Research, analysis, and evaluation are tools to be used in reviewing student development training programs. Many educators believe that follow-up research is an effective instrument for analyzing and evaluating the effectiveness of a graduate training program.

In discussing follow-up research, Shertzer and England stated:

It will not be argued that student opinion, in and of itself, is sufficient to justify curriculum and program change. Decisions for change involve judgments directed toward operationalizing program objectives. Several factors, e.g., the competencies needed by the practitioner and orientation to the program, enter into and influence staff judgments with respect to curriculum and program change. However, opinions of those who complete professional preparation programs should constitute credible evidence since opinions are based upon direct experience in the program and the later application of learnings and skills in the work situation.<sup>6</sup>

Findings of follow-up research can benefit the current staff. Through consideration of collated and tabulated results there will be certain cues that could suggest reconsideration of program organization, course content, and instructional approach. However, follow-up research which involves ratings or other subjective data as well as factual career information must of necessity be limited by the validity of the judgments reported, as suggested by the writers above.

#### Statement of the Problem

There have been very few follow-up studies anywhere and none at Oklahoma State University made to gather information concerning the characteristics, experiences, and opinions of the doctoral graduates in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University. There is insufficient information about the further career development of these doctoral graduates and their thoughts and ideas regarding the relevance of their education to their career experiences has never been ascertained.

#### Purpose of Study

The purpose of the research was to report on the graduates opinions, perceptions and evaluation of the effectiveness, relevancy, adequacy, and quality of the student personnel and guidance educational preparation. The information and statistics tabulated will provide the current staff with student opinions and facts regarding their student personnel educational preparation program at Oklahoma State University.

Specifically, the research obtained information about pre-training (personal), training experiences, post-training experiences, and an evaluation of training experiences. Furthermore, the researcher hopes to identify, through analysis of the collated data, items which when studied as group data could lead to meaningful curriculum changes.

In addition, the graduates were to make suggestions on how their educational preparation could have been strengthened.

#### Significance of the Study

Evaluation has been described by student personnel and guidance educators as the foundation to program improvement and development.

Shertzer and England stressed the need for evaluative research when they stated:

Counselor educators are obligated to conduct follow-up studies of those who enter and leave their preparation programs. Perhaps the demand upon them is even more exacting than upon others who conduct professional preparation programs since counselor educators instruct and urge counselors to conduct follow-up studies of their students and activities. It should be noted that organized student follow-up studies are required of those institutions which expect to meet professional standards for preparing secondary school counselors.<sup>7</sup>

There have been very few studies made to evaluate the quality and utility of graduate programs in student personnel and guidance. This study will provide information which may have a bearing on the professional preparation of doctoral graduates.

It appears that the literature shows that while guidance trainees are encouraged to do follow-up research in relation to their programs, the guidance educators have been remiss in evaluation of the

graduate training programs themselves.

### Specific Areas of the Study

The questionnaire used in conducting research concerning the graduates covered areas that were grouped into the following categories:

1. What were some characteristics of the graduate's pre-training (personal) years?
  - (a) Sex
  - (b) What factors influenced the graduate's choice of Oklahoma State University?
  - (c) What is the graduate's present place of employment in relationship to his location at pre-enrollment in the program?
  - (d) What method was used to finance the graduate's training?
  - (e) What types of work experience has the graduate had other than those related to education, before, after, and during graduate work?
  - (f) What is the graduate's present age?
  - (g) What is the graduate's present marital status?
2. What were some characteristics of the graduate's training experiences?
  - (a) How many years did it take for the graduate to complete each one of his degrees?
  - (b) What was the major of each degree earned by the graduate?
  - (c) What was the graduate's age at the completion of each degree?
  - (d) From what institution were the graduate's degrees obtained?
  - (e) What was the occupational objective of the graduate at the entry into each of his degree programs?
  - (f) What was the nature of the graduate's work experience between his degree programs?
  - (g) Did the graduate's occupational choice change during the study for each degree? What was the reason for change?
3. What were some characteristics of the graduate's post-training experience?
  - (a) If the graduate did not remain in student personnel work, why did he change?
  - (b) What is the graduate's annual salary?



- (c) If the graduate is a counselor, what is the number of counselees with whom he works?
  - (d) What were the graduate's first jobs? How long did he stay with each job?
  - (e) If working in the educational field, at what level is the graduate presently employed?
  - (f) What is the title of the graduate's present position?
  - (g) How many articles and books has the graduate published?
  - (h) How many memberships does the graduate hold in national and state professional organizations?
  - (i) In what states has the graduate been employed?
  - (j) In what state is the graduate presently employed?
4. What are the graduate's evaluations of the educational training programs?
- (a) What are the ways the graduate sees to improve the doctoral program?
  - (b) What does the graduate see as inadequacies in the doctoral program?
  - (c) What were the greatest values received from the doctoral program?
  - (d) What are the graduate's evaluations of the utility of the course work in selected areas of the doctoral program?
  - (e) What are the graduate's evaluations of involvement in present or past positions of a designated number of tasks or functions? What was the degree of preparedness for those tasks and functions?
  - (f) What were the degrees of the graduate's satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the doctoral educational program that prepared him for future professional activities and the effectiveness of the professional staff?
  - (g) What degree of rating does the graduate give the staff at Oklahoma State University.
  - (h) How would the graduates rate the practicum or internship courses taken at Oklahoma State University?
  - (i) How would the graduates rate the staff and instruction in the student personnel and guidance training program?

#### Assumptions

The questionnaire is presumed valid because of the thorough and careful procedures used in pre-testing and analyzing it. It was

critically studied and tested by a graduate research class. It was pre-tested on a sample of the total population.

Most members of the faculty of the student personnel and guidance programs at Oklahoma State University reviewed and offered suggestions and comments to further validate the questionnaire. It is assumed the graduates surveyed gave honest and accurate answers.

#### Limitations

This study will be limited to graduates of Oklahoma State University who were awarded Doctor of Education degrees (Ed.D) in student personnel and guidance. The years surveyed were those between June 1962 and August 1972. Follow-up research which involves ratings or other subjective data as well as factual career information must of necessity be limited by the validity of the judgment reported.

#### Definition of Terms

Graduates - The subjects of the study, the graduates of the Ed.D degree program in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University between 1962 and 1972.

Program - The pattern of course work that constituted qualification for conferring of the Ed.D degree with a major in student personnel and guidance.

Task or Function - Fundamental types of work activities normally performed by student personnel professionals. These could be tasks or functions performed in past or present positions.

Educational Preparation - Knowledge and skills that must be

learned to demonstrate professional competence in the field of student personnel work.

Student Development - Assisting the student in his search for identity and in his development of self-discipline, self-evaluation and competence in decision making and educating the student, both as an individual and in a group.

Practical Utility - Quality and usefulness of course work taken at Oklahoma State University.

Training Experience - Experience during the years that the student was attending Oklahoma State University.

Post-training Experience - Experience during the years following the student's graduation from Oklahoma State University.

Evaluation of Training Experiences - Opinions and judgment of the graduate training experience.

### Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes an introduction and background for this study. It also includes the need for and the purpose of this study. Specific areas for research are listed. Limitations and assumptions are also explained.

Chapter II is a review of the literature that relates to this research. The methods used to conduct this study make up Chapter III. Chapter IV has tabulations and explanations of the data gathered. The study is summarized in Chapter V and definite conclusions and recommendations are made.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Council of Student Personnel Associations, A Proposal for Professional Preparation of College Student Development Educators (Ithaca, N. Y., 1971), pp. 1-13.
2. Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education, A Proposal for Professional Preparation in College Student Personnel Work (Detroit, 1968 Revision), pp. 1-10.
3. COSPA, 1971, pp. 1-13.
4. Council of Student Personnel Associations, Student Development Services in Higher Education (N. Y., July, 1972), pp. 1-7.
5. COSPA, 1971, pp. 1-13.
6. Bruce Shertzer and Joan England, "Follow-up Data on Counselor Education Graduates--Relevant, Self-Revealing, or What?" Counselor Education and Supervision 7, No. 4 (Summer, 1968), p. 363.
7. Ibid., p. 363.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

#### An Overview of the Research

In a review of student personnel dissertations written between 1910 and 1964, only slightly over four percent have been related to evaluation or training of student personnel and guidance programs. Although a number of authors have written about the issue of standards for professional preparation, the question of what constitutes adequate preparation for the profession has been largely unanswered. It would appear from a review of these dissertation abstracts, books, and student personnel publications that one of the most neglected areas of research in the field of student personnel and guidance has been in the analysis of the graduate educational program.

In the numerous articles and research studies considered, it was evident that there were a wide variety of approaches and research designs used in approaching this topic. Because of this diversity in the student personnel field, the author has chosen to review chronologically these research contributions.

Mathewson made reference to James B. Conant, who believes the success or failure of the American system of public education depends on the guidance program and, therefore, the entire educational process may hinge on the qualifications of guidance personnel and hence upon the training process which produces them.<sup>1</sup>

In 1960, Harmon and Arnold were concerned about the lack of research that had been published on the reactions of practicing counselors to their preparation.<sup>2</sup> One of their findings was that counselors were anxious to give their reactions relating to their training programs.

When considering the curriculum for the training process in student personnel and guidance, Barry and Wolf suggested that there are many questions that need to be answered.<sup>3</sup> Four questions they listed were as follows:

- (1) What body of information and skills should every guidance-personnel worker have before he is considered to be trained?
- (2) What should be the balance in guidance-personnel training programs between the liberal and technical offerings?
- (3) What information and skills from related fields are rightfully a part of the subject matter of guidance-personnel training programs?
- (4) How can materials from other fields be integrated into these programs?

Barry and Wolf believe that limited evaluation of training programs can both contribute to and perpetuate problem issues in student personnel education.<sup>4</sup> The lack of systematic study requires that the solutions to problems be sought through trial and error, guesswork, and armchair philosophy. On the other hand, comprehensive evaluation might eliminate some of the problem issues in content, methodology, and selection.

Hill and Nitzschke suggested that a factor making it difficult to establish uniform preparation objectives in guidance was the lack of basic research and evaluation in the field.<sup>5</sup>

In a speech before student personnel and guidance people, McDaniel identified the ten areas lacking sufficient research in the

field of guidance.<sup>6</sup> One of the areas lacking adequate research was that of comparing the different methods proposed for use in building effective counselor training programs.

Counselor education graduates who were at the University of Wyoming between 1962 and 1966 were surveyed by Price for their evaluation of the counselor education program.<sup>7</sup> The subjects surveyed indicated that they were not provided sufficient experience in group process and practicum. They felt they had insufficient experiences in the general area of testing.

From an analysis of 53 student personnel and guidance textbooks, Godard identified 13 areas of behavioral research and theory that had relevance for the practice and preparation of guidance-personnel workers.<sup>8</sup> This study was concerned with the development of interdisciplinary academic foundations to be used in the graduate preparation of guidance-personnel workers.

The following year, Shires used a questionnaire for surveying University of Virginia graduates to gather information that would be useful to the future evaluation and revisions of the program in graduate student personnel and guidance education.<sup>9</sup> It concluded that a regular system of follow-up of the graduates of the student personnel and guidance program would be valuable in a continuing evaluation of the program.

The next two years saw the need for research relating to supervised training experiences being recognized. At North Texas State University, Anderson in a study of counselor trainees, concluded that on-campus counseling practicum was more beneficial than off-campus practicum for the practicing of counseling techniques.<sup>10</sup> She also

suggested that counseling practicum be limited to 15 counselor trainees per section.

Norton recognized the need for analyzing supervised training experiences.<sup>11</sup> He surveyed selected colleges and universities and found that institutions offering advanced degrees relate more closely to American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) standards than institutions with Master's degree programs only. There was agreement by both counselor candidates and counselor educators that the practical training experience had been the most effective part of all candidates preparation. Counselor educators also tended to agree that the supervisory approach should be used most.

The following year, Dietz sent questionnaires to 272 principals, 385 counselors, and 924 teachers who gave the following recommendation in regard to counselor training.<sup>12</sup> Greater emphasis should be given to practicum experiences in counselor training programs and certification requirements. Further research should be initiated on factors which determine the evaluation of counselor roles and function models and the establishment of priorities for counselor activities.

Standards for counselor educators were the primary concern when Dalrymple surveyed 370 heads of departments of counselor education to determine the degree to which counselor educators perceived that implementation of minimum standards and accreditation of programs of counselor education is the way to insure that the person entering into the counseling profession is adequately trained and educated.<sup>13</sup> The questionnaire was formulated from Section II of the 1967 ACES standards. The primary conclusion was that counselor educators, in the



perception of the respondents, should accept and attempt to implement in their programs of counselor education the 1967 ACES standards.

In the early 1970's, the value of follow-up research was beginning to be recognized. Although very few were made, this type of study began to appear in the literature. A survey of 172 graduates of St. Louis University was completed by Munden for the purpose of gathering information concerning the Master's degree graduates of counselor education.<sup>14</sup> It was suggested that additional longitudinal and in-depth surveys of graduates of the counselor education program of St. Louis University be conducted to provide further information about the program.

The same year, Fox mailed questionnaires to 266 graduates of the counselor education program of Memphis State University.<sup>15</sup> A recommendation was made that the college of education should encourage all departments of the college to conduct follow-up studies of their graduates and to engage in periodic evaluation of their curriculum and academic programs.

A questionnaire was sent by Redovich to Marquette Doctoral and Master's degree graduates in student personnel and guidance for the years 1960-1970.<sup>16</sup> Most of the graduates were basically satisfied with graduate education and the quality of graduate instruction. Many of the graduates were found employed in positions for which they were prepared.

A follow-up study was completed by Kasper.<sup>17</sup> He surveyed 168 graduates of the Master's degree program of student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University. The study described and analyzed the graduates and surveyed retrospective opinions regarding the

practical utility of selected course work in the program. The study concluded that evaluation of the effectiveness of preparation is accomplished through continuing contacts with former students and with the schools in which they work.

#### A Summary of Research

In a review of the different research accomplished on student personnel training programs, it was very evident that little had been done to gather opinions and information about the various training programs or their results.

Follow-up studies of graduates in student personnel and guidance have just begun to appear and there seems to be no coordinated effort to consolidate and analyze this information. There seems to be no common thread in the research related to student personnel and guidance training. It would appear that the development of uniform philosophic goals and objectives for graduate preparation are needed but difficult to prepare because of the lack of basic research and evaluation in this field.

Summarizing some of the problems in training and evaluation in a relatively new field like student personnel and guidance, Barry and Wolf listed three theories for consideration:

- (1) Guidance-personnel work has no tradition, no commonly accepted discipline, and no thorough evaluation studies.
- (2) Many guidance-personnel workers can agree on the necessity for special training, but they cannot agree on what that training should include.
- (3) The guidance-personnel field has grown so rapidly that the trainees have had little time to analyze their work and to plan for the future.<sup>18</sup>

In many of the studies, the need for surveys and follow-up research was discussed. It also was suggested that more in-depth surveys be conducted. The scope and depth of the follow-up approach to evaluation certainly varies, as is shown through the selected studies in the preceding review.

Although there was just a trickle of follow-up research beginning to appear in the 1970's, three researchers, Munden, Redovich, and Kasper all suggested additional graduate surveys. Both Norton and Anderson agreed that supervised training experience was an effective part of the graduate preparation.

In one study, it was reported that counselors were anxious to give their reactions related to their training programs. Barry and Wolf felt that limited evaluation of training programs can both contribute to and perpetuate problem issues in student personnel education.

Difficulty in establishing uniform preparation objectives in guidance was partially caused by lack of basic research and evaluation according to Hall and Nitzschke. McDaniel identified ten areas lacking sufficient research in the field of guidance.

Although graduate follow-up evaluation is only one approach to determining the effectiveness and adequacy of a graduate training program, there is overwhelming evidence that this area has been totally neglected until recently and can provide many answers and benefits to the graduate training program at any university.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Robert H. Mathewson, "Graduate Training for School Counselors," Occupations, 30 (February, 1952), p. 355.
2. Donald Harmon and Dwight L. Arnold, "High School Counselors Evaluate Their Formal Preparation," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 39 (December, 1960), pp. 303-305.
3. Ruth Barry and Beverly Wolf, Modern Issues in Guidance-Personnel, (New York, 1963), p. 88.
4. Ibid.
5. George E. Hill and Dale F. Nitzschke, "Preparation Programs in Elementary School Guidance," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 40 (October, 1961), p. 155.
6. H. B. McDaniel, "Needed Field Research in Guidance," Occupations, 30 (May, 1952), pp. 660-661.
7. Judy Price, "An Evaluation of the Counselor Education Program at the University of Wyoming by Federally Funded Graduates During the Period 1962 Through 1966," DAI, 33, No. 1 (1972), 162A.
8. Jerry J. Godard, "Toward a Development of Multi-Disciplinary Foundations for Use in the Preparation of Guidance-Personnel Workers," DA, 27, No. 9 (1967), 2879A (Columbia University).
9. James C. Shires, "An Appraisal of the Master of Education Program in Guidance and Counseling Through a Follow-up of Graduates," DA, 28, No. 7 (1968), 2522A (University of Virginia).
10. Sharon J. W. Anderson, "Changes in Attitudes, Personality, and Effectiveness of Counselor Trainees in Counseling Practicums," DA, 29, No. 11 (1969), 3825A (North Texas State University).
11. Francis H. Norton, "Counselor Preparation: An Analysis of the Supervised Training Experience in Selected Counselor Education Programs," DAI, No. 9 (1970), 3733A (Wayne State University).
12. Siegfried C. Dietz, "Counselor Job Satisfaction and Colleague Perceptions of the ASCA Role and Function Recommendations," DAI, 31, No. 4 (1970), 1573-74A (Arizona State University).

13. Frank M. Dalrymple, "Counselor Educators Perceptions of the 1967 ACES Standards and Accreditation of Programs of Counselor Education," DAI, 31, No. 11 (1971), 5769A (University of South Dakota).

14. J. R. Munden, "An Analysis of a Master of Education Program in Counseling and Guidance Through a Follow-up of Graduates for the Period of 1965 Through 1969," DA, 32, No. 2 (1971), 742A (St. Louis University).

15. Ray P. Fox, "A Study of the Master's Degree Program in Guidance and Counseling at Memphis State University and Evaluation of the Program as Perceived by Its Graduates: Fall Semester 1965-Spring Semester 1971," DAI, 32, No. 12 (1972), 6757-58A (Memphis State University).

16. Dennis W. Redovich, "A Study of the Graduates and the Graduate Programs in Education at Marquette University Based on a Follow-up Study of its Graduates for the Years 1960-1970," DAI, 33, No. 1 (1972), 174A.

17. Paul T. Kasper, "A Study of the Graduates of the Master's Degree Program in Student Personnel and Guidance at Oklahoma State University," DAI, 33, No. 2 (1972), 570A.

18. Ruth Barry and Beverly Wolf, Modern Issues in Guidance-Personnel, (New York, 1963), p. 86.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

#### Introduction

Opinions of those who complete professional preparation programs are considered by many educators to constitute credible evidence since opinions are based upon direct experience in the program and the later application of learnings and skills in work situations. It is essential that faculty and administration in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University be kept informed regarding the extent to which their graduate preparation program is providing adequate and useful preparation.

This chapter describes the procedures and methods used to gather these opinions of particular graduates of the Ed.D program in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University.

#### Sources of Data and Types of Information Collected

Located at Oklahoma State University, there were three different offices that provided the sources from which data was gathered for study: the Alumni Development office, the Registrar's office, and the Library.

The list of names of the students who graduated with Ed.D degrees in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University between 1962 and 1972 was derived from graduation programs found in the

Registrar's office or from the files of different faculty members.

The procedure for contacting each member of the study population was initiated by a direct phone call to that person. Using the addresses located earlier, the author checked telephone information for the home of the subject. If a college was located in the student's hometown, a telephone number was obtained for it also. All graduates but one were contacted by this telephone method and asked to participate in the study by filling out a questionnaire to be sent. A few cases required second and third telephone calls. All agreed to participate and were mailed the questionnaire. One of the graduates was on an island in the vicinity of Turkey, but was located by a former professor. She also completed the questionnaire. The time required to locate all the graduates and telephone them was seven months.

An analysis by year of graduation is made of the respondents in Table I to show the number of graduates by year and their sex.

Twelve graduates or 21 percent of the population were female. Forty-five of the graduates or 79 percent were male. It appears that 1967 was a peak year for graduates caused by the spin-off from the year-long federal institutes that were held in previous years. The year 1971 was also a peak year for graduates, but no apparent reason was detected.

#### Construction of the Questionnaire

An eight-page instrument was developed by the researcher to secure the required information to complete this study.

Four phases were used in the complete development of this instrument. The first phase consisted of working with the investigator's

TABLE I  
A COMPARISON OF GRADUATES BY SEX AND DISTRIBUTION  
BY THE YEAR GRADUATED

| Years                | Total<br>Population<br>N | Male<br>Majors<br>N | Female<br>Majors<br>N | % of<br>Responses |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 1962                 | -                        | -                   | -                     | -                 |
| 1963                 | -                        | -                   | -                     | -                 |
| 1964                 | 1                        | -                   | 1                     | 100               |
| 1965                 | 1                        | 1                   | -                     | 100               |
| 1966                 | 5                        | 4                   | 1                     | 100               |
| 1967                 | 11                       | 9                   | 2                     | 100               |
| 1968                 | 7                        | 6                   | 1                     | 100               |
| 1969                 | 6                        | 3                   | 3                     | 100               |
| 1970                 | 9                        | 7                   | 2                     | 100               |
| 1971                 | 11                       | 10                  | 1                     | 100               |
| 1972                 | 6                        | 5                   | 1                     | 100               |
| Population<br>Totals | 57                       | 45                  | 12                    | 100               |
| Sex<br>Percentages   |                          | 79                  | 21                    |                   |

adviser and with another student personnel educator to build a questionnaire that obtained follow-up information about the graduate's personal data, training experiences, post-training experiences, and an evaluation of his program. An effort was made to make all questions of the type that would take a simple check answer. Of the eight pages, only one had questions requiring a written response in the graduate's own words.

The second phase of the development of the questionnaire consisted of distributing the instrument to members of the Applied Behavioral



Studies Department at Oklahoma State University. They were encouraged to study and make suggestions for alterations of the document. The recommendations were discussed with the researcher's academic adviser and incorporated in the study.

The third phase consisted of group discussion in a graduate training seminar with the instrument being criticized and analyzed. This seminar panel brought about additional changes to the instrument.

The fourth phase consisted of the asking of two members of the population to fill out the questionnaire and make comments and criticism. After this four-phase procedure, the adviser and researcher completed the final instrument. The instrument required only fourteen minutes to complete and was returned by 100 percent of the study population.

#### Technique

The questionnaire was printed in professional form by the Graphic Arts Department of Northern Oklahoma College. The questionnaire was sent to the address supplied by the researcher as a result of the initial phone call made to the graduate to request his participation in the study. All graduates agreed to participate, and all of the questionnaires were returned. Each questionnaire sent out was accompanied by a letter on Oklahoma State University stationery from the Department of Applied Behavioral Studies in Education. The letter simply reminded the graduate of the importance of the study and of his commitment made by telephone to participate in this study. The letter asked for a hurried response and supplied a procedure to return it. The questionnaire had the return address on the back page and was

stamped so that the respondent simply had to staple or tape it together to return. Copies of both the letter and questionnaire are included in the appendix.

#### Analysis of Data

The instrument contained two major sections. One section presented a number of tasks or functions commonly performed by student personnel professionals. The task or function was analyzed on a basis of involvement in present position, involvement in past positions, and preparedness for the task. Average or mean scores were determined for each area and individual function.

The second major section was designed to evaluate the practical utility of the courses taken during the Ed.D program. An average or mean score was determined for each of the selected courses.

All other questions were placed on an average or mean score basis for analysis.

## CHAPTER IV

### COMPENDIUM OF THE SURVEY

Fifty-seven Oklahoma State University graduates with an Ed.D in student personnel and guidance, who graduated between the years 1962 and 1972 were surveyed by a follow-up questionnaire and the results are given in this chapter. A questionnaire congruent with the aims of this study was sent to 57 graduates during the summer and fall of 1973. The total group of graduates returned the questionnaire.

Information collected was in four basic areas: (1) Pre-training (personal data), (2) training experiences, (3) post-training experiences, and (4) evaluation of training experiences. Comparisons and analyses made of selected variables based on responses in each of the four basis areas mentioned.

In the pre-training (personal data) area, analyses were made of the ages, marital status, sex and present location of the graduates. Factors influencing the choice by the graduates of the college and methods used to finance his graduate study were also analyzed.

Data pertaining to training experiences, the heart of the study, was gathered and analyzed by utilizing three specially designed survey instruments. One of the survey instruments listed a number of tasks or functions commonly performed by student professionals and/or taught by the Applied Behavioral Studies faculty at Oklahoma State University. An analysis was made of responses by graduates who were asked to

indicate how the tasks or functions were related to present or past positions and how well the graduate perceived himself as prepared for the task or function to be performed.

The graduate's perception of the practical utility of the courses he had completed during his Ed.D program was analyzed. Further investigation was accomplished by studying the results of ratings with regard to the faculty and instruction of the Ed.D program.

Analyzation was made of variables relative to the graduate's perceptions of the program from which he graduated. The graduate evaluated the degree to which he thought the Ed.D program in student personnel and guidance had prepared him for professional activities. The effectiveness of the professional faculty was also rated.

Post-training experiences were examined by analyzing the graduate's present position, his title, positions held, years in various positions, annual salary, occupational objectives, changes in objectives, work experience (both educational and other), publications, and participation in professional organizations.

The survey instrument also provided the graduate an avenue for expressing opinions about ways to improve the Ed.D program in student personnel and guidance and also to make positive comments about the program.

#### Pre-Training Information (Includes Personal Data)

Table II presents data showing the percentage distribution by age of the graduates. The majority of the men are shown in the two categories which place the graduate's age between 30 and 49. Fifty percent of the women are between 30 and 39 years of age. It should be

TABLE II  
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATES

| Years  | Male %   | Female %   |
|--------|----------|------------|
| 20-29  | 0        | 8.5        |
| 30-39  | 40       | 50         |
| 40-49  | 45       | 0          |
| 50-59  | 13       | 33         |
| 60-69  | <u>2</u> | <u>8.5</u> |
| Totals | 100      | 100        |

noted that there is an absence of women in the 40 to 49 age bracket. Forty-one and one-half percent of the women were located in the upper two categories of the chart while only 15 percent of the men were in these two upper categories.

Ninety-eight percent of the men graduates were married at the time of the survey as compared to 42 percent of the women respondents indicating that they were married. Table III also shows that only 2 percent of the men were in the "other" classification which is divorced, single, separated or widowed, as opposed to the fact that over 50 percent of the women are classified in this category.

Table IV shows a combination of factors influenced the graduates to choose Oklahoma State University as the college where they would obtain their Ed.D degree. Forty-two and seven-tenths percent of the respondents checked all of the listed factors of convenience, program offerings, reputation of faculty, financial help available, as their

TABLE III  
MARITAL STATUS OF GRADUATES

| Marital Status | Male %   | Female %  |
|----------------|----------|-----------|
| Married        | 98       | 42        |
| Other*         | <u>2</u> | <u>58</u> |
| Totals         | 100      | 100       |

\*Other: Divorced, Single, Separated, Widowed

TABLE IV  
FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED GRADUATES CHOICE  
OF OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

| Factors   | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|---|-----------|-------------|------------|
| A Combination of Convenience and Program Offerings - Reputation of Faculty and Financial Help Available             | 21        | 4           | 25         |
| Convenience   | 6         | 2           | 8          |
| Program Offerings   | 3         | -           | 3          |
| NDEA Institute  | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Alumni Recommendation   | 2         | 1           | 3          |
| Influences Written in by the Graduate:<br>Employment, Faculty Reputation,<br>Flexibility, Geographic Location, etc. | 11        | 5           | 16         |
| Totals  | 45        | 12          | 57         |

reasons for choosing Oklahoma State University. Convenience was the largest single item checked as a reason. Program offerings and the NDEA Institute were other single choices made by more than one graduate. Both men and women were alike in having multiple reasons in choosing Oklahoma State University.

As shown in Table V, most of the graduates used a variety of financial methods to finance their graduate study. The majority of the graduates combined their own resources with some type of work or loan. Approximately 14 percent of the graduates used their own resources. Another 14 percent were in the NDEA Institute or received an assistantship. Of the five individuals who were using the NDEA Institute to finance their doctoral program, four were women. Work was another important method the graduate used to finance the educational program.

TABLE V  
METHODS USED TO FINANCE GRADUATE STUDY

| Method         | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Self-Financed  | 7         | 1           | 8          |
| Work           | 6         | -           | 6          |
| Loan           | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Assistantship  | 1         | 2           | 3          |
| NDEA Institute | 1         | 4           | 5          |
| Combination    | 25        | 4           | 29         |
| Other          | <u>4</u>  | <u>1</u>    | <u>5</u>   |
| Totals         | 45        | 12          | 57         |

Only one person financed his entire education with a loan. This particular loan was granted by the educational institution for which the individual worked.

In Table VI it is evident that most of the graduates not only locate in a different school following the completion of their program, but also in a different state. Approximately 16 percent remain in the same educational setting. A significant percentage stay in the same state but move into a private setting.

No significant differences appear between male and female as far as their present location in relation to prior employment.

TABLE VI  
THE GRADUATES LOCATION OF PRESENT EMPLOYMENT  
IN RELATION TO THAT PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT  
IN THE GRADUATE PROGRAM

| Location of<br>Present Employment   | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Same School                         | 7         | 2           | 9          |
| Different School, Same State        | 11        | 2           | 13         |
| Different School, Different State   | 21        | 4           | 25         |
| Other:                              |           |             |            |
| (A) First Employment                | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| (B) Same State to a Private Setting | 4         | 2           | 6          |
| (C) Not Employed                    | -         | 1           | 1          |
| (D) Same State, Same Business       | <u>1</u>  | <u>-</u>    | <u>1</u>   |
| Totals                              | 45        | 12          | 57         |



The graduates held a broad variety of jobs outside of the educational field. One significant area was jobs primarily classified as labor (Table VII). Some of the more common areas were business related and service or helping type jobs (Table VIII).

TABLE VII  
SOME OF THE GRADUATES WORK EXPERIENCES  
OUTSIDE OF EDUCATION

| Type of Jobs for Men                             | Men<br>N |
|--|----------|
| Farm and Ranch                                   | 5        |
| Salesman   | 3        |
| Administrator, Manager or Proprietor             | 7        |
| Business   | 19       |
| Working with People in Advisement or Helping Way | 8        |
| Labor  | 25       |
| Other  | 10       |

#### Training Experiences

Table IX tabulates and summarizes the ages of the graduates at the time of completion of their degree. Approximately 86 percent of the graduates were between 21 and 30 years of age when they received their Bachelor's degree. Sixty-five percent of the graduates were between 21 and 30 years of age when they received their Master's degree. One change was that 66.6 percent of the women remained in

TABLE VIII  
SOME OF THE GRADUATES WORK EXPERIENCES  
OUTSIDE OF EDUCATION

| Type of Jobs for Women                           | Women<br>N |
|--|------------|
| Business, Secretary, Bookkeeper, etc.            | 3          |
| Administrator type or Proprietor                 | 3          |
| Working with People in Advisement or Helping Way | 5          |
| Other  | 5          |

TABLE IX  
AGES OF THE GRADUATES AT THE TIME  
OF COMPLETION OF THEIR DEGREES

| Degree     | Ages  |    |       |   |       |   |       |   |       |   | Totals<br>N |
|------------|-------|----|-------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------------|
|            | 21-30 |    | 31-40 |   | 41-50 |   | 51-60 |   | 61-70 |   |             |
|            | M     | F  | M     | F | M     | F | M     | F | M     | F |             |
|            | N     | N  | N     | N | N     | N | N     | N | N     | N |             |
| Bachelor's | 39    | 10 | 5     | 1 | -     | 1 | 1     | - | -     | - | 57          |
| Master's   | 29    | 8  | 13    | 1 | 2     | 3 | 1     | - | -     | - | 57          |
| Ed.D       | 10    | 4  | 20    | 2 | 13    | 4 | 2     | 2 | -     | - | 57          |
| Totals     | 78    | 22 | 38    | 4 | 15    | 8 | 4     | 2 | -     | - | 171         |

this category at the time they received their Master's degree, but the percentage of men in this category has decreased from approximately 87 percent to 64 percent. For the completion of the Ed.D degree, the

highest percentage (44) of men were in the 31 to 40 age category.

The highest percentage (33 1/3) of women were in the category of 41 to 50 years of age.

Table X presented results to show that female graduates overall required less time to finish their degree. The only exception to this was during the Ed.D degree program. Then, there was a slight difference in that the men required slightly less time.

TABLE X

MEAN OF YEARS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE ACADEMIC DEGREES

| Degree     | Male | Female |
|------------|------|--------|
| Bachelor's | 4.68 | 3.66   |
| Master's   | 2.18 | 1.51   |
| Ed.D       | 3.83 | 3.97   |

Forty-nine percent of the Bachelor's degrees were obtained by graduates in Oklahoma. Approximately 44 percent of the Master's degrees were received in-state. Of course, all the Ed.D degrees were received in-state (Table XI).

Table XIII began to show the trend of the graduate towards his final educational objective. Approximately 51 percent of the graduates were now declared student personnel majors. Another 26 percent were in Education and Administration. Twelve percent were psychology

majors. Forty-six and seven-tenths percent of the males were declared student personnel majors. Sixty-six and six-tenths percent of the women had declared as student personnel majors.

TABLE XI  
LOCATION OF AWARDING INSTITUTION

| Location     | Bachelor's |   | Master's |   | Ed.D |    |
|--------------|------------|---|----------|---|------|----|
|              | M          | F | M        | F | M    | F  |
|              | N          | N | N        | N | N    | N  |
| In-State     | 21         | 7 | 18       | 7 | 45   | 12 |
| Out-of-State | 24         | 5 | 27       | 5 | -    | -  |

TABLE XII  
THE GRADUATES MAJOR WHILE PURSUING THE MASTER'S DEGREE

| Master's Major               | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Student Personnel & Guidance | 21        | 8           | 29         |
| Education and Administration | 13        | 2           | 15         |
| Psychology                   | 3         | 2           | 5          |
| Educational Psychology       | 4         | -           | 4          |
| History                      | 1         | -           | 1          |
| English                      | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Economics                    | 1         | -           | 1          |
| T. & I. Education            | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Totals                       | 45        | 12          | 57         |

As shown in Table XIII, 12 percent of the graduates majored in education while obtaining their Bachelor's degree. Ten and one-half percent majored in History and ten and one-half percent majored in Math. The major that ranked first with the men was History. The women graduates were equally interested in Education, Elementary Education, English, and Music. Eight and seventh-tenths percent majored in Psychology.

TABLE XIII

## THE GRADUATES MAJOR WHILE PURSUING THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

| Bachelor's Major     | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|----------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Math                 | 5         | 1           | 6          |
| Education            | 5         | 2           | 7          |
| Social Science       | 5         | -           | 5          |
| History              | 6         | -           | 6          |
| Psychology           | 4         | 1           | 5          |
| Elementary Education | 3         | 2           | 5          |
| English              | 3         | 2           | 5          |
| Music                | 2         | 2           | 4          |
| Biology              | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Home Economics       | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Business             | 3         | -           | 3          |
| Religion             | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Chemistry            | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Sociology            | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Political Science    | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Language Arts        | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Physiology           | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Economics            | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Personnel Management | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Non-Major            | <u>1</u>  | <u>-</u>    | <u>1</u>   |
| Totals               | 45        | 12          | 57         |

The occupational objective of the graduate at entry into each of his degree programs is analyzed in Table XIV. Fifty-four percent of the graduates were in categories other than teaching, counseling or psychology when they pursued their Bachelor's degree. In the graduates Master's degree work only 8.7 percent were in the "other" category. At this stage of their education, 51 percent had selected counseling or psychology as their occupational objective. In the Bachelor's degree program, none of the graduates had chosen administration of any kind as an occupational objective. At the Master's level, only 15.8 percent had chosen administration as an objective. The percentage climbed to 35 percent for those declaring administration as their objective. In the Bachelor's degree program, the women graduates had not chosen either administration or counseling as an occupational choice. The emphasis by the women went from zero to 83 percent choosing administration or counseling as their occupational objective at the advanced level of education. The heavy emphasis was on either counseling or psychology. The percentage of graduates (both men and women) interested in teaching declined from 40 percent in the Bachelor's degree program to 24.5 percent in the Master's degree program to finally approximately 8.7 percent during the Ed.D program.

Occupational objectives changed for 60 percent of the graduates during the periods in which they pursued their Bachelor's degree. During the completion of the Master's degree, only 33 percent changed their occupational objectives. The number changing their occupational objective climbed to 37 percent during the time period the graduate used to complete his Ed.D degree.

TABLE XIV  
GRADUATES OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVE AT ENTRY  
INTO EACH OF HIS DEGREE PROGRAMS

| Objective                | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| <u>Bachelor's Degree</u> |           |             |            |
| Teacher                  | 16        | 7           | 23         |
| Administrator            | -         | -           | -          |
| Counseling or Psychology | 3         | -           | 3          |
| Other                    | <u>26</u> | <u>5</u>    | <u>31</u>  |
| Totals                   | 45        | 12          | 57         |
| <u>Master's Degree</u>   |           |             |            |
| Teacher                  | 12        | 2           | 14         |
| Administrator            | 6         | 3           | 9          |
| Counseling or Psychology | 22        | 7           | 29         |
| Other                    | <u>5</u>  | <u>-</u>    | <u>5</u>   |
| Totals                   | 45        | 12          | 57         |
| <u>Ed.D Degree</u>       |           |             |            |
| Teacher                  | 3         | 2           | 5          |
| Administrator            | 18        | 2           | 20         |
| Counseling or Psychology | 17        | 8           | 25         |
| Other                    | <u>7</u>  | <u>-</u>    | <u>7</u>   |
| Totals                   | 45        | 12          | 57         |

In further analysis of the information contained in Table XV, it is observed that men more often than women changed their occupational objectives during their quest of Bachelor's and Master's degrees, but that during the years leading to an Ed.D degree the women more often than men changed their occupational objectives. Two-thirds of the

population changed their mind during their Bachelor's degree program. The results reversed themselves during the final two programs. Two-thirds of the population did not change the final two programs.

TABLE XV

NUMBER OF GRADUATES WHOSE OCCUPATIONAL OBJECTIVES CHANGED  
DURING THEIR STUDY FOR EACH OF THEIR DEGREES

| Objective Changed        | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N | Total %  |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|----------|
| <u>Bachelor's Degree</u> |           |             |            |          |
| Yes                      | 30        | 7           | 37         | 65       |
| No                       | 14        | 5           | 19         | 33       |
| No Response              | <u>1</u>  | <u>-</u>    | <u>1</u>   | <u>2</u> |
| Totals                   | 45        | 12          | 57         | 100%     |
| <u>Master's Degree</u>   |           |             |            |          |
| Yes                      | 16        | 3           | 19         | 33       |
| No                       | 28        | 8           | 36         | 63       |
| No Response              | <u>1</u>  | <u>1</u>    | <u>2</u>   | <u>4</u> |
| Totals                   | 45        | 12          | 57         | 100%     |
| <u>Ed.D Degree</u>       |           |             |            |          |
| Yes                      | 16        | 5           | 21         | 37       |
| No                       | 28        | 7           | 35         | 61       |
| No Response              | <u>1</u>  | <u>-</u>    | <u>1</u>   | <u>2</u> |
| Totals                   | 45        | 12          | 57         | 100%     |



Seventy percent of the graduates reported on in Table XVI had less than five years of work experience between the Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Fifty percent of the women graduates had only zero to two years of experience between the Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Thirty-one percent of the men fell in this category.

TABLE XVI  
THE GRADUATES YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE  
BETWEEN THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

| Years of Experience | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| 0 - 2               | 14        | 6           | 20         |
| 3 - 5               | 17        | 3           | 20         |
| 6 - 8               | 5         | -           | 5          |
| 9 - 11              | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| 12 - 14             | 2         | -           | 2          |
| 15 - 17             | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| No Response         | <u>5</u>  | <u>1</u>    | <u>6</u>   |
| Totals              | 45        | 12          | 57         |

Table XVII shows that the number of years of work experience changes significantly between the Master's degree and the Ed.D degree. Fifty-seven percent of the men have from three to eight years of experience between the Master's and Ed.D degrees. Forty-one and six-tenths percent of the women were in the less-than-two-years bracket. Twenty percent of the men have worked more than nine years between the

last two degrees. It would appear that the 35 percent who did not respond to this question did not work between the last two degrees.

TABLE XVII  
THE GRADUATES YEARS OF WORK EXPERIENCE  
BETWEEN THE MASTER'S DEGREE  
AND THE Ed.D DEGREE

| Years of Experience | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| 0 - 2               | 4         | 5           | 9          |
| 3 - 5               | 13        | -           | 13         |
| 6 - 8               | 13        | 3           | 16         |
| 9 - 11              | 5         | -           | 5          |
| 12 - 14             | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| 15 - 17             | 3         | -           | 3          |
| No Response         | <u>6</u>  | <u>3</u>    | <u>9</u>   |
| Totals              | 45        | 12          | 57         |

In Table XVIII results show that the mean of years by graduates for different work experiences between the Bachelor's and Master's degree is as would be expected, higher in educational type work than non-educational work. It is interesting to note that the means of years in educational work experiences and non-educational work experiences are identical. Results also showed that the means of the men's work years is slightly higher than the means of the women graduates.

TABLE XVIII  
 MEAN OF YEARS OF THE GRADUATES FOR DIFFERENT WORK  
 EXPERIENCES BETWEEN THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE  
 AND THE MASTER'S DEGREE

| Work Experiences                 | Male | Female |
|----------------------------------|------|--------|
| Educational Work Experiences     | 3.9  | 3.5    |
| Non-Educational Work Experiences | 3.63 | 3.5    |

Between the Master's and Ed.D degrees, a significant decline in non-educational type work experiences was indicated. In the survey completed in this study, male graduates averaged 6.3 years. Males averaged 2.6 years of non-educational work experience and females reported no non-educational work experience (Table XIX).

#### Post-Training Experiences

Table XX shows that if the graduate left student personnel work, 14 percent simply wanted other type of work. Seven percent changed for more money. Three and one-half percent of the graduates found better job opportunities.

Table XXI indicates that 80 percent of the graduates work and are paid on a twelve-month basis. Approximately 30 percent of the graduates make over \$19,000 per school term. Eighty-two percent of those making over \$19,000 are on a twelve-month contract. None of the

TABLE XIX

MEAN OF YEARS OF THE GRADUATES FOR DIFFERENT WORK  
EXPERIENCES BETWEEN THE MASTER'S DEGREE  
AND THE Ed.D DEGREE

| Work Experiences                 | Male | Female |
|----------------------------------|------|--------|
| Educational Work Experiences     | 6.3  | 5.3    |
| Non-Educational Work Experiences | 2.6  | 0.0    |

TABLE XX

REASONS FOR GRADUATE LEAVING  
STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK

| Reason for Changing Vocation | Male<br>N | Female<br>N |
|------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Financial                    | 4         | -           |
| No Job Openings              | 1         | 1           |
| Better Opportunity           | 2         | 2           |
| Wasn't Happy                 | -         | 1           |
| Wanted Other Type Work       | 8         | -           |
| Other                        | <u>7</u>  | <u>3</u>    |
| Totals                       | 22        | 7           |

females who are part of the study are over the \$19,000 salary range.

Fifty percent of the women are contracted on a twelve-month basis.

Over 50 percent are in the range of \$15,000 to \$19,000. Only nine percent of the graduates make less than \$11,000. Thirty-three and one-third percent of those who make less than \$11,000 are women.

TABLE XXI  
TABLE SHOWING SALARY RANGES

| Salary Range        | Months   |          |          |           |          |          |          |          | Total<br>N |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
|                     | Male     |          |          |           | Female   |          |          |          |            |
|                     | 9        | 10       | 11       | 12        | 9        | 10       | 11       | 12       |            |
| Less than \$11,000  | -        | -        | -        | 1         | 2        | -        | -        | 2        | 5          |
| \$11,000 - \$13,000 | 1        | -        | -        | -         | -        | -        | -        | -        | 1          |
| \$13,000 - \$15,000 | 4        | 2        | -        | 3         | 1        | -        | -        | -        | 10         |
| \$15,000 - \$17,000 | 2        | 2        | -        | 7         | -        | 2        | -        | 1        | 14         |
| \$17,000 - \$19,000 | -        | 1        | -        | 5         | -        | -        | 1        | 3        | 10         |
| Over \$19,000       | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>14</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>-</u> | <u>17</u>  |
| Totals              | 8        | 6        | 1        | 30        | 3        | 2        | 1        | 6        | 57         |

Thirty-three and one-third percent of the graduates see from zero to 19 counselees per week. Approximately 9 percent see 40 to 49 counselees per week. Forty-five and six-tenths percent did not respond and it appears they are not seeing counselees. Table XXII shows there is very little difference between men and women graduates as far as counselees seen.

Approximately 97 percent of the graduates held a college level job after graduation from the Ed.D program. Forty-nine percent of the

male graduates held jobs as administrators. Twenty-nine percent were employed as teachers. Fifteen and one-half percent went into counseling work. Fifty percent of the female counterparts were in teaching positions.

TABLE XXII  
APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COUNSELEES  
WORKED WITH EACH WEEK

| Number of<br>Weekly Counselees | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| 0 - 19                         | 16        | 3           | 19         |
| 20 - 39                        | 5         | 2           | 7          |
| 40 - 59                        | 3         | 2           | 5          |
| 60 - above                     | -         | -           | -          |
| No Response                    | <u>21</u> | <u>5</u>    | <u>26</u>  |
| Totals                         | 45        | 12          | 57         |

Approximately half of the men took a second job and about half of those were administrative-type positions. Slightly less than half went into teaching positions.

About 15½ percent of the men had taken a third job. Again, most of the changes were into administrative positions. About 25 percent of the women changed to a third job. Table XXIII shows that a majority of the graduates were in administrative positions in either jobs one, two, or three.

TABLE XXIII  
LISTING OF FIRST THREE JOBS HELD  
BY GRADUATES AFTER GRADUATION

| Jobs                | College Level |        | High School & Below |        | Other |        |
|---------------------|---------------|--------|---------------------|--------|-------|--------|
|                     | Male          | Female | Male                | Female | Male  | Female |
|                     | N             | N      | N                   | N      | N     | N      |
| <u>Job 1</u>        |               |        |                     |        |       |        |
| Administrative Type | 22            | 2      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Teacher Type        | 13            | 6      | -                   | -      | 1     | 1      |
| Counselor Type      | 7             | 1      | -                   | -      | -     | 1      |
| Combination         | -             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Other               | 3             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| <u>Job 2</u>        |               |        |                     |        |       |        |
| Administrative Type | 11            | 3      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Teacher Type        | 8             | 2      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Counselor Type      | 3             | 1      | -                   | 1      | -     | -      |
| Combination         | -             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Other               | -             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| <u>Job 3</u>        |               |        |                     |        |       |        |
| Administrative Type | 4             | 1      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Teacher Type        | 1             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Counselor Type      | 2             | 2      | -                   | 1      | -     | -      |
| Combination         | -             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |
| Other               | -             | -      | -                   | -      | -     | -      |

Table XXIV shows that the male graduates held their first job 2.8 years. The female graduates held their first job 2.6 years.

Of the 24 men who changed to a second job, the average number of years on the second job was 3.6 years. Eight women changed to a second position and held it an average of 3.4 years. Seven men changed to a

third position and held it an average of three years. Four women changed to a third job and averaged two years on that job. Table XXV provides more detailed information on the number of years on each of the first three jobs held by the graduates.

TABLE XXIV  
NUMBER OF YEARS OF TENURE FOR FIRST THREE  
JOBS HELD BY GRADUATES AFTER GRADUATION

|                             | Male | Female |
|-----------------------------|------|--------|
| <u>Job 1</u>                |      |        |
| Total Population            | 45   | 12     |
| Average Years on First Job  | 2.8  | 2.66   |
| <u>Job 2</u>                |      |        |
| Average Years on Second Job | 2.66 | 3.38   |
| Number Who had a Second Job | 24   | 8      |
| <u>Job 3</u>                |      |        |
| Average Years on Third Job  | 3    | 2      |
| Number Who had a Third Job  | 7    | 4      |

As would be anticipated, 63 percent of the graduates are presently employed in senior colleges or universities (Table XXVI). Approximately 10 percent of the graduates are in junior college settings. A greater number of men are in private business or self-employed than are women. There are more graduates in combination-type jobs at the high



school, junior high school level than there are working at a single level only. One individual is employed in government work. No graduate was employed in industry.

TABLE XXV  
NUMBER OF YEARS ON EACH OF THE FIRST THREE JOBS  
HELD BY THE GRADUATE

| Years on Job | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| <u>Job 1</u> |           |             |            |
| Years        |           |             |            |
| 0 - 2        | 25        | 8           | 33         |
| 3 - 5        | 15        | 2           | 17         |
| 6 - 8        | <u>5</u>  | <u>2</u>    | <u>7</u>   |
| Totals       | 45        | 12          | 57         |
| <u>Job 2</u> |           |             |            |
| Years        |           |             |            |
| 0 - 2        | 12        | 3           | 15         |
| 3 - 5        | 11        | 4           | 15         |
| 6 - 8        | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| No Response  | <u>21</u> | <u>4</u>    | <u>25</u>  |
| Totals       | 45        | 12          | 57         |
| <u>Job 3</u> |           |             |            |
| Years        |           |             |            |
| 0 - 2        | 4         | 3           | 7          |
| 3 - 5        | 2         | 1           | 3          |
| 6 - 8        | 1         | -           | 1          |
| No Response  | <u>38</u> | <u>8</u>    | <u>46</u>  |
| Totals       | 45        | 12          | 57         |

TABLE XXVI  
AREAS IN WHICH THE GRADUATES  
ARE PRESENTLY EMPLOYED

| Area                        | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Elementary                  | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Senior High School          | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| Junior College              | 5         | 1           | 6          |
| College or University       | 30        | 6           | 36         |
| Private Business            | 3         | 1           | 4          |
| Self-Employed               | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Other:                      |           |             |            |
| State or Federal Government | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Combinations:               |           |             |            |
| K-12                        | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Elementary-12               | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Elementary and High School  | -         | 1           | 1          |
| No Response                 | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Totals                      | 45        | 12          | 57         |

Twenty-eight percent of the graduates had the title of professor. Thirty-nine percent of the titles indicated were in the administrative category. Twenty-one percent listed titles associated with counseling type functions. There was an absence of women in administrative roles. The women held titles of psychologists, counselors, professors, and teachers (Table XXVII).

Women seem to have been more involved in writing and publishing than men. Forty-five men wrote 30 articles and 12 women wrote 24 articles. None of the women had published a book (Table XXVIII).

TABLE XXVII  
TITLES OF PRESENT POSITIONS

| Position                                       | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|--|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Teacher  | -         | -           | -          |
| Teacher, Counselor                             | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Counselor                                      | 2         | 2           | 4          |
| Director of Guidance or Pupil Personnel        | 3         | -           | 3          |
| Administrative Dean                            | 3         | -           | 3          |
| Professor                                      | 14        | 2           | 16         |
| No Response                                    | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Combinations:                                  |           |             |            |
| Professor & Director of Counseling Service     | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Professor & Counselor                          | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Professor & Director of Faculty Development    | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Professor & Chairman of Education Department   | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Professor & Psychologist                       | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Professor & Director of Testing                | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Other:   |           |             |            |
| Director of Research Training                  | -         | -           | -          |
| Clinical Director                              | 1         | -           | 1          |
| School Psychologist                            | 2         | 1           | 3          |
| Director of Housing                            | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Director of University Placement               | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Director of Counseling Center                  | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Director of Educational Service                | 1         | -           | 1          |
| College President                              | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Ass't. to Vice-President for Academic Affairs  | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Writer   | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Preacher                                       | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Ass't. to Director, College of Arts & Sciences | -         | -           | -          |
| Extension                                      | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Private Psychologist                           | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Vice-President for Student Affairs             | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Coordinator for Research                       | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Director of Non-resident Student               |           |             |            |
| Resource Center                                | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Director of Behavior Modification Project      | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Director of Testing                            | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Director of Counselor Education                | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Totals   | 45        | 12          | 57         |

TABLE XXVIII  
PUBLISHING INFORMATION ABOUT THE GRADUATES

| Articles<br>Published | Men<br>N | Women<br>N | Highest<br>Number<br>Individual<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-----------------------|----------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|
| Articles              | 25       | 24         | 20                                   | 49         |
| Books                 | 5        | -          | 3                                    | 5          |
| TV Series             | 1        | -          | 1                                    | 1          |

Table XXIX presents the number of national professional organizations to which the graduates belong. The highest number belonged to by one individual was nine for a male and seven for a female graduate. Male graduates belonged to more organizations than female graduates.

Oklahoma comprises 43.7 percent of the states worked in by the graduate since completion of the Ed.D. Table XXX shows that the

TABLE XXIX  
NUMBER OF NATIONAL PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS  
TO WHICH GRADUATES BELONG

|                         | Male | Female |
|-------------------------|------|--------|
| Number of Organizations | 3.56 | 3.1    |

TABLE XXX  
 NUMBER OF STATES WORKED IN SINCE COMPLETION  
 OF THE Ed.D DEGREE

| States Worked In | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Oklahoma         | 26        | 5           | 31         |
| Missouri         | 9         | 1           | 10         |
| Texas            | 7         | -           | 7          |
| Arkansas         | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Kansas           | 2         | -           | 2          |
| New Mexico       | 1         | -           | 1          |
| California       | 2         | 1           | 3          |
| Illinois         | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Iowa             | 1         | -           | 1          |
| South Dakota     | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Wisconsin        | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Alabama          | 1         | -           | 1          |
| South Carolina   | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Connecticut      | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Arizona          | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Virginia         | 1         | -           | 1          |
| West Virginia    | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Massachusetts    | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Hawaii           | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Louisiana        | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Indiana          | -         | 1           | 1          |
| <u>Countries</u> |           |             |            |
| Japan            | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Turkey           | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Totals           | 58        | 14          | 72         |

state, next to Oklahoma, most worked in was Missouri, closely followed by Texas. The graduates have worked in 23 states plus two foreign countries.

Table XXXI, which presents information about the states where the graduates are presently employed, continues the same trends indicated in Table XXX. Oklahoma is the leading employing state with Missouri and Texas following. One of the graduates is presently employed in Turkey. Thirteen states and one foreign country are represented.

TABLE XXXI  
GRADUATES PRESENT EMPLOYMENT BY STATES

| States           | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Oklahoma         | 22        | 5           | 27         |
| Missouri         | 9         | 1           | 10         |
| Texas            | 7         | -           | 7          |
| California       | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| Virginia         | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Arizona          | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Connecticut      | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Wisconsin        | 1         | -           | 1          |
| South Dakota     | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Iowa             | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Louisiana        | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Massachusetts    | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Indiana          | -         | 1           | 1          |
| <u>Countries</u> |           |             |            |
| Turkey           | -         | 1           | 1          |
| No Response      | -         | 1           | 1          |
| Totals           | 45        | 12          | 57         |

## Evaluation of Training Experiences

Throughout the replies, there seemed to be a thread indicating a need for more staff. Several graduates indicated they would like to see more emphasis placed on psychological dynamics of self and others (Table XXXII).

Counseling Practicum was by far the area that was considered to be most valuable to the graduates. Statistics was also rated very high as was Personality Theories. It was interesting to note that those selecting Counseling Practicum were all men. None of the women considered this area of greatest value in the program (Table XXXIII).

Using a scale of one to five, (five-very useful; one-useless) Table XXXIV shows the graduates rating the practical utility of the course work.

The highest rating was given by female graduates to the courses, Counseling Practicum, Abnormal Psychology, and Psychology Adjustment. This relates back to the fact that many women graduates went into counseling positions. The lowest rating was given by female graduates in the course Principles and Administration of Guidance Services.

The highest ratings by area were in Personality and Adjustment. The lowest ratings by area were given to Guidance. It should be noted that the female graduates gave the highest and lowest ratings, but on the average, the men gave the overall lowest ratings and the female graduates, the highest.

By individual courses, the highest rated course in the counseling area was Counseling Practicum. The lowest rating in counseling was given to Problems and Principles of Student Counseling. In research

TABLE XXXII

WAYS TO IMPROVE THE Ed.D DEGREE PROGRAM  
IN STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE

| Ways to Improve  | Men<br>N | Women<br>N | Total<br>N |
|--|----------|------------|------------|
| Coordination of practicing student personnel agencies on campus with teaching areas . . . . .                                    | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Bring in younger staff members . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Bring in more staff . . . . .  | 2        | -          | 2          |
| Bring in more qualified staff . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More continuity in the professional ranks . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More clinical psychology courses . . . . .   | 1        | 1          | 2          |
| More practicum experience . . . . .  | 1        | 1          | 2          |
| Provide a broad base practicum of internship with diverse clients, not just college students . . . . .                           | 3        | 1          | 4          |
| Remove the education and "professional role" courses and develop emphasis on psychological dynamics of self and others . . . . . | 5        | 2          | 7          |
| Greater emphasis on interpersonal dynamics . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More training with psychodrama, supervision, play therapy, group practicum, family counseling and multiple counseling . . . . .  | -        | 1          | 1          |
| Freedom of choice in curriculum and research studies . . . . .   | -        | 1          | 1          |
| Teach more budget preparation . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Raise standards . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More emphasis on vocational counseling . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More work with the exceptional child and learning disabilities . . . . .   | 1        | 1          | 2          |
| Greater application of theory to practice . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Structure expected outcomes of students . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Centralize program . . . . .   | 2        | -          | 2          |
| Award Ph.D instead of Ed.D . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More emphasis on internship . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Provide smaller classes . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Closer relationship between students and faculty . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More work on legal aspects . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More emphasis on diagnostic interviews and more emphasis on counseling psychology . . . . .                                      | 1        | -          | 1          |



TABLE XXXIII  
AREAS OF GREATEST VALUE TO THE GRADUATE

| Areas                     | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Counseling Practicum      | 10        | -           | 10         |
| Personality Theories      | 5         | -           | 5          |
| Statistics                | 6         | -           | 6          |
| Tests and Measurements    | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Curriculum                | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Internship in Counseling  | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Student Personnel Seminar | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Clinical Psychology       | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Research                  | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| Group Guidance            | 3         | -           | 3          |
| Counseling Theory         | 2         | 2           | 4          |
| Psychology Courses        | 1         | -           | 1          |
| Higher Education          | 3         | 1           | 4          |
| Student Personnel Courses | 1         | 1           | 2          |
| Individual Assistance     | 5         | 1           | 6          |

methods, the course Research in Education receives the highest rating and Doctoral Seminar received the lowest. In measurements, Elementary Statistical Methods was rated the highest in practical utility and Educational Measurements, the lowest. Higher Education Student Personnel Service was ranked the highest in the Higher Education Student Personnel area and also the lowest. In the Personality and Adjustment area, Abnormal Psychology and Psychology Adjustment received the highest rating and Personality Theories the lowest. The Psychological Foundations area had Human Development as the highest rated course and the lowest rated course.

TABLE XXXIV

THE GRADUATES RATINGS OF THE PRACTICAL UTILITY OF  
 COURSE WORK TAKEN AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
 (5-VERY USEFUL TO 1-USELESS)

| Course Work                                      | Male | Female | Combined<br>Male & Female | Total<br>By Area |
|--|------|--------|---------------------------|------------------|
| <u>Guidance</u>                                  |      |        |                           |                  |
| Principles and Admin. of Guidance Service        | 3.86 | 3.33   | 3.60                      | 3.60             |
| <u>Counseling</u>                                |      |        |                           |                  |
| Problems and Principles of Student Counseling    | 4.00 | 3.66   | 3.83                      | -                |
| Group Guidance                                   | 4.02 | 4.44   | 4.23                      | -                |
| Interview Technique                              | 4.26 | 4.00   | 4.13                      | -                |
| Counseling Practicum                             | 4.26 | 5.00   | 4.78                      | -                |
| Intern. in Counsel. Student Personnel Service    | 4.57 | 4.80   | 4.69                      | 4.33             |
| <u>Research Methods</u>                          |      |        |                           |                  |
| Research in Education                            | 4.23 | 4.80   | 4.52                      | -                |
| Doctoral Seminar                                 | 3.90 | 3.60   | 3.75                      | -                |
| Doctoral Thesis                                  | 4.30 | 4.08   | 4.19                      | 4.15             |
| <u>Measurements</u>                              |      |        |                           |                  |
| Educational Measurements                         | 4.29 | 4.00   | 4.15                      | -                |
| Elementary Statistical Methods                   | 4.20 | 4.37   | 4.29                      | -                |
| Advanced Educational Statistics                  | 4.22 | 4.27   | 4.25                      | 4.25             |
| <u>Higher Education Student Personnel</u>        |      |        |                           |                  |
| Higher Education Student Personnel               | 4.25 | 4.00   | 4.13                      | -                |
| Higher Education Student Personnel Service       | 3.84 | 4.16   | 4.00                      | -                |
| Super. Experience in Education Student Personnel | 3.93 | 4.00   | 3.97                      | 4.03             |
| <u>Personality and Adjustment</u>                |      |        |                           |                  |
| Abnormal Psychology                              | 4.33 | 5.00   | 4.67                      | -                |
| Personality Theories                             | 4.32 | 4.66   | 4.49                      | -                |
| Psychology Adjustment                            | 4.47 | 5.00   | 4.74                      | 4.63             |

TABLE XXXIV (Continued)

| Course Work   | Male | Female | Combined<br>Male & Female | Total<br>By Area |
|---|------|--------|---------------------------|------------------|
| <u>Psychology Foundations</u>                       |      |        |                           |                  |
| Human Development                                   | 3.73 | 4.45   | 4.09                      | -                |
| Psychology of Learning                              | 3.90 | 4.42   | 4.16                      | 4.13             |
| <u>Curriculum and Administration</u>                |      |        |                           |                  |
| Curriculum and Methods in Higher Education          | 3.63 | 3.00   | 3.32                      | -                |
| Organization and Administration of Higher Education | 3.78 | 4.20   | 3.99                      | 3.66             |
| <u>Vocational Development</u>                       |      |        |                           |                  |
| Vocational Information                              | 3.73 | 4.85   | 4.29                      | -                |
| Theories of Occupational Choice                     | 3.94 | 4.33   | 4.14                      | 4.22             |
| <u>Related Behavioral Science</u>                   |      |        |                           |                  |
| Educational Sociology                               | 3.68 | 3.80   | 3.74                      | 3.74             |

Tables XXXV, XXXVI, and XXXVII present the results of a rating given by graduates about their past and present involvement and preparedness for a number of tasks or functions performed by student personnel professionals. The results in Table XXXV are given in statistical means, five being the high degree and one being the low degree. The highest rating given any one task or function as related to involvement in present position, is to the task or function of planning a testing program. The lowest rating given to this area is for the task or function of the application of statistical techniques to original research. Again, as in earlier charts, the higher rating is given to a psychology-type item, that being the teaching of related psychology or behavioral science courses. The highest combined rating goes to working with groups.

In the individual counseling part of the table, the highest rating goes to the task or function of individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment. The lowest rating goes to the task or function of intervention among relationship forces within the home and family sphere.

Table XXXVI gives the graduates rating of how the tasks or functions were involved in past positions. The data is given in statistical means. The task or function which received the highest rating as a task or function involved in past positions was popularizing the guidance concept with students and other educational professionals. The task or function with the lowest rating was again the application of statistical techniques to original research along with giving and interpreting personality and adjustment inventories which was located in the individual counseling section of the table.

TABLE XXXV

DEGREE THAT GRADUATES ARE INVOLVED IN SELECTED TASKS OR FUNCTIONS IN THEIR POSITION  
 (0) = No Basis to Judge; (1) = Low Degree; (5) = High Degree

| Task or Function   | Male | Female | Combined |
|--|------|--------|----------|
| Application of statistical techniques to original research . . . . .   | 3.21 | 2.20   | 2.97     |
| Reading statistically treated research with understanding . . . . .  | 4.04 | 3.73   | 3.89     |
| Interpreting standard/derived scores . . . . .   | 3.47 | 3.82   | 3.65     |
| Planning a testing program . . . . .   | 4.52 | 3.50   | 4.01     |
| Giving and interpreting interest and aptitude tests . . . . .  | 3.43 | 2.70   | 3.07     |
| Being active and knowledgeable in professional activities . . . . .  | 4.33 | 3.91   | 4.12     |
| Popularizing the guidance concept with students and other<br>educational professionals . . . . .             | 3.84 | 3.45   | 3.65     |
| Teaching student personnel related courses . . . . .   | 3.35 | 3.20   | 3.28     |
| Teaching related psychology or behavioral science courses . . . . .  | 4.03 | 4.33   | 4.18     |
| Teaching education related courses . . . . .   | 3.25 | 3.00   | 3.13     |
| Administering a student personnel division . . . . .   | 3.70 | 3.00   | 3.35     |
| Working within confines of legalities in areas such as due<br>process, search, confidentiality, etc. . . . . | 3.76 | 3.33   | 3.55     |
| Working out role relations in the particular educational setting . . . . .                                   | 3.52 | 3.13   | 3.33     |
| Administering student discipline . . . . .   | 2.40 | 2.57   | 2.49     |
| Working with groups . . . . .  | 4.11 | 4.30   | 4.21     |
| Recognition of neurotic or psychotic behaviors . . . . .   | 3.56 | 4.10   | 3.83     |
| Application of vocational development and choice theories . . . . .  | 3.25 | 3.38   | 3.32     |
| Application of personality theories to counseling . . . . .  | 3.55 | 3.90   | 3.73     |
| Development of a framework for appraisal of the individual . . . . .   | 3.75 | 3.70   | 3.73     |

TABLE XXXV (Continued)

| Task or Function  | Male | Female | Combined |
|---|------|--------|----------|
| <u>Individual Counseling</u>  |      |        |          |
| Individual helping relationship with career development dynamics . . . . .                    | 3.46 | 2.56   | 3.01     |
| Giving and interpreting personality and adjustment inventories . . . . .                      | 3.02 | 2.60   | 2.81     |
| Individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment in<br>academic environment . . . . . | 3.77 | 3.50   | 3.64     |
| Intervention among relationship forces within the home and<br>family sphere . . . . .         | 3.22 | 2.55   | 2.87     |

TABLE XXXVI

DEGREE THAT GRADUATES WERE INVOLVED IN SELECTED TASKS OR FUNCTIONS IN PAST POSITIONS  
 (0) = No Basis to Judge; (1) = Low Degree; (5) = High Degree

| Task or Function   | Male | Female | Combined |
|--|------|--------|----------|
| Application of statistical techniques to original research . . . . .   | 3.12 | 2.57   | 2.84     |
| Reading statistically treated research with understanding . . . . .  | 3.70 | 3.25   | 3.47     |
| Interpreting standard/derived scores . . . . .   | 4.06 | 3.33   | 3.70     |
| Planning a testing program . . . . .   | 3.66 | 3.25   | 3.46     |
| Giving and interpreting interest and aptitude tests . . . . .  | 3.93 | 3.44   | 3.69     |
| Being active and knowledgeable in professional activities . . . . .  | 4.11 | 3.57   | 3.84     |
| Popularizing the guidance concept with students and other<br>educational professionals . . . . .             | 4.32 | 3.25   | 3.79     |
| Teaching student personnel related courses . . . . .   | 3.26 | 2.67   | 2.97     |
| Teaching related psychology or behavioral science courses . . . . .  | 3.75 | 2.83   | 3.29     |
| Teaching education related courses . . . . .   | 3.27 | 3.75   | 3.50     |
| Administering a student personnel division . . . . .   | 3.00 | 4.00   | 3.50     |
| Working within confines of legalities in areas such as due<br>process, search, confidentiality, etc. . . . . | 3.68 | 3.88   | 3.78     |
| Working out role relations in the particular educational setting . . . . .                                   | 3.44 | 3.00   | 3.22     |
| Administering student discipline . . . . .   | 3.08 | 2.80   | 2.94     |
| Working with groups . . . . .  | 3.78 | 3.88   | 3.83     |
| Recognition of neurotic or psychotic behaviors . . . . .   | 3.68 | 3.50   | 3.59     |
| Application of vocational development and choice theories . . . . .  | 3.53 | 3.33   | 3.43     |
| Application of personality theories to counseling . . . . .  | 3.48 | 3.87   | 3.68     |
| Development of a framework for appraisal of the individual . . . . .   | 3.37 | 4.13   | 3.75     |

TABLE XXXVI (Continued)

| Task or Function  | Male | Female | Combined |
|---|------|--------|----------|
| <u>Individual Counseling</u>  |      |        |          |
| Individual helping relationship with career development dynamics . . . . .                    | 3.68 | 3.50   | 3.59     |
| Giving and interpreting personality and adjustment inventories . . . . .                      | 3.46 | 2.57   | 3.02     |
| Individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment in<br>academic environment . . . . . | 4.18 | 3.71   | 3.95     |
| Intervention among relationship forces within the home and<br>family sphere . . . . .         | 2.91 | 3.71   | 3.31     |



Combining both male and female ratings, the function or task that the graduate indicated he was most involved in was being active and knowledgeable in professional activities. The combined rating which indicated the task or function in which the graduate was least involved was application of statistical techniques to original research.

In the individual counseling section of the table, the task receiving the highest rating of past involvement was individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment in academic environment. The lowest rating went to giving and interpreting personality and adjustment inventories.

The results recorded in Table XXXVII presents the graduates perceptions and ratings of how they were prepared for selected tasks or functions. There were two selected tasks or functions which received the highest ratings in preparedness. They were reading statistically treated research with understanding and teaching related psychology or behavioral science courses. The lowest individual rating went to the function of working out role relations in the particular educational setting.

In the individual counseling portion of the table, the task of individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment in academic environment received the highest individual rating. The lowest rating given in this area was for the task of intervening among relationship forces within the home and family sphere.

The highest combined rating by both men and women went to the task of being prepared for interpreting standard/derived scores. The lowest combined rating went to the task or function of intervention among relationship forces within the home and family sphere.

TABLE XXXVII

## DEGREE THAT GRADUATES WERE PREPARED FOR SELECTED TASKS OR FUNCTIONS

(0) = No Basis to Judge; (1) = Low Degree; (5) = High Degree

| Task or Function   | Male | Female | Combined |
|--|------|--------|----------|
| Application of statistical techniques to original research . . . . .   | 4.06 | 3.33   | 3.70     |
| Reading statistically treated research with understanding . . . . .  | 4.20 | 3.83   | 4.02     |
| Interpreting standard/derived scores . . . . .   | 4.05 | 4.17   | 4.11     |
| Planning a testing program . . . . .   | 3.97 | 3.83   | 3.90     |
| Giving and interpreting interest and aptitude tests . . . . .  | 4.10 | 4.08   | 4.09     |
| Being active and knowledgeable in professional activities . . . . .  | 4.00 | 4.00   | 4.00     |
| Popularizing the guidance concept with students and other<br>educational professionals . . . . .             | 3.85 | 3.75   | 3.80     |
| Teaching student personnel related courses . . . . .   | 4.09 | 3.73   | 3.91     |
| Teaching related psychology or behavioral science courses . . . . .  | 3.95 | 4.20   | 4.08     |
| Teaching education related courses . . . . .   | 3.63 | 3.80   | 3.72     |
| Administering a student personnel division . . . . .   | 4.00 | 3.56   | 3.78     |
| Working within confines of legalities in areas such as due<br>process, search, confidentiality, etc. . . . . | 3.63 | 3.30   | 3.47     |
| Working out role relations in the particular educational setting . . . . .                                   | 3.41 | 3.00   | 3.21     |
| Administering student discipline . . . . .   | 3.42 | 3.44   | 3.43     |
| Working with groups . . . . .  | 3.29 | 3.55   | 3.42     |
| Recognition of neurotic or psychotic behaviors . . . . .   | 3.55 | 3.11   | 3.33     |
| Application of vocational development and choice theories . . . . .  | 3.72 | 3.38   | 3.55     |
| Application of personality theories to counseling . . . . .  | 3.55 | 4.00   | 3.78     |
| Development of a framework for appraisal of the individual . . . . .   | 3.69 | 3.92   | 3.81     |

TABLE XXXVII (Continued)

| Task or Function  | Male | Female | Combined |
|---|------|--------|----------|
| <u>Individual Counseling</u>  |      |        |          |
| Individual helping relationship with career development dynamics . . . . .                    | 3.72 | 3.42   | 3.57     |
| Giving and interpreting personality and adjustment inventories . . . . .                      | 3.25 | 3.25   | 3.54     |
| Individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment in<br>academic environment . . . . . | 3.80 | 3.92   | 3.86     |
| Intervention among relationship forces within the home and<br>family sphere . . . . .         | 3.05 | 3.25   | 3.15     |

In Table XXXVIII, the lowest rating given by both men and women was a 2.48 rating to periodic evaluation by students of all aspects of the program. The highest rating went to the flexibility within the curriculum to allow for individual differences among students. On a scale of one to five, with five representing the highest rating, all ratings were over a 3.0 except the one weak area listed above. Only one area ranked over a 4.0.

The means of a ranking of satisfaction with assistance given by Oklahoma State University professors and the program, are presented in Table XXXIX. On a scale of five to one, five being highly satisfied or having much interest, the mean average of the table was 4.255. Male graduates gave the program an overall rating of 4.33. Female graduates gave the program an overall rating of 4.18.

The areas receiving the highest rating of satisfaction were satisfaction with program advisement and personal satisfaction in present position. The lowest rating went to interest in students by professors and general satisfaction with preparation and training.

Table XL is a table of means showing the rating of the student personnel and guidance faculty. The rating was based on one being distinguished and four being adequate. The ratings by both were almost identical.

Table XLI shows that the ratings of the counseling practicum are higher than any of the three practicum or internship courses. Fifty-four and three-tenths percent of the graduates rated this course as essential. Only two graduates indicated it was of no value.

Nineteen and three-tenths percent rated the quality of fellow students as superior. Fifty-six and one-tenth percent thought their

TABLE XXXVIII

RATING OF THE STAFF AND INSTRUCTION RECEIVED  
(Ratings = 1-5) (5 = Highest)

|  | Male | Female | Combined |
|--|------|--------|----------|
| Flexibility within the curriculum to allow for individual differences among students . . . . .               | 4.13 | 4.33   | 4.23     |
| Instructional quality in all aspects of the program . . . . .  | 3.73 | 3.55   | 3.64     |
| Availability of staff for assistance in individual research . . . . .  | 4.00 | 3.83   | 3.92     |
| Integration of formal instruction, seminars, and supervised experiences . . . . .                            | 3.41 | 3.36   | 3.39     |
| Staff time for the supervision of individual study of counseling . . . . .                                   | 3.27 | 3.33   | 3.30     |
| Staff's encouragement of the spirit of inquiry and the production and utilization of research data . . . . . | 3.87 | 3.50   | 3.69     |
| Intellectual stimulation by faculty members in the classroom . . . . .                                       | 3.68 | 3.58   | 3.63     |
| Intellectual stimulation by fellow students in informal settings . . . . .                                   | 3.82 | 3.25   | 3.54     |
| Intellectual stimulation by faculty members in informal settings . . . . .                                   | 3.60 | 3.25   | 3.43     |
| Intellectual stimulation by fellow students in the classroom . . . . .                                       | 3.62 | 3.25   | 3.44     |
| Opportunities for self-evaluation and development of self-understanding . . . . .                            | 3.53 | 3.33   | 3.43     |
| Periodic evaluation by students of all aspects of the program . . . . .                                      | 2.45 | 2.50   | 2.48     |

TABLE XXXIX

MEANS SHOWING RANKING OF SATISFACTIONS  
WITH THE ASSISTANCE GIVEN BY  
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
PROFESSORS

---

5 - 1

Five = Highly Satisfied  
Five = Much Interest

One = Highly Dissatisfied  
One = Little Interest and  
the Like

---

| Item  | Male | Female |
|---|------|--------|
| General satisfaction with preparation & training            | 4.27 | 4.08   |
| Satisfaction with program advisement                        | 4.52 | 4.33   |
| Interest in students by professors                          | 4.23 | 4.17   |
| Adequacy of preparation for present position                | 4.23 | 4.27   |
| Personal satisfaction in present position                   | 4.61 | 4.33   |
| Adequacy of preparation in attaining self-<br>understanding | 4.12 | 3.92   |
| Overall rating  | 4.33 | 4.18   |

---

TABLE XL

MEANS SHOWING RATING OF THE STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE FACULTY  
(1) = Distinguished; (2) = Strong; (3) = Good; (4) = Adequate

---

|      | Male | Female |
|------|------|--------|
| Mean | 2.07 | 2.08   |

---

TABLE XLI  
RATINGS OF COUNSELING PRACTICUM

| Ratings     | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Essential   | 22        | 9           | 31         |
| Helpful     | 9         | -           | 9          |
| Of No Value | 2         | -           | 2          |
| Other       | <u>12</u> | <u>3</u>    | <u>15</u>  |
| Totals      | 45        | 12          | 57         |

peers were excellent. Two graduates rated their peers as only fair. Women graduates rated their fellow students lower than the men graduates. Four graduates did not respond in Table XLII.

TABLE XLII  
RATING OF FELLOW STUDENTS

| Rating      | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Superior    | 9         | 2           | 11         |
| Excellent   | 30        | 2           | 32         |
| Good        | 3         | 5           | 8          |
| Fair        | 2         | -           | 2          |
| No Response | <u>1</u>  | <u>3</u>    | <u>4</u>   |
| Totals      | 45        | 12          | 57         |

Evaluation of the practicum or internship course is accomplished in Table XLIII, which indicates that 22.8 percent feel that the course Supervised Experiences in Higher Education is essential. Only one person thought it was of no value.

TABLE XLIII  
RATINGS OF SUPERVISED EXPERIENCES  
IN HIGHER EDUCATION  
STUDENT PERSONNEL

| Rating      | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Essential   | 10        | 3           | 13         |
| Helpful     | 11        | 2           | 13         |
| Of No Value | 1         | -           | 1          |
| No Response | <u>23</u> | <u>7</u>    | <u>30</u>  |
| Totals      | 45        | 12          | 57         |

Twenty-nine and eight-tenths percent of the graduates found that the course Internship in Counseling in Student Personnel Service was essential. Again, only one thought it was of no value. Table XLIV also indicated that 19.3 percent thought it was helpful.

The graduates were very complimentary in their comments (Table XLV). They were very high on the faculty and their advisers. The Student Personnel and Guidance program received many favorable comments.



TABLE XLIV  
 RATINGS OF INTERNSHIP IN  
 STUDENT PERSONNEL  
 SERVICE

| Rating      | Male<br>N | Female<br>N | Total<br>N |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Essential   | 12        | 5           | 17         |
| Helpful     | 10        | 1           | 11         |
| Of No Value | 1         | -           | 1          |
| No Response | <u>22</u> | <u>6</u>    | <u>28</u>  |
| Totals      | 45        | 12          | 57         |

TABLE XLV  
 GRADUATES COMMENTS

| Area                                      | Complimentary |            |            | Uncomplimentary |            |            |
|---|---------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
|   | Men<br>N      | Women<br>N | Total<br>N | Men<br>N        | Women<br>N | Total<br>N |
| Faculty                                   | 5             | 3          | 8          | 1               | 1          | 2          |
| Advisers                                  | 3             | 2          | 5          | -               | -          | -          |
| Courses                                   | -             | 2          | 2          | 1               | -          | 1          |
| Student Personnel and<br>Guidance Program | 11            | -          | 11         | 1               | -          | 1          |

Several of the students felt it would be beneficial to bring the faculty and students closer together. Along the same line, it would appear that the graduates feel the need of more faculty (Table XLVI).

TABLE XLVI

AREAS IN STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE THE  
GRADUATE WOULD LIKE TO SEE IMPROVED

| Areas  | Men<br>N | Women<br>N | Total<br>N |
|--|----------|------------|------------|
| In counselor training, expose trainees to<br>different population -- inner city,<br>voc. rehab., aged, minority groups . . . . . | -        | 1          | 1          |
| More training in group work . . . . .  | -        | 1          | 1          |
| Stronger human development courses . . . . .   | -        | 1          | 1          |
| More training on developing a budget . . . . .   | -        | 1          | 1          |
| Increase faculty or limit enrollment . . . . .   | -        | 1          | 1          |
| More clinical psychology applied to education . . . . .  | -        | 1          | 1          |
| More personal involvement by faculty with<br>Graduate students . . . . .   | -        | 1          | 1          |
| More training in diagnostic procedures . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Instruction should not be by assistants . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| How to work with administrators . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More emphasis on interviewing techniques . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Bring students and professors together more . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More experience in testing and counseling<br>practicum . . . . .   | 1        | -          | 1          |
| More emphasis on psychology . . . . .  | 3        | -          | 3          |
| Raise standards . . . . .  | 1        | -          | 1          |
| Have a stronger group program . . . . .  | 3        | -          | 3          |
| In practicum and internship more structure<br>and feedback from supervisors is needed . . . . .                                  | -        | 1          | 1          |

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is composed of a brief review of the study and an itemized summary of findings. It also includes recommendations that resulted from the study.

#### Summary of the Study

Very few follow-up studies anywhere and none at Oklahoma State University have been made to gather information concerning the characteristics, experiences, and opinions of the doctoral graduates in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University. There has been a lack of information about the further career development of doctoral graduates and their thoughts and ideas regarding the relevance of their education to their career experience.

The study undertaken and completed was considered to be useful and important to the faculty and administration in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University. It provided information as to the extent to which the graduate preparation program in student personnel and guidance is meeting and satisfying the needs presented by the tasks and functions of the graduates work position. Opinions of those who complete professional preparation programs are considered by most educators to constitute credible evidence since opinions are based upon direct experience in the programs and the later applications

of learnings and skills in work situations.

A list of names of the students who graduated with Ed.D degrees in student personnel and guidance at Oklahoma State University between 1962 and 1972 was derived from graduation programs found in the Registrar's office or from the files of different faculty members.

There were three different offices that provided the sources from which data was gathered for this study. They were the Alumni Development office, the Registrar's office, and the Library.

The procedure for contacting each member of the study population was initiated by a direct phone call to that person. Using the addresses obtained from various sources, the author checked telephone information for the home of the subject. If a college was located in the student's hometown, a telephone number was obtained for it also. All graduates agreed to participate and were mailed a questionnaire. A few cases required second and third telephone calls. All questionnaires were obtained.

#### Findings of the Study

(1) Most of the graduates were between ages 29 and 59. There were 26 percent more women than men in the upper 50-69 age bracket.

(2) Over half of the women graduates were either single, divorced, separated, or widowed. All but two of the men were married.

(3) Convenience was the leading factor in what influenced the graduates choice of Oklahoma State University. In most cases it was a combination of factors which influenced the choice of Oklahoma State University.

(4) Over half of the graduates used a combination of methods to finance the cost of their degree. Only one person reported a loan as a resource. Seven of the students indicated that their schooling was completely self-financed.

(5) Many of the graduates located in different schools and different states from the one they were in prior to entering the program. This is true of both male and female graduates.

(6) Well over half of the graduates are employed in senior colleges or universities. A smaller group works in junior college settings. More men than women graduates go into private business.

(7) Eleven of the graduates had held three jobs since graduation. Approximately half had held at least two jobs. Almost all of the graduates had held a college level job sometime after graduation. About half of the men were administrators. Approximately 50 percent of the women were teachers.

(8) Both men and women graduates remained on their first job after graduation for over two years. The number of years on the second job of those who changed was two years. One-third of the women changed to a third job. Six of the 45 men changed to a third job.

(9) Most of the graduates are employed on a twelve-month basis. Approximately one-third were making over \$19,000. All of the females were making less than \$19,000. One-half of the women contracted on a twelve-month basis. Two-thirds of the males were employed on a twelve-month basis

(10) Men more often than women changed their occupational objective during their early degrees. Immediately before the attainment of the Ed.D degree, women more often than men changed their occupational

objectives. Two-thirds of the graduates changed their mind as to their occupational objective during their Bachelor's degree program.

(11) Fifty-four percent of the graduates had as their occupational objective areas other than teaching, counseling, or psychology. In the Bachelor's degree program, none of the graduates had chosen administration of any kind as an occupational objective. The percentage of graduates interested in teaching went from 40 percent in the Bachelor's degree program to approximately 9 percent during the Ed.D program.

(12) Over two-thirds of the graduates had less than five years of work experiences between their Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Over half of the men had from three to eight years experience between their Master's and Ed.D degrees. Over 40 percent of the women had less than two years of work experience.

(13) The graduates had more work experiences between their Bachelor's and Master's degree that were in educational type work than non-educational. The number of graduates in non-educational type work declines significantly between the Master's and Ed.D degrees.

(14) In the area of practical utility of course work, the female graduates gave the highest rating to Counseling Practicum, Abnormal Psychology, and Psychology of Adjustment. The lowest rating by females was given to Principles and Administration of Guidance Services. Males gave the highest ranking to Internship in Counseling Student Personnel Service and the lowest to Curriculum and Methods in Higher Education. The highest ratings by area were in Personality and Adjustment. The lowest ratings by area were given to Guidance.

(15) Women were more involved in writing and publishing than men.

(16) Working with groups was the task in which the graduates indicated they were most involved in their present positions. The task that they were least involved in was in the area of administering student discipline. Women were least involved in application of statistical techniques to original research. Men were least involved in administering student discipline. Females are most actively involved in teaching related psychology or behavioral science courses. Males were more involved in planning a testing program than any other task or function. In past positions, the total group rated the task of individual counseling in the area of adjustment in the academic environment as the task in which they were most involved. Females alone rated the task of developing a framework for appraisal of the individual as the task they were most active in, while men rated popularizing the guidance concept with students and other educational professionals.

The graduates indicated they received the best preparation in interpreting standard/derived scores and teaching related psychology or behavioral science courses.

(17) Approximately 86 percent of the graduates were between 21 and 30 years of age when they received their Bachelor's degree. Sixty-five percent of the graduates were between 21 and 30 years of age when they received their Master's degree. At the completion of the Ed.D degree, 44 percent of the men were in the 31 to 40 years of age category. Thirty-three and one-half percent of the women were in the 41 to 50 years of age category.

(18) In the time required to complete the degrees, females took less years on the Bachelor's and Master's degrees. The men finished

the Ed.D sooner than the women.

(19) Approximately one-half of the graduates Bachelor's and Master's degrees were finished out of state.

(20) The students gave high ratings of satisfaction in the area of program advisement and in personal satisfaction in present position. The lowest ratings went to adequacy of preparation in attaining self-understanding and the area of general satisfaction with preparation and training.

(21) The student personnel and guidance faculty was rated 2.07½ on a one to four basis (1 = Distinguished; 4 = Adequate).

(22) Counseling Practicum was rated the highest of the three practicum or internship-type courses. Over one-half rated it as essential. Supervised experiences in Higher Education Student Personnel was considered by the graduates to be from helpful to essential. Internship in counseling was considered to be very valuable.

(23) Two-thirds of the graduates rated their peers as excellent to superior.

(24) One-third of the graduates see up to 19 counselees per week. Nine percent see as many as 59 counselees.

(25) Graduates belong to an average of three organizations. Men belong to more by a small percentage. Some belong to as many as nine.

(26) Most of the graduates work in Oklahoma, Texas, and Missouri. Missouri ranks second. The graduates have worked in 23 states plus two foreign countries.

(27) The graduates are presently employed in 13 states and one foreign country. Oklahoma, Missouri, and Texas lead in number of graduates employed.



(28) In rating of staff and instruction received, curriculum flexibility rated the highest. Availability of staff for assistance in individual research also received high marks. A rating of periodic evaluation by students of all aspects of the program rated the lowest mark.

(29) Graduates comments were generally complimentary. The faculty received the most complimentary remarks of any of the categories.

(30) Counseling Practicum was listed by the graduates as the area of greatest value. It was closely followed by Personality Theories, Statistics, and Group Guidance.

(31) The graduates recommended that the college bring in more, younger, and better qualified staff.

(32) Several thought internship courses should be with more diverse clients and not just college students.

(33) The graduates recommended an increased emphasis on psychological dynamics of self and others.

#### Recommendations from the Study

It would be impossible to make a survey such as that conducted without gleaning a number of ideas or recommendations for change. However, it is difficult to evaluate the merits of the input received. The writer has included only those suggestions which are clearly brought forth by the responses and multiple mention in the voluntary commentary of respondents. He has also attempted to synthesize logically response patterns into recommendations where such appeared to be evident.

1. Improve the information system so as to better portray the program as a career opportunity for single women and minorities.
2. Consideration should be given to strengthening the backgrounds of graduates for general higher education administration.
3. The program appears to be well structured in terms of the broad general areas of preparation and should be continued in somewhat the same general format.
4. While the program appears to serve primarily Oklahoma and surrounding states, continued efforts should be made to promote it nationally.
5. Make available to the students information and counseling about ways to finance their education.
6. Provide more information about student personnel administrative roles.
7. Provide increased work experience with groups.
8. Plan more ways for the graduate student and the instructor to have interchange. Develop procedures to assist instructors and advisers to show more interest and sensitivity to students.
9. Develop a procedure to periodically evaluate the preparation program both with students and faculty.
10. Coordinate the practicing student personnel area with the educational area.
11. Include training in budget and financial administration.
12. Provide a complete course in legal aspects of student personnel work.
13. Add as many as three courses in administration. It appears these courses would be of great value.

### Recommendations for Further Research

One of the characteristics of research is that it raises as many or more questions than it answers. This may also be considered one of the benefits. The present study is no exception to this tendency. The following are some of the areas which come to mind for further investigation.

1. Periodic surveys should be made of the student personnel graduate to obtain his opinions while he is still in the program.
2. Further follow-up studies of the graduates and their opinions as to their appropriate and adequate preparation should be made.
3. Survey of those who employ and supervise the student personnel graduate for further opinions on the preparation program should be made.
4. Other surveys might be made of the students involved in this study to obtain more depth of information.
5. The matter of different post-doctoral career patterns of men and women deserves study and attention.
6. It would be worthwhile to investigate the relevance of specific content within various areas and courses to later functions and needs.
7. Where different approaches have been instituted in the instruction of various courses (such as the practicum) longitudinal studies with comparative evaluations by graduates would be interesting.
8. The diversity of careers followed by graduates suggests:
  - (1) That the curriculum is highly general, relating to many specialties;
  - (2) That students with varied characteristics, interests, and

career objectives utilize the program as a vehicle to move in varied directions; or (3) Both of the foregoing. This phenomenon merits further investigation.

In a sense, a study such as the present one only serves to pique the curiosity of the researcher. While it is believed that important information and insights relating to career patterns and program validation has been collected and revealed, much further study is merited.

Worthy of special consideration of the faculty at the University is the omnibus nature of this doctoral program both in terms of student goals and career opportunities. It may be that this is the precise intent of program planners. If this is not the intent of present planners and curriculum evaluators within the University faculty, the results of the study suggest that perhaps a format with a core program and several options might be considered.

#### A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Sharon J. W. "Changes in Attitudes, Personality, and Effectiveness of Counselor Trainees in Counseling Practicums." DA, 29, No. 11 (1969), 3825A (North Texas State University).
- Barry, Ruth and Beverly Wolf. Modern Issues in Guidance-Personnel. (New York, 1963), pp. 86, 88.
- Council of Student Personnel Associations. A Proposal for Professional Preparation of College Student Development Educators. (Ithaca, N. Y., 1971), pp. 1-13.
- Council of Student Personnel Associations. Student Development Services in Higher Education. (N. Y., July, 1972), pp. 1-7.
- Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education. A Proposal for Professional Preparation in College Student Personnel Work. (Detroit, 1968 Revision), pp. 1-10.
- Dalrymple, Frank M. "Counselor Educators Perceptions of the 1967 ACES Standards and Accreditation of Programs of Counselor Education." DAI, 31, No. 11 (1971), 5769A (University of South Dakota).
- Dietz, Siegfried C. "Counselor Job Satisfaction and Colleague Perceptions of the ASCA Role and Function Recommendations." DAI, 31, No. 4 (1970), 1573-74A (Arizona State University).
- Fox, Ray P. "A Study of the Master's Degree Program in Guidance and Counseling at Memphis State University and Evaluation of the Program as Perceived by Its Graduates: Fall Semester 1965-Spring Semester 1971." DAI, 32, No. 12 (1972), 6757-58A (Memphis State University).
- Godard, Jerry J. "Toward a Development of Multi-Disciplinary Foundations for Use in the Preparation of Guidance-Personnel Workers." DA, 27, No. 9 (1967), 2879A (Columbia University).
- Harmon, Donald and Dwight L. Arnold. "High School Counselors Evaluate Their Formal Preparation." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 39 (December, 1960), pp. 303-305.
- Hill, George E. and Dale F. Nitzschke. "Preparation Programs in Elementary School Guidance." Personnel and Guidance Journal, 40 (October, 1961), p. 155.

- Kasper, Paul T. "A Study of the Graduates of the Master's Degree Program in Student Personnel and Guidance at Oklahoma State University." DAI, 33, No. 2 (1972), 570A.
- Mathewson, Robert H. "Graduate Training for School Counselors." Occupations, 30 (February, 1952), p. 355.
- McDaniel, H. B. "Needed Field Research in Guidance." Occupations, 30 (May, 1952), pp. 660-661.
- Munden, J. R. "An Analysis of a Master of Education Program in Counseling and Guidance Through a Follow-up of Graduates for the Period of 1965 Through 1969." DA, 32, No. 2 (1971), 742A (St. Louis University).
- Norton, Francis H. "Counselor Preparation: An Analysis of the Supervised Training Experience in Selected Counselor Education Programs." DAI, 30, No. 9 (1970), 3733A (Wayne State University).
- Price, Judy. "An Evaluation of the Counselor Education Program at the University of Wyoming by Federally Funded Graduates During the Period 1962 Through 1966." DAI, 33, No. 1 (1972), 162A.
- Redovich, Dennis W. "A Study of the Graduates and the Graduate Programs in Education at Marquette University Based on a Follow-up Study of its Graduates for the Years 1960-1970." DAI, 33, No. 1 (1972), 174A.
- Shertzer, Bruce and Joan England. "Follow-up Data on Counselor Education Graduates--Relevant, Self-Revealing, or What?" Counselor Education and Supervision, 7, No. 4 (Summer, 1968), p. 363.
- Shires, James C. "An Appraisal of the Master of Education Program in Guidance and Counseling Through a Follow-up of Graduates." DA, 28, No. 7 (1968), 2522A (University of Virginia).

APPENDIX A

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY SURVEY

OF Ed.D GRADUATES STUDENT

PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
 SURVEY OF Ed.D GRADUATES  
 STUDENT PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE

- (1) Name \_\_\_\_\_ (2) Age \_\_\_\_\_ (3) Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_
- (4) Sex \_\_\_\_\_ (5) Present Address \_\_\_\_\_
- (6) What factor or factors influenced your choice of Oklahoma State University as the university to obtain your Ed.D in student personnel and guidance?
- (A) Convenience \_\_\_\_\_ (B) Program Offerings \_\_\_\_\_
- (C) Reputation of Faculty \_\_\_\_\_ (D) Financial Help Available \_\_\_\_\_
- (E) Other: Please Specify \_\_\_\_\_
- (7) What method did you use to finance your graduate study?
- (A) Self-financed \_\_\_\_\_ Loan \_\_\_\_\_ Work \_\_\_\_\_
- (B) Graduate Assistantship \_\_\_\_\_ (C) Dorm Counselor \_\_\_\_\_
- (D) Other: Please Specify \_\_\_\_\_
- (8) What is the location of your present employment in relation to that prior to enrollment into the Ed.D in the student personnel and guidance program at Oklahoma State University?
- (A) Same School-Same State \_\_\_\_\_ (B) Different School-Same State \_\_\_\_\_
- (C) Different School-Different State \_\_\_\_\_ (D) Other \_\_\_\_\_
- (9) Presently Employed In:
- Elementary \_\_\_\_\_ Middle School \_\_\_\_\_ Jr. High School \_\_\_\_\_
- Sr. High School \_\_\_\_\_ Jr. College \_\_\_\_\_ College/University \_\_\_\_\_
- Industry \_\_\_\_\_ Private Business \_\_\_\_\_ Self-Employed \_\_\_\_\_
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_ Specify \_\_\_\_\_



(10) Title of Present Position:

Teacher\_\_\_\_\_ Teacher-Counselor\_\_\_\_\_ Counselor\_\_\_\_\_

Director of Guidance\_\_\_\_\_ Administrative Dean\_\_\_\_\_ Professor\_\_\_\_\_

Other: Specify\_\_\_\_\_



- (11) List the first three jobs held after graduating from Oklahoma State University with your Ed.D in student personnel and guidance.

| <u>Title or Position</u> | <u>Years Held</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Job 1 _____              | _____             |
| Job 2 _____              | _____             |
| Job 3 _____              | _____             |

- (12) What is your Annual Salary:

( ) 9 mo.            ( ) 10 mo.            ( ) 12 mo.

Less than \$11,000 \_\_\_\_\_            \$15,000 - \$17,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$11,000 - \$13,000 \_\_\_\_\_            \$17,000 - \$19,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$13,000 - \$15,000 \_\_\_\_\_            Over \$19,000 \_\_\_\_\_

- (13) Did your occupational objectives change during your study for each of your three degrees? Complete:

| <u>Degree</u>                      | <u>Was there a change?</u> |    |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----|
|                                    | Yes                        | No |
| Bachelor's Reason for Change _____ |                            |    |
| Master's Reason for Change _____   |                            |    |
| Ed.D Reason for Change _____       |                            |    |

- (14) What was your occupational objective at the beginning of your entry into the program leading to:

(A) Bachelor's Degree \_\_\_\_\_

(B) Master's Degree \_\_\_\_\_

(C) Ed.D Degree \_\_\_\_\_

- (15) How many full years work experience did you have between:

(A) Bachelor's and Master's Degree \_\_\_\_\_  
 Educational Exp. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Non-educational Exp. \_\_\_\_\_

(B) Master's and Ed.D Degree \_\_\_\_\_  
 Educational Exp. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Non-educational Exp. \_\_\_\_\_

This section presents a number of tasks or functions commonly performed by student personnel professionals. In the appropriate spaces, would you please indicate: (1) the degree to which the task or function is involved in your present position; (2) the degree to which the

task or function has been involved in a past position held since graduation; and (3) the degree to which you felt that the doctoral program at Oklahoma State University prepared you to perform this task or function. Make check: 0 = No basis to judge; (1) = Low Degree; (5) = High Degree.

| task or function  | Involvement in Present Position |   |   |   |   |   | Involvement in Past Positions |   |   |   |   |   | Preparedness for the task |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | 5                               | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5                             | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5                         | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Application of statistical techniques to original research...   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Reading statistically treated research with understanding....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Interpreting standard/derived scores.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Planning a testing program.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Giving and interpreting interest and aptitude tests.....  |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Being active and knowledgeable in professional activities....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Popularizing the guidance concept with students and other educational professionals.....              |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Teaching student personnel related courses.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Teaching related psychology or behavior science courses.....  |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Teaching education related courses.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Administering a student personnel division.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Working within confines of legalities in areas such as due process, search, confidentiality, etc..... |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Working out role relations in the particular educational setting.....                                 |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Administering student discipline.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Working with groups.....  |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Recognition of neurotic or psychotic behaviors.....   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Application of vocational development and choice theories...  |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Application of personality theories to counseling.....  |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Development of a framework for appraisal of the individual...   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| <u>Individual Counseling</u>  |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Individual helping relationship with career development dynamics.....                                 |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Giving and interpreting personality and adjustment inventories.....                                   |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Individual helping relationship techniques of adjustment in academic environment.....                 |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |
| Intervention among relationship forces within the home and family sphere.....                         |                                 |   |   |   |   |   |                               |   |   |   |   |   |                           |   |   |   |   |   |

(16) If you are not presently in a student personnel and guidance position, why did you change your vocation? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(17) List some work experiences outside of education:

(A) \_\_\_\_\_

(B) \_\_\_\_\_

(C) \_\_\_\_\_

(18) List the following:

(A) Number of articles published \_\_\_\_\_

(B) Number of books published \_\_\_\_\_

(19) Please complete the following:

| Item                                    | Bachelor's Degree | Master's Degree | Ed.D Degree |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| (A) Major . . .                         | _____             | _____           | _____       |
| (B) Age Completed                       | _____             | _____           | _____       |
| (C) No. of yrs. used to complete degree | _____             | _____           | _____       |
| (D) Name of awarding Institution        | _____             | _____           | _____       |

(20) Evaluate the degree to which your doctoral education program prepared you for future professional activities and the effectiveness of the professional staff while a student in the doctoral program at Oklahoma State University. Use a scale of 5 - 1; 5 = highly satisfied to 1 = highly dissatisfied or 5 = much interest to 1 = little interest and the like.

| <u>Item</u>   | <u>Number</u> | <u>Rank</u> |
|---|---------------|-------------|
| General satisfaction with your preparation and training | 5 4 3 2 1     |             |
| Satisfaction with program advisement                    | 5 4 3 2 1     |             |
| Interest in students by professors                      | 5 4 3 2 1     |             |
| Adequacy of preparation for present position            | 5 4 3 2 1     |             |
| Personal satisfaction in present position               | 5 4 3 2 1     |             |
| Adequacy of preparation in attaining self-understanding | 5 4 3 2 1     |             |

- (21) Rate the student personnel and guidance faculty at Oklahoma State University with:

1 = Distinguished; 2 = Strong; 3 = Good; 4 = Adequate Rating\_\_\_\_\_

- (22) Evaluate the practicum or internship courses.

(1) Essential           (2) Helpful           (3) Of no value

Supervised Experience in Higher Education Student Personnel\_\_\_\_\_

Internship in Counseling in Student Personnel Service\_\_\_\_\_

Counseling Practicum\_\_\_\_\_

- (23) After being associated with student personnel professionals in your work experience and at professional meetings, how would you rate the quality of student who went through the Ed.D program in student personnel and guidance with you at Oklahoma State University?

Superior           Excellent           Good           Fair

- (24) If you are presently counseling, what is the approximate number of counselees that you work with each week?\_\_\_\_\_

- (25) How many national professional organizations do you belong to?\_\_\_\_

- (26) What are the names of the states you have worked in since completion of the Ed.D?\_\_\_\_\_

- (27) What state are you presently employed in?\_\_\_\_\_

- (28) What are some ways to improve the Ed.D program in student personnel and guidance?\_\_\_\_\_

- (29) What are some areas in student personnel and guidance that you would like to see improved?\_\_\_\_\_

- (30) What were the areas of greatest value in your training program in student personnel and guidance while at Oklahoma State University?

- (31) Other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Rate the following aspects of the Student Personnel and Guidance training program (Ed.D) at Oklahoma State University. (5) = Superior, (4) = Excellent, (3) = Good, (2) = Fair, (1) = Poor.

A. STAFF AND INSTRUCTION

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Flexibility within the curriculum to allow for differences among students . . . . .                      | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Instructional quality in all aspects of the program . .  | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Availability of staff for assistance in individual research . . . . .                                    | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Integration of formal instruction, seminars, and supervised experiences . . . . .                        | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Staff time for the supervision of individual study of counseling . . . . .                               | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Staff's encouragement of the spirit of inquiry and the production and utilization of research data . . . | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Intellectual stimulation by faculty members in the classroom . . . . .                                   | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Intellectual stimulation by fellow students in informal settings . . . . .                               | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Intellectual stimulation by faculty members in informal settings . . . . .                               | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Intellectual stimulation by fellow students in the classroom . . . . .                                   | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Opportunities for self-evaluation and development of deeper self-understanding . . . . .                 | 5 4 3 2 1 |
| Periodic evaluation by students of all aspects of the program . . . . .                                  | 5 4 3 2 1 |

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE





# Oklahoma State University

APPLIED BEHAVIORAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074  
416 CLASSROOM BUILDING  
(405) 372-6211, EXT. 7274

Enclosed you will find a copy of the questionnaire we discussed in our recent telephone conversation. I appreciate your willingness to give twenty minutes of your time to help complete this study.

The Student Personnel and Guidance Department of Oklahoma State University has advised and cooperated with this researcher in developing the questionnaire. The results will be used to upgrade the professional preparation of student personnel and guidance students at Oklahoma State University. Your response will be strictly confidential. No individual or institution will be identified in the report of the study.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Dr. Frank McFarland  
Director of Student Services  
Professor of Education

Clane A. Kirtley  
Dean of Students

CAK/kf  
Enclosure

VITA

Clane Alan Kirtley

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

**Thesis:** A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN STUDENT PERSONNEL  
AND GUIDANCE FROM OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

**Major Field:** Student Personnel and Guidance

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Perry, Oklahoma, September 14, 1934,  
the son of Larkin and Dorothy Kirtley; married to Ladine  
Kirtley; have children, Kurt, Mike, Gary, and Kari.

**Education:** Completed grades one through twelve in the public  
schools of Perry, Oklahoma; graduated upon completion of the  
twelfth grade in Perry High School, Perry, Oklahoma, in May,  
1952; attended two years at Northern Oklahoma College and  
graduated in 1954 with an Associate of Business degree;  
attended Southwestern Oklahoma State University at Weather-  
ford for two years and graduated with the Bachelor of  
Science degree with a major in Business Education and a  
minor in Physical Education in 1956; attended Central State  
University at Edmond; completed requirements for the Master  
of Science degree in 1962 and the Doctor of Education degree  
at Oklahoma State University, with a major in Student Per-  
sonnel and Guidance, in May, 1980.

**Professional Experiences:** Employed as a teacher and coach in  
Delhi Public Schools, Delhi, Oklahoma, 1956-1958; taught  
seventh grade and coached in Tonkawa Junior High and High  
School, 1958-1960; coached and taught Business at Northern  
Oklahoma College from 1960-67; served as Dean of Students  
from 1968 until present time at Northern Oklahoma College,  
Tonkawa, Oklahoma.