

A SURVEY OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION AT OKLAHOMA STATE
UNIVERSITY 1964-1973

By

THOMAS LEE HARNED

Bachelor of Science
The University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1964

Master of Public Health
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1968

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
July, 1974

Thesis
1974D
H289s
Cap. 2

MAR 13 1975

A SURVEY OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION AT OKLAHOMA STATE
UNIVERSITY 1964-1973

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Clai

Chairman

Thomas J. Cannon

Thesis Adviser

Frank E. Van Rantford

Donald S. Phillips

N. N. Denton

Dean of the Graduate College

902090

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. J. Kenneth St. Clair, committee chairman, and Dr. Thomas A Karman, thesis adviser, as well as to the other helpful members of the advisory committee, Dr. Frank E. McFarland, and Dr. Donald S. Phillips, I am grateful.

I wish to thank the Department of Administration and Higher Education of The College of Education of Oklahoma State University for their support and cooperation in this study.

To the 84 respondents who are doctoral graduates in educational administration from Oklahoma State University for the years 1964 through 1973, who took time to fill out and return the questionnaire, I am indebted.

To Judy, my wife, I am particularly grateful for her continuous love and encouragement which helped to make this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING	1
Introduction	1
Significance of the Study	3
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Definition of Terms	5
Summary	6
II. RELATED LITERATURE	8
Introduction	8
Follow-Up Studies Focusing on Evaluation of Graduate Education	8
Follow-Up Studies Focusing on Evaluation of Educational Administration Programs	13
Recommendations of Professional Organizations and National Planning Committees	17
Summary	18
III. PROCEDURES	20
Introduction	20
Basic Assumptions	20
Method	21
The Instrument	21
Analysis of Data	24
Welfare of the Subjects	24
Limitations	24
Summary	25
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	26
Introduction	26
Description of the Subjects	26
Descriptions and Perceptions of the Educational Administration Program at Oklahoma State University	32
Summary	46

Chapter	Page
V. MAJOR FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS	49
Introduction	49
Summary of the Findings	50
Implications	51
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	61
APPENDIX A - STUDY INSTRUMENT	64
APPENDIX B - COVER LETTER	67
APPENDIX C - FOLLOW-UP LETTER	69
APPENDIX D - SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	27
II. Frequency and Percentage of Respondents Classified According to Primary Job Title	29
III. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Defining and Clarifying Organizational Goals and Objectives	33
IV. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Developing Plans to Achieve Long and Short Range Objectives	34
V. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Techniques for Systematic Planning and Implementation	34
VI. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Establishing Priority Rankings Among Administrative Problems	35
VII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Collecting, Analyzing, and Interpreting Data Related to Administrative Problems	36
VIII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Theoretical Models in the Functions of Administration	36
IX. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Recruiting and Selection Procedures	37
X. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Describing Job Respon- sibilities for Self and Subordinates	38
XI. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Planning and Executing Personnel Evaluations	38

Table	Page
XII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Knowledge of Financial Aspects of Administration	39
XIII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Knowledge of Public and Private Funding Bases to Secure Financial Support	39
XIV. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Principles of Accounting in the Management of a Departmental or Program Budget	40
XV. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Developing a Receptivity to Others Through a Knowledge of Human Behavior	41
XVI. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Utilizing Knowledge and Techniques of Group Processes to Facilitate Interaction With Faculty, Students, Peers, and Supervisors	42
XVII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Organizing Presentations Which Effectively Convey Ideas	42
XVIII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Conducting Effective Conferences and Meetings	43
XIX. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Enhancing Others to Increase Cooperation and Job Satisfaction	43
XX. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Analyzing the Relationship Between School, Community, and Government in Decisions Which Affect Program Administration	44
XXI. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Recognizing the General Legal Principles That Affect Program Administration	45
XXII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Attempting to Influence Legislation Which Influences Education	45

Table	Page
XXIII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning 20 Selected Behaviors	47
XXIV. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning the Opportunity to Acquire Five Selected Behaviors According to Classification of Employment	72
XXV. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning the Opportunity to Acquire Five Selected Behaviors According to Teaching Duties	73
XXVI. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning the Opportunity to Acquire Five Selected Behaviors According to Number of Employees Supervised	74
XXVII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning the Opportunity to Acquire Five Selected Behaviors According to Years of Professional Experience	75
XXVIII. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning the Opportunity to Acquire Five Selected Behaviors According to Years Employed in an Administrative Position(s)	76
XXIX. Frequency and Percentage of the Perceptions of Respondents Concerning the Opportunity to Acquire Five Selected Behaviors According to Year of Graduation	77

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Introduction

In the early years of our national history, schooling was a relatively simple business, with the little red schoolhouse being probably the most characteristic symbol of the local school operation. Since school administration did not evolve as an area of practice until the latter part of the nineteenth century, and since it did not become a defined area of study until the twentieth century, there was little need for educational administration in the sense that it is known today (Campbell, Corbally and Ramseyer, 1966). Administrators were employed first in city schools, for in urban areas there were schools with more than one teacher. In those schools, one of the teachers would be designated as principal teacher or some similar title to indicate a supervisory type role and function. As responsibilities assigned to the schools became greater, a greater number of managerial tasks needed to be performed; therefore, boards of education began to employ persons (i.e. administrators) to perform those managerial tasks.*

*It was 1927 before school government was differentiated from general government, and it was some years later before the lay school committee or board of education was ready to employ a school administrator. Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston, 1966), p. 76.

As the need for administrators increased, formal educational programs in educational administration were developed. Because scholars in such programs have examined closely the practice of educational administration and the preparation of administrators, therefore the practice of educational administration has tended to become more scientific. Educational administration was studied scientifically as a result of the school survey and similar movements in the second and third decades of the twentieth century (Campbell and others, 1966). It has been noted previously that the role of the educational administrator has evolved from that of principal teacher to coordinator of a big business.*

With the development of a complex administrative structure the educational systems got larger, and there resulted a need to organize what was becoming big business. One aspect of that trend to organize is evident in periods of development of educational administration. Campbell and others (1966) listed three periods in the development of educational administration: (1) job analysis, 1910-1930; (2) human relations, 1930-1950; and (3) behavioral science, 1950 to the present.** In recent years there has been considerable effort devoted to the development of

*Total expenditures for public and nonpublic schools at all levels of education from kindergarten through the graduate school amounted to an estimated \$83.8 billion during the 1971-72 school year. This outlay more than doubles the \$40 billion spent only seven years earlier and is nearly ten times the \$8.8 billion expended in 1949-50. Kenneth A. Simon and W. Vance Grant, Digest of Educational Statistics (Washington, 1972), pp. 22-25.

**Because this reference uses the phrase "1950 to the present" it should be noted that the work was published in 1966; and systems has had enough effect on educational administration to be added as a fourth period. Cf. Harry Hartley, Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968), p. 49.

systems models and programs which would assist administrators in obtaining and analyzing data.*

Significance of the Study

Among the most significant aspects of educational administration are planning, implementing, and evaluating an educational program. Mayhew and Ford (1974) maintain that, because the demand for college-level manpower in many fields is either standing still or shrinking, the orderly growth of professional and graduate education can only take place if individual advanced-degree programs remain competitive. These two authors further state that these programs can only remain competitive by taking advantage of all possible improvements and adapting curriculums to rapidly changing circumstances.

Professional programs in education are constantly undergoing revision due to the nature of society and the needs of professions. Consequently, it is essential that faculty in the universities be kept informed regarding the extent to which their programs are providing useful preparation. Dressel (1971) recommended that if colleges and universities were seriously interested in promoting individual development through the curriculum and instruction, they should evaluate their programs in terms of their responsiveness to contemporary college students and their new needs and concerns.

*The U. S. Department of Defense pioneered in producing a number of planning concepts which may be appropriate for education; e.g., systems analysis, strategic planning, needs research, think tanks, decision centers, logic-sequence network diagrams, and the planned-programmed-budgeting-system framework. Harry Hartley, Educational Planning-Programming-Budgeting (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1968), p. 83.

Tyler (1949) suggested studies of the learners and of contemporary life outside the school as sources of educational objectives, because the question is raised as to the contemporary significance of particular items of knowledge or particular skills and abilities. Tyler further described the technique of job analysis as a method of studying life outside the school, and elaborated on job analysis stating,

In essence, job analysis is simply a method of analyzing the activities carried on by a worker in a particular field in order that a training program can be focused upon those critical activities performed by this worker (p. 17).

Job analysis is a common practice in technical education for curricular development and/or evaluation, however, job analysis studies are not as common in graduate education. It is a common practice to select graduates of a particular program when conducting a job analysis study for curricular evaluation. This approach is frequently referred to as a follow-up study. At the present time the doctoral program in Educational Administration of Oklahoma State University is undertaking such a review.

Statement of the Problem

The practice and the study of educational administration is changing due to the nature of society and the needs of the profession. In the ongoing operation of an educational program evaluation is a continuous and systematic process involving students and faculty. However, systematic evaluation involving contemporary life outside the school, i.e., the practicing graduate, is usually not conducted as often. Therefore, the need exists to systematically gather input data from practicing graduates.

Research has indicated the salience of the graduate follow-up as one means for evaluating curricula (Alciatoire and Eckert, 1968). Other research has investigated how valuable specific skills are to the graduates in their work (Buswell and others, 1966).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent to which individuals who received the Degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Administration from Oklahoma State University between the spring of 1964 and the summer of 1973 perceived that the instructional program (i.e., the Ed.D. Program in Educational Administration) prepared them for positions in educational administration.

Two specific areas were of primary concern:

1. To ascertain whether the Ed.D. program, as perceived by the graduates, afforded an opportunity to acquire certain selected behaviors often expected of administrators.
2. To determine whether or not the subjects perceived those selected behaviors as being essential in their work.

Definition of Terms

Educational Administration was defined as a program of study preparing persons for positions of leadership in an educational setting.

Behavior^{*} was defined as the desired or intended action(s) or reaction(s) in which individuals are to act, think or feel as a result of

* Adapted from: Benjamin S. Bloom (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook 1, Cognitive Domain (New York, 1956), p. 12.

participating in some unit of instruction, i.e., knowledge, skills and abilities acquired in a program of study.

Summative evaluation* was defined as the gathering of information concerning the teaching-learning process after instruction has occurred.

Formative evaluation* was defined as gathering information in the early phases of developing a system of instruction, i.e., used for immediate feedback in modification of course materials.

Follow-up was defined as maintenance of contact or reestablishment of contact with a person (former student or graduate) in order to evaluate an educational program.

Summary

In Chapter One the general background of the study, the significance of the study, a statement of the problem investigated and the purpose of the study were presented.

Chapter Two is a review of selected literature related to follow-up studies focusing on evaluation of graduate education, follow-up studies focusing on evaluation of educational administration programs, and recommendations of professional organizations and national planning committees regarding curriculum revision.

The procedures used in identification of the subjects and data collection are described in Chapter Three. Limitations of the study were listed.

Chapter Four consists of the presentation and analysis of data.

*Definitions related to summative and formative evaluation are taken from: Michael Scriven, The Methodology of Evaluation (Chicago, 1967).

The major findings and implications of the study are discussed in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

When a review of related literature was undertaken, it was found that there was a great deal of interest in modifying existing educational administration programs, with suggestions often focusing on the need to establish broader relationships with agencies in the field, on the need to strengthen the specialization component of graduate programs in educational administration, and on the need to expand practicum opportunities. In light of that, Griffiths' 1959 statement continues to be accurate, "If any one statement could be made concerning educational administration at this time, it would be that as a field of study it is undergoing radical change" (p. 1).

Presented in this chapter are: (a) follow-up studies focusing on evaluation of graduate education, (b) follow-up studies focusing on evaluation of educational administration programs, and (c) recommendations of professional organizations and national planning committees.

Follow-Up Studies Focusing on Evaluation of Graduate Education

The follow-up study approach is not without its problems as a method of program evaluation. First, there are many of the studies that are simply a collection of opinions as to whether or not the graduate

was satisfied with their program of study, e.g., which course(s) and which teaching method(s) were liked or disliked. Second, few studies of graduate programs actually investigate how essential certain knowledge, skills, and abilities are to the graduate in their present employment. The following studies investigated how essential certain knowledge, skills, and abilities were to graduates in their work.

Buswell, McConnell, Heiss, and Knoell (1966) conducted a national study involving 2,568 doctoral graduates to ascertain which skills of educational research were most valuable in the graduate's present work in order that recommendations might be made to improve training programs for educational research. This study is clearly one in which the value judgments* of practicing graduates were being sought for the purpose of making recommendations regarding the providing of opportunities for acquiring certain skills and abilities in graduate programs. A summary of the graduate training program variables revealed that of the 10 program variables examined in this study, five were found to be "significant."

- (1) The first of these involved actual participation while a graduate student in doing research either as an assistant to a professor or as an assistant in a research center or bureau.
- (2) There was a significant difference between those who published research prior to receiving the doctor's degree and those who did not.
- (3) The amount of full-time residence while a graduate student raises one of the critical questions in regard to graduate work. The data indicated clearly that for many persons who work for their doctor's degree in education the process

*Evaluation has been defined as the gathering of information for the purpose of making decisions. Therefore, evaluation is concerned with questions of utility that involve value and judgment. See Wayne W. Welch, "Curriculum Evaluation," Review of Educational Research 39 (1969), p. 429.

was a distinctly part-time operation, being done while they held full-time jobs. Due to full-time jobs . . . the candidate for the doctoral degree is deprived of living in a research climate during his period of graduate study.

(4) Significantly fewer doctors in the research group were in debt at the time of receiving their degree than was the case for those in the no-research group.

(5) The percent of doctors from public institutions who have published research is significantly higher than is the percent of those from private institutions (pp. 28-29).

Minnesota Ph.D.'s were asked to evaluate their training in a study reported by Alciatore and Eckert (1968). A sample of the 1954-56, University of Minnesota Ph.D. graduates from all fields having doctoral graduates during those three years were contacted, with 675 or 89.6 percent responding. Findings of this study were compared with findings of a 1935-48 study of more than 1,700 Ph.D. graduates of the same institution. These studies were aimed at identifying the types of skill and knowledge Ph.D. graduates were using in their current work. Also sought were appraisals of the value of those abilities and the degree to which the abilities had been acquired in graduate school. The instruments were designed to provide information pertaining to Ph.D.'s current employment, publication record, and satisfaction with the graduate school program. Reactions were also sought to a list of 30 types of knowledge, skills, and attitudes; respondents were asked to indicate how useful each of these was in their present work and whether or not the particular characteristic had been acquired in graduate school. Few studies of doctoral graduates have investigated how valuable selected skills are to the graduate in their present employment.

On the whole, these Ph.D. recipients are very satisfied with their graduate school experiences and give high endorsement to their doctoral courses and teachers. However, they believe the emphasis given to many graduate school goals concerned with research and professional development exceeded their present usefulness and suggest increased attention to

general education goals and considerably more stress on developing administrative and teaching skills. In expressing their stand on controversial issues on graduate education, they again strongly endorse more preparation for teaching and favor more breadth in course work and thesis topics. Two-fifths also advocate a lessening of the time it takes to complete the degree (p. 50).

While the preceding follow-up studies contained considerations for determining which skills and abilities were helpful to the graduate in their work; the following follow-up studies concentrated predominantly on discovering satisfaction and dissatisfaction with graduate education. The following studies are discussed in chronological order according to dates of publication.

Berelson (1960) reported one of the landmark studies in Graduate Education in the United States, which had the purpose to review the first century of graduate work in this country. This national study was designed to "systematically collect facts and judgments" from more than 4,500 subjects, 2,300 of these subjects being 1957 doctoral graduates. The following is a summary of responses from those 1957 recipients of the doctorate.

With all the problems, anxieties, hard work, disappointments, deficiencies, and the rest, would the recipients still go through it again? 'Yes,' say over 90 percent--and most of the rest aren't sure; only 3 percent definitely say 'no.' Would they take essentially the same program? 'Yes,' say three-fourths. Would they go to the same institution? 'Yes,' say two-thirds. And as an unfair, yet revealing, question, that was intended to get at the motives of the recent doctorate more than his appraisal of graduate study: 'Would you be willing to undertake the same program if there were no degree, or its equivalent, awarded at the end--just for the learning involved?' A third say they would, and less than half say 'no'; the rest can't say. So all in all, the critics of graduate education must recognize that even though the recent recipients do indicate a number of things wrong with the training program as now conducted, by and large they give it a strong vote of approval (p. 214).

A follow-up study of doctoral graduates from Teachers College, University of Nebraska, was undertaken by Seagren (1962) with the cooperation of 220 subjects with the Ph.D. or the Ed.D. degree with a major in education. The graduates were asked to appraise various phases of their program and to give their opinions of several controversial issues in graduate education. Seagren summarized the responses as follows.

A majority of the graduates considered their course work appropriate in terms of their professional interests and felt that there was a proper balance between courses required in their major area and the courses outside their major area. Foreign languages to satisfy degree requirement were considered of little value. Almost all of the graduates agreed that the amount of time and money expended in obtaining the doctorate was justified and a majority would come to the University of Nebraska again if they were starting their graduate program (Dissertation Abstracts, 1962A, p. 1991).

In a study of the doctoral program in higher education of the School of Education of Indiana University, Broertjes (1965) also used the graduate follow-up approach. His data were obtained from 38 graduates of the program between 1959 and 1964. The purpose of the study was to evaluate "the quality and effectiveness of the graduate program in higher education at the doctoral level at Indiana University." The subjects' responses regarding their program were reported in two categories: (1) satisfied, and (2) less satisfied.

Areas in which less satisfaction was indicated related to: (a) required course work in educational statistics, research, and measurement; (b) placement, guidance, and counseling services; and (c) the quantitative adequacy of the faculty. There were indications of a need to emphasize teaching and the business aspects of administration (Dissertation Abstracts, 1965A, p. 5122).

Heiss (1967) conducted a study in which Berkeley doctoral graduates of 56 departments in the early 1960's were asked to appraise their

academic programs; and found that 83 percent of the respondents (N = 2,251 respondents of 3,165 subjects) were more satisfied than dissatisfied with their overall doctoral experience. The respondents expressed a need for a more personalized or individualized orientation and integration into the academic life and for more interaction with faculty. They further perceived a need for greater interdisciplinary involvement. Heiss further reported that the graduates perceived the need for a re-examination of the rationale of which some university requirements were predicated and for a re-evaluation of the appropriateness of these requirements to specific fields of knowledge.

A follow-up study was conducted by Redovich (1971) at Marquette University to evaluate the graduate programs of the School of Education for the years 1960 to 1970. All of the 35 doctoral and 676 master's degree graduates of Marquette University for the above years comprised the subjects for this study. Useable responses were obtained from 28 (80 percent) of the doctoral graduates and from 274 (46 percent) of the master's graduates. A majority of the respondents were satisfied with the positions they then held and with their graduate preparation for it. None of the graduates were unemployed or actively seeking a position. Doctoral graduates were described as being more satisfied with their graduate education and the quality of instruction than were master's graduates.

Follow-Up Studies Focusing on Evaluation of Educational Administration Programs

While there is not an abundance of follow-up studies regarding doctoral graduates with a major in education there are even fewer

investigations using the graduate follow-up approach concerning doctoral programs in educational administration. The following studies are discussed in chronological order according to their dates of publication.

Self (1954) conducted a study of 81 selected school administrators in Oklahoma, asking them to: (a) identify problems occurring in their work, and (b) to rank the "helpfulness" to their work of recent formal educational experiences in the graduate program in educational administration of Oklahoma State University. Administrator respondents indicated that their recent educational experiences provided them little or no help in acquiring skills in problem solving related to business and financial management, but they indicated that their experiences had been very helpful in preparing them for problem solving related to pupil relations. The recent educational experiences were rated as average in helpfulness in the three areas of: (1) personnel administration, (2) public relations, and (3) improving instruction.

Beyers (1954) conducted an appraisal of the graduate program in educational administration of the University of Pittsburgh as a project of the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA). There were 112 subjects who had completed the graduate program in educational administration and had received either the Ed.D. or the Ph.D. degree. Of the sample, 79 subjects or 71 percent responded to Beyer's questionnaire. Respondents indicated that additional training or experiences in the following curriculum content would be helpful in their work.

- (1) Labor-management problems
- (2) Political science
- (3) International and intercultural relations
- (4) Skills in writing
- (5) Skills in public speaking

A questionnaire was answered by 253 superintendents representing 34 doctoral preparation programs in educational administration (Moscatto, 1962). The purpose of the study was to determine the "effectiveness," as perceived by the respondents, of the doctoral programs in educational administration in offering the curricular opportunities and experiences necessary for the respondents to develop the competencies required in their work. The questionnaire contained 28 items related to 12 areas of competency in providing instructional leadership. In the analysis of the findings six items of the 28 items scored above the defined level of effectiveness of 2.50 (on a scale of 1.00 to 3.00). The respondents ranked five of 12 identified instructional experiences above the criterion level of effectiveness of 2.50 (on a scale of 1.00 to 3.00); and listed 15 suggestions for improving the doctoral preparation programs in educational administration.

Graduates (N = 42 respondents of 54 subjects) of the doctoral program in educational administration of The Ohio State University for the years 1955 to 1965 were asked to appraise their program regarding their personal acquisition of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed in their work (Yarnall, 1965). The findings indicated that the graduates perceived the need for experiences in administration with administrators rather than staff, in order that decision-making might be involved in learning. Yarnall found that graduates indicated the need for more practical learning opportunities, simulated problems, internships, interdisciplinary experiences, and less structure, with more small seminars and student involvement. Some of the most frequently mentioned "strengths" of the program were competence of the faculty, relationships with faculty and other students, and work in the Center or Bureau of

Educational Research and Service while in the program.

Coley (1968) conducted a follow-up study of 147 Oklahoma school superintendents who had received their highest degree from Oklahoma State University, with responses being returned by 140 subjects or 95.2 percent. The purpose of this investigation was to survey the "strengths and weaknesses" of the Oklahoma State University program in educational administration as perceived by the Oklahoma superintendents who were graduates of that program. Opinions regarding program content indicated that over 50 percent of the respondents reported more emphasis was needed in: (1) curriculum and instruction; (2) finance and business management; (3) public relations; (4) organization and administration; and (5) plant planning and management. The area indicated most frequently as being in need of more emphasis was finance and business management. Class discussions and seminars received the highest commendation as a method of teaching (greater than 70 percent). Generally the superintendents signified that their expectations were fulfilled in the satisfaction of the work itself and the need to accept responsibility. They expressed disappointment in the areas of salary and freedom from restrictions. Those superintendents over 45 years of age were less inclined to indicate opportunity for advancement as fulfilling their expectations and more inclined to view necessity for technical competence and interpersonal relations as being what they expected. Some of Coley's suggestions for further study were: (1) a similar investigation should be made of other graduates in school administration who were not included in this study; and (2) due to the changing nature of educational administration, continuous follow-up of the graduates should be conducted to discover evolving areas of need.

Recommendations of Professional Organizations
and National Planning Committees

Numerous 'blue ribbon' committees have developed recommendations or plans for curricular revision and/or reform. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973, p. 28) recommended that there be more participation by students in curricular development and review. The Panel on Alternative Approaches to Graduate Education (1973) sponsored by the Council of Graduate Schools and the Graduate Record Examination Board recommended that:

Graduate departments should develop ongoing, technical consultative panels composed of successful, nonuniversity-based doers in fields allied to the disciplines; these panels should meet regularly with the instructional staff for the purpose of providing suggestions concerning curricula, evaluative criteria--all matters related to advanced training (p. 38).

Following more than a year of "participatory planning" the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) adopted five goals to guide the organization and its membership during the five-year period 1974-1979. Two of the five goals are especially related to evaluation and development of programs in educational administration.

1. Achieving in UCEA universities program innovations and leadership needed to address effectively the new training capability-training demand discrepancy.
2. Achieving a fuller understanding of the expectations-performance discrepancy and conceptualizing for implementation alternatives to reduce the discrepancy.
(UCEA Newsletter, Vol. XV, No. 4, April, 1974, p. 6)

At the 1966 National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), it was proposed that a committee be appointed to consider the future of educational administration. The committee received the name "The 1985 Committee," and published a final report in 1971.

The following quote, taken from the report, offers not a recommendation or a goal but a prediction by Knezevich (1971).

Curriculum revisions have been a way of life ever since schools were organized as specialized educational institutions. At times additions and deletions were relatively minor, or there were long time spans between them. The increased rate of development of new courses of study and the continuing reorganization of the subject content . . . will be extended during the next two decades. Incorporating the new knowledge produced in all disciplines will be a continuing challenge to keep the curriculum relevant in 1985 as well as in 1970. Every phase of the school's curriculum will have undergone a significant revision at least twice by 1985. This will embrace the academic and vocational program as well (p. 44).

Summary

The scope and depth of the follow-up approach to evaluation certainly vary, as is shown through the selected studies in the preceding review. Examples of scope are: national, institutional, college, individual program or department within an institution. Examples of depth are from one concept to an array, e.g., usefulness, satisfied-dissatisfied, liked-disliked, and lists of skills and abilities. However, not many of the studies have focused on skills and abilities which were perceived as essential in the graduate's work. Therefore, because of the many changes in the nature of educational administration this study is designed to focus upon specific areas of knowledge, skills, and abilities and their essentiality in the work of educational administrators.

It was discussed in Chapter One that early in our history there were schools with just one teacher; then gradually schools in the cities employed more than one teacher with one among them being designated "principal" teacher. As the management tasks increased in quantity and

as schools developed into more complex organizations, the need increased for administrators. Gradually programs in educational administration were started and graduates of those programs began to meet the need for school administrators. The profession grew and organized around the early scholars of educational administration and the practicing administrators. During this early period of educational administration the "how-to-do-it" of administration was passed on, based upon those practices which seemed to work best.

As the study and practice of administration grew and developed, a more scientific approach was gradually developed in both study and practice. As a basic characteristic of a scientific approach, "what was" a present theory or practice was questioned and examined with scrutiny for the purpose of first identification, and then later for the purpose of improving "what was to be." This scrutiny and questioning was essentially evaluation. This analyzing, synthesizing, and decision making regarding the study and practice of educational administration did not occur without influencing and/or being influenced by change.

As was shown in more recent investigations described in Chapter Two the evaluation process continued to be recognized as useful in determining educational objectives. It should be pointed out that the graduate follow-up evaluation process is only one approach at determining what ought to be part of professional programs and practice. Therefore, this study is considered to be one important segment of the complex process of curriculum evaluation and development. ". . . there can be no curriculum evaluation that is not intertwined with curriculum development, and curriculum evaluation is an immediately important goal" (Westbury, 1970, p. 257).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

It has been established that educational programs are constantly changing as the nature of the society and as the needs of the professions are changing. Consequently, it is essential that faculty in universities be kept informed regarding the extent to which their programs are providing useful preparation. The doctoral program in Educational Administration of Oklahoma State University has sought information regarding the extent to which the program has provided useful preparation according to the perceptions of graduates. "Systematic review and assessment of the product, e.g. [sic], student, is carried on as a routine procedure because a systems approach requires commitment to evaluation as a continuous process" (Blendinger, 1969, p. 57).

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that curriculum evaluation is a continuous process which promotes and improves the quality of learning experiences. It was further assumed that program graduates were a valid and useful source of input data for curriculum evaluation. It was assumed that the questionnaire approach to data collection was capable of yielding valid data for curriculum evaluation. Finally, it was assumed that graduates were able

to recall whether their Ed.D. program afforded the opportunity to acquire certain behaviors.

Method

The descriptive survey method was used for this study to ascertain the perceptions of the graduates regarding the opportunity to acquire certain skills and abilities in the Oklahoma State University doctoral program in educational administration.

Identification of Subjects

The population for this study consisted of the 88 doctoral graduates of the doctoral program in Educational Administration of Oklahoma State University from the spring of 1964 through the summer of 1973. Each subject of the population was identified from the official copies of the Oklahoma State University Commencement publication as having a major in Educational Administration. The official copy of each commencement publication was acquired from the Office of the Registrar of Oklahoma State University. Current mailing addresses were obtained from the Oklahoma State University Alumni Office, the Oklahoma State University Placement Services, and/or members of the Oklahoma State University faculty.

The Instrument

The instrument was composed of predominantly fixed alternative type questions that were organized into the following parts: Part I--was a general information page designed by the researcher to obtain selected background data about the subjects; and Part II--was a modification by

the researcher of the Administrator Behavior Rating Scale used by Heiner* (1973). The design of Part II of the instrument consisted of two scales which were used to record whether or not graduates perceived their program as affording the opportunity to acquire certain behaviors and to record the essentiality of those behaviors in their work. The first scale was a fixed-alternative type to ascertain whether or not the graduate perceived that his Ed.D. program had afforded him the opportunity to acquire each of the 20 behaviors on the instrument. The subject responded by circling either YES or NO. The second scale was a four item Likert type designed to rank the essentiality of each of the 20 behaviors on the instrument. The subject responded by circling one of four symbols as follows: SA, A, D, or SD. The subject was to circle SA if he strongly agreed that the behavior was essential in his work, and was to circle A if he agreed moderately that the behavior was essential in his work. The subject was to circle SD if he strongly disagreed that the behavior was essential in his work, and was to circle D if he disagreed moderately that the behavior was essential in his work. There were 20 behaviors representing five conceptual areas of curriculum in educational administration. The 20 behaviors were adapted from an existing instrument and certainly were not intended to be comprehensive in scope. The five conceptual areas of curriculum were: (1) Administration, (2) Supervision, (3) Finance, (4) Communications and Human Relations, and (5) School-Community Relations and Law. See Appendix A for a list of the 20 behaviors on the instrument. Behaviors numbered 13

*Karl W. Heiner, "Administrator Behavior Rating Scale," (unpublished research, University of California, San Francisco, 1973).

through 18 were related to administration, and those numbered 19 through 21 were related to supervision. The conceptual area of finance was represented by behaviors numbered 22 through 24, and behaviors numbered 25 through 29 represented communications and human relations. The fifth area of curriculum, school-community relations and law was represented by behaviors numbered 30 through 32. These five conceptual areas of curriculum were used as an organizing rubric in the descriptive analysis of the findings in Chapter Four.

Administration of the Instrument

A pilot study was conducted by administering the questionnaire to 45 persons enrolled in graduate courses offered in educational administration at Oklahoma State University. The 45 persons were asked to evaluate the items in terms of the following questions: (1) Which questions, if any, were unclear to you? (2) Were there any questions which you feel should be included which were not? If so, please give us your suggestions. (3) Did you find any question where the alternative answers, which were provided, were not adequate? If so, please specify the question and give us your suggestions.

Each of the 88 graduates received a cover letter (see Appendix B) requesting his cooperation in the study and a questionnaire (see Appendix A) for individual responses. Each mailing was sent by first-class mail and return postage was pre-paid. The cover letters and questionnaires were mailed on January 24, 1974. Since Dr. Kenneth St. Clair or Dr. Richard Jungers were listed as the advisor for approximately half of the subjects (each approximately 25 percent), it seemed advisable to have each of those professors sign the cover letter as well as the

researcher. One follow-up letter (see Appendix C) was used in those instances where necessary, and those letters were mailed on February 5, 1974. The cut-off date for using returned questionnaires was March 15, 1974.

Analysis of Data

The analysis of data was done through the expression of frequency and percentage distribution in tabular and descriptive form. A percentage and frequency count was used to describe the demographic data of the respondents. A percentage and frequency count was also used to describe the responses, for each of the 20 behaviors, to the questions: In your judgment did your Ed.D. program afford you the opportunity to acquire this behavior?; and in your work is this behavior essential?

Welfare of the Subjects

Even though each questionnaire was numbered in order to determine which were returned, the questionnaires did not have the respondent's name on them. Every measure was taken to protect the respondents by maintaining anonymity throughout the analysis of data and the report of the findings.

Limitations

In a descriptive survey there is always a possibility of bias in findings because of the absence of information from nonrespondents. An instrument which relies upon fixed-alternative responses for information, although conducive to high responses, imposes limits upon the respondent and hinders his freedom of response.

Another matter which could be considered as a limiting factor in a study of this nature, is the accuracy of recall of graduates regarding whether their doctoral program afforded opportunities for acquiring the 20 behaviors listed on the instrument.

This study was limited to specific graduates of a particular program within one institution, thus the findings cannot be generalized to other institutions, programs, or subjects.

Because studies of this nature are limited to a description of the data, this study attempts neither prediction nor causation as a goal.

Summary

The aim of this study was to perform a summative evaluation of the doctoral program in educational administration at Oklahoma State University using the descriptive, graduate follow-up approach. The findings of this summative evaluation were intended to be useful in the formative stages of curriculum revision.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The instrument was mailed to the population of 88 Oklahoma State University doctoral graduates in Educational Administration. Presentation of the data are included in this chapter. The first section contains the presentation and analysis of the data describing the subjects. The second section contains the descriptions and perceptions of the educational administration program at Oklahoma State University as perceived by the graduates.

Description of the Subjects

There were 84 subjects of a population of 88 who returned useable questionnaires, for a response of 95.45 percent. The population consisted of one female and 87 males. Thirty-four respondents, or 40.48 percent, were employed in four-year colleges or universities, while 31 or 36.90 percent were employed in administrative positions in Kindergarten through the twelfth grade. More than 60 percent of the respondents indicated that they had no teaching duties. Forty-four percent of the subjects indicated that they supervise between 1-50 employees. The subjects are described by 25 percent who have 21-25 years of professional experience. Thirty-three percent of the respondents have been employed

in administrative positions for six to ten years. Fifty-two percent of the subjects have held two to four positions since graduating with the Ed.D. degree, while 26 percent of the former students were 41-45 years of age--25 percent were 46-50 years of age. Table I contains additional details concerning characteristics of the subjects, according to eight variables.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Employment	K-12	31	36.90
	Vo-Tech	2	2.38
	2 yr. College	3	3.57
	4 yr. College	34	40.48
	Other	14	16.67
Teaching Duties	None	53	63.10
	Part-Time	17	20.24
	Full-Time	14	16.67
Number Employees Supervised	None	9	10.71
	1-50	37	44.05
	51-150	16	19.05
	151-300	13	15.48
	301-500	5	5.95
	501-1,000	1	1.19
	Over 1,000	3	3.57
Years Professional Experience	5 or less	2	2.38
	6-10	15	17.86
	11-15	15	17.86
	16-20	19	22.62
	21-25	21	25.00
	26-30	11	13.10
	Over 30	1	1.19

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Years Administrative Experience	None	1	1.19
	5 or less	15	17.86
	6-10	28	33.33
	11-15	22	26.19
	16-20	11	13.10
	21-25	6	7.14
	26-30	1	1.19
	Over 30	0	0
Year Graduated With Ed.D.	1964	6	7.14
	1965	9	10.71
	1966	10	11.90
	1967	6	7.14
	1968	5	5.95
	1969	9	10.71
	1970	11	13.10
	1971	9	10.71
	1972	9	10.71
	1973	10	11.90
Number Positions Since Ed.D.	None	0	0
	1	39	46.43
	2-4	44	52.38
	5-7	0	0
	8-10	1	1.19
	Over 10	0	0
Age	Below 26	0	0
	26-30	4	4.76
	31-35	12	14.29
	36-40	13	15.48
	41-45	22	26.19
	46-50	21	25.00
	51-55	7	8.33
	56-60	4	4.76
	Over 60	1	1.19

As is shown in Table II, 27 percent of the respondents had a primary job title of superintendent of schools, and eight percent had a primary job title of school principal. Administrators with no teaching

duties made up 27 percent of the respondents, and 17 percent of the respondents were administrators with part-time teaching duties. Those respondents classified as teaching faculty made up 18 percent of the respondents.

TABLE II
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED
ACCORDING TO PRIMARY JOB TITLE

Category	Primary Job Title	No.	Sub Total	%
I. Superintendent	Superintendent of Schools	21	23	27.38
	Asst. School Supt.	2		
II. Principal	Principal	5	7	8.35
	Dir. Secondary Education	1		
	Dir. Jr. High School	1		
III. Administrators with no teaching duties	A. K-12		3	
	Dir. Title III	1		
	Dir. Instructional Services	1		
	Dir. Federal & Special Programs	1		
B. Two-Year College	Dean Social Science Div.	1	4	
	Dean of Students	1		
	Vice President Liberal Arts	1		
	Dir. Vocational Studies Div.	1		

TABLE II (Continued)

Category	Primary Job Title	No.	Sub Total	%
C. Four-Year College or University				
	President	1		
	Registrar	1		
	Acting Dean of the College	1		
	Asst. to President, and Dir. Special Programs	2		
	Administration & Programs	1		
			6	
D. Government Services				
	Asst. Coordinator for Eval. State Dept. Vo-Tech Educ.	1		
	Coordinator Planning, Research & Eval. State Dept. Educ.	1		
	Area Supervisor State Dept. of Education	1		
	Budget Coordinator, State Board of Regents	1		
	Coordinator of Energy Policy U.S.O.E.	1		
	Dir. Staff Dev. Ext. Srvc. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture	1		
	Deputy Regional Director Dept. H.E.W.	1		
	U.S. Postal Srvc. Tng.	1		
	Exec. Dir. Comm. Action Prog. Office Economic Opportunity	1		
	Dir. County Extension, Coop. Extension Service	1	10	
	Category III Sub Total		23	27.38
IV. Administrators with part-time teaching duties				
A. Four-Year College or University				
	Dean of Instruction	1		
	Dean School of Business	1		
	Asst. to Graduate Dean Asst. Prof. Ed. Adm.	1		
	Asst. Dean, Assoc. Prof.	1		
	Personnel Officer	1		
	Consultant, Univ. Extension	1		
	Dir. Supervised Teaching & Certification	3		

TABLE II (Continued)

Category	Primary Job Title	No.	Sub Total	%
	Asst. Dir. Southwest Center for Safety	1		
	Dir. Testing and Learning Skills	1		
	Chairman, Industrial Educ. Head, Dept. of Education	1	13	
B. State Level	Dir. of Research State Dept. Vo-Tech Education	1	<u>1</u>	
	Category IV Sub Total		14	16.68
V. Teaching Faculty				
A. Full-time teaching Four-Year College or University	Prof. Educational Adm. Professor Professor Mathematics Assoc. Prof. Ed. Adm. Assoc. Prof. Secondary Ed. Assoc. Prof. Education Assoc. Prof. Education, Co- ordinator Teacher Ed. Center Asst. Prof. Ed. Adm. Asst. Prof. Education Dir. Pre-Professional Lrng. Elementary Education Community Resource Dev. Program Specialist	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1		13
B. Part-time teaching Four-Year College or University	Teacher Assoc. Prof. Administration	1 1	<u>2</u>	
	Category V Sub Total		15	17.87
VI. Other	Pres. Church Dev. Inc. Church Adm. Consultant Exec. Dir., United School Administrators of Kansas	1 1 1	2	2.39

Descriptions and Perceptions of the Educational
Administration Program at Oklahoma
State University

Part II of the instrument contained 20 behaviors representing five conceptual areas of curriculum in educational administration. The five conceptual areas of curriculum were: (1) Administration, (2) Supervision, (3) Finance, (4) Communications and Human Relations, and (5) School-Community Relations and Law. Tables III through VIII contain frequencies and percentages of the perceptions of respondents regarding behaviors related to the conceptual area of administration. Tables IX through XI contain frequencies and percentages of the perceptions of respondents regarding behaviors related to the conceptual area of supervision. The following three tables, XII through XIV, contain frequencies and percentages of the perceptions of respondents regarding behaviors related to the conceptual area of finance. Tables XV through XIX contain frequencies and percentages of the perceptions of respondents regarding behaviors related to the conceptual areas of communications and human relations. Tables XX through XXII contain frequencies and percentages of the perceptions of respondents regarding behaviors related to the conceptual areas of school-community relations and law.

The second scale on the instrument was a four item Likert type, with the four categories being strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. There were so few responses in the categories of disagree and strongly disagree (with many cells having no responses) that the data were combined for the categories of disagree and strongly disagree. Then to provide for a more meaningful comparison of responses

the data were combined from the responses in the categories of agree and strongly agree. Therefore in reporting the data only two categories were used to describe the responses, and the categories were agree and disagree.

Defining and clarifying organizational goals and objectives was agreed to be essential in the work of 99 percent of the respondents. As is shown in Table III, 89 percent of the respondents perceived that they had the opportunity to acquire this behavior in their doctoral program.

TABLE III
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING DEFINING AND CLARIFYING ORGANIZATIONAL
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Defining & clarifying organizational goals & objectives	73	89.02	9	10.98	82	98.77	1	1.20

As is shown in Table IV, 71 respondents perceived their doctoral program as affording them the opportunity to acquire the behavior of developing plans to achieve long and short range objectives. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents agreed that the behavior was essential in their work.

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING DEVELOPING PLANS TO ACHIEVE LONG
AND SHORT RANGE OBJECTIVES

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Developing plans to achieve long & short range objectives	71	87.65	10	12.35	82	97.62	2	2.38

Eighty-six percent of the respondents agreed that utilizing techniques for systematic planning and implementation, e.g., PERT, PPBS, and Task Analysis, was essential in their work; but only 43 percent perceived their doctoral program as affording them the opportunity to acquire this behavior (Table V).

TABLE V

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING UTILIZING TECHNIQUES FOR SYSTEMATIC
PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing techniques for systematic plan- ning and implementation	36	43.37	47	56.63	71	85.55	12	14.46

Establishing priority rankings among administrative problems was agreed to be essential in the work of 93 percent of the respondents. Seventy-six percent of the respondents perceived that their Ed.D. program afforded them the opportunity to acquire the ability to rank problems according to their priority (Table VI).

TABLE VI
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING ESTABLISHING PRIORITY RANKINGS AMONG
ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Establishing priority rankings among administrative problems	62	75.61	20	24.39	78	92.85	6	7.14

As is shown in Table VII, 88 percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire the behaviors of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data related to administrative problems. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents agreed that these behaviors were essential in their work.

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire the behavior of utilizing theoretical models in the functions of administration, e.g.,

Getzels-Guba and Etzioni (Table VIII). Seventy-two percent of the respondents agreed that this behavior was essential in their work.

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING COLLECTING, ANALYZING, AND INTERPRETING
DATA RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data related to administra- tive problems	73	87.95	10	12.05	82	97.62	2	2.38

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING UTILIZING THEORETICAL MODELS IN THE
FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing theoretical models in the functions of administration	74	89.16	9	10.84	60	72.29	23	27.71

Fifty-one percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program did not afford them the opportunity to acquire the behavior of utilizing recruiting and selection procedures, yet 88 percent agreed that this behavior was essential in their work (Table IX).

TABLE IX
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING UTILIZING RECRUITING AND
SELECTION PROCEDURES

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing recruiting and selection procedures	40	49.38	41	50.62	73	87.95	10	12.05

The behavior of describing job responsibilities for self and subordinates was agreed to be essential in the work of 96 percent of the respondents, as is shown in Table X. Sixty-six percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire this behavior.

As is shown in Table XI, 92 percent of the respondents agreed that the behaviors of planning and executing personnel evaluations was essential in their work, yet 47 percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program did not afford them the opportunity to acquire these behaviors.

TABLE X
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
 CONCERNING DESCRIBING JOB RESPONSIBILITIES
 FOR SELF AND SUBORDINATES

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Describing job responsibilities for self and subordinates	54	65.85	28	34.15	81	96.43	3	3.57

TABLE XI
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
 CONCERNING PLANNING AND EXECUTING PERSONNEL EVALUATIONS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Planning and executing personnel evaluations	44	53.01	39	46.99	77	91.67	7	8.33

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire the behavior of utilizing knowledge of financial aspects of administration. Ninety percent of the respondents agreed that this behavior was essential in their work (Table XII).

TABLE XII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING UTILIZING KNOWLEDGE OF FINANCIAL
ASPECTS OF ADMINISTRATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing knowledge of financial aspects of administration	65	78.31	18	21.69	76	90.47	8	9.52

As shown in Table XIII, 81 percent of the respondents agreed that the behavior of utilizing knowledge of public and private funding bases to secure financial support was essential in their work, however, 48 percent perceived that their doctoral program did not afford them the opportunity to acquire this behavior.

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING UTILIZING KNOWLEDGE OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
FUNDING BASES TO SECURE FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing knowledge of public & private fund- ing bases to secure financial support	43	52.44	39	47.56	67	80.72	16	19.28

The behavior of utilizing principles of accounting in the management of a departmental or program budget was agreed to be essential in the work of 83 percent of the respondents, while 67 percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program did not afford them the opportunity to acquire the behavior (Table XIV).

TABLE XIV
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING UTILIZING PRINCIPLES OF ACCOUNTING IN
THE MANAGEMENT OF A DEPARTMENTAL
OR PROGRAM BUDGET

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing principles of accounting in the management of a departmental or program budget	27	32.53	56	67.47	70	83.33	14	16.66

Developing a receptivity to others through a knowledge of human behavior was agreed to be essential in the work of 100 percent of the respondents (Table XV). Ninety percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire this behavior.

One hundred percent of the respondents agreed as essential in their work the behaviors of utilizing knowledge and techniques of group process

to facilitate interaction with faculty, students, peers, and supervisors (Table XVI). Eighty percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire these behaviors.

TABLE XV
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
 CONCERNING DEVELOPING A RECEPTIVITY TO OTHERS
 THROUGH A KNOWLEDGE OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Developing a receptivity to others through a knowledge of human behavior	74	90.24	8	9.76	84	100		

Ninety-nine percent of the respondents agreed that organizing presentations which effectively convey ideas was a behavior that was essential in their work; whereas, 71 percent perceived that they had the opportunity to acquire the behavior in their doctoral program (Table XVII).

Ninety-five percent of the respondents agreed that the behavior of conducting effective conferences and meetings was essential in their work, while 61 percent perceived that their doctoral program did not afford the opportunity to acquire the behavior (Table XVIII).

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
 CONCERNING UTILIZING KNOWLEDGE AND TECHNIQUES OF
 GROUP PROCESSES TO FACILITATE INTERACTION
 WITH FACULTY, STUDENTS, PEERS,
 AND SUPERVISORS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Utilizing knowledge and techniques of group process to facilitate interaction with faculty, students, peers, and supervisors	66	80.49	16	19.51	84	100		

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
 CONCERNING ORGANIZING PRESENTATIONS WHICH
 EFFECTIVELY CONVEY IDEAS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Organizing presentations which effectively convey ideas	58	70.73	24	29.27	83	98.81	1	1.19

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING CONDUCTING EFFECTIVE
CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	32	39.02	50	60.98	80	95.23	4	4.76

Enhancing others to increase cooperation and job satisfaction was agreed to be essential in the work of 95 percent of the respondents, as is shown in Table XIX. Sixty-five percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire the behavior.

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING ENHANCING OTHERS TO INCREASE COOPERATION
AND JOB SATISFACTION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Enhancing others to increase cooperation and job satisfaction	53	65.43	28	34.57	79	95.19	4	4.81

As shown in Table XX, analyzing the relationship between school, community, and government in decisions which affect program administration was perceived as essential in the work of 93 percent of the respondents. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents replied "Yes" that their doctoral program afforded the opportunity to acquire the behavior.

TABLE XX
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
 CONCERNING ANALYZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL,
 COMMUNITY, AND GOVERNMENT IN DECISIONS WHICH
 AFFECT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Analyzing the relationship between school, community, and Government in decisions which affect program administration	65	78.31	18	21.69	78	92.86	6	7.14

Recognizing the general legal principles that affect program administration, e.g., liability and negotiations was agreed to be essential in the work of 90 percent of the respondents (Table XXI). Eighty-nine percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program afforded them the opportunity to acquire the behavior.

Eighty-six percent of the respondents agreed that attempting to influence legislation which influences education was essential in their

work, however 73 percent of the respondents perceived that their doctoral program did not afford them the opportunity to acquire the behavior (Table XXII).

TABLE XXI

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING RECOGNIZING THE GENERAL LEGAL PRINCIPLES
THAT AFFECT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Recognizing the general legal principles that affect program administration	73	89.02	9	10.98	76	90.47	8	9.52

TABLE XXII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS
CONCERNING ATTEMPTING TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION WHICH
INFLUENCES EDUCATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Attempting to influence legislation which influences education	22	27.50	58	72.50	69	86.25	11	13.30

As is shown in Table XXIII, more than 80 percent of the respondents agreed that 19 of the behaviors were essential in their work. There were two behaviors which 100 percent of the respondents agreed that the behaviors were essential in their work: (1) Developing a receptivity to others and (2) Using knowledge and techniques of group process. There were 15 behaviors which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived that their program afforded the opportunity to acquire.

It can be noted from Table XXIII that each of the five conceptual areas described on pages 32 and 33 of this chapter had one behavior each which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived that they did not have the opportunity to acquire in their doctoral program. More than 80 percent of the respondents agreed, however, that each of those five behaviors was essential in their work. Those five behaviors were: (1) Using techniques for systematic planning, (2) Using recruiting and selection procedures, (3) Using principles of accounting in a budget, (4) Conducting effective conferences and meetings, and (5) Attempting to influence legislation.

Summary

In the first portion of this chapter descriptive data relating to the characteristics of the respondents helped to establish the experiential base from which to analyze the data. Described in the final portion of the chapter were perceptions of the respondents regarding whether or not their doctoral program in educational administration at Oklahoma State University afforded them the opportunity to acquire behaviors often expected of administrators, and how essential each behavior was in their work. A percentage and frequency count was used to

TABLE XXIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING 20 SELECTED BEHAVIORS

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior				Essential in Work			
	Yes		No		Agree		Disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Defining and clarifying goals and objectives	73	89.02	9	10.98	82	98.77	1	1.20
Developing plans for long and short range goals	71	87.65	10	12.35	82	97.62	2	2.38
Using techniques for systematic planning	36	43.37	47	56.63	71	85.55	12	14.46
Establishing priority rankings among problems	62	75.61	20	24.39	78	92.85	6	7.14
Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data	73	87.95	10	12.05	82	97.62	2	2.38
Using theoretical models in administration	74	89.16	9	10.84	60	72.29	23	27.71
Using recruiting and selection procedures	40	49.38	41	50.62	73	87.95	10	12.05
Describing job responsibilities	54	65.85	28	34.15	81	96.43	3	3.57
Planning and executing personnel evaluations	44	53.01	39	46.99	77	91.67	7	8.33
Using knowledge of financial aspects of administration	65	78.31	18	21.69	76	90.47	8	9.52
Using knowledge of funding bases to secure support	43	52.44	39	47.56	67	80.72	16	19.28
Using principles of accounting in a budget	27	32.53	56	67.47	70	83.33	14	16.66
Developing a receptivity to others	74	90.24	8	9.76	84	100	0	0
Using knowledge and techniques of group process	66	80.49	16	19.51	84	100	0	0
Organizing effective presentations	58	70.73	24	29.27	83	98.81	1	1.19
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	32	39.02	50	60.98	80	95.23	4	4.76
Enhancing cooperation and job satisfaction	53	65.43	28	34.57	79	95.19	4	4.81
Analyzing school-community relations in decisions	65	78.31	18	21.69	78	92.86	6	7.14
Recognizing legal principles in administration	73	89.02	9	10.98	76	90.47	8	9.52
Attempting to influence legislation	22	27.50	58	72.50	69	86.25	11	13.30

describe the characteristics of the subjects as well as the responses for each of the 20 behaviors.

Chapter Five is a presentation of the major findings and implications of the study.

CHAPTER V

MAJOR FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The practice and the study of educational administration is changing due to the nature of society and the needs of the profession. In the ongoing operation of an educational program, evaluation is a continuous and systematic process involving students and faculty. However, systematic evaluation involving contemporary life outside the school, i.e., the practicing graduate, is usually not conducted as often.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the extent to which individuals who received the Degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Administration from Oklahoma State University between the spring of 1964 and the summer of 1973 perceived that the instructional program in educational administration prepared them for positions in educational administration. Two specific areas were of primary concern: (1) To ascertain whether the instructional program, as perceived by the graduates, afforded an opportunity to acquire certain selected behaviors often expected of administrators, and (2) To determine whether or not subjects perceived those selected behaviors as being essential in their work.

There were 88 doctoral graduates identified as the population for this study, and 84 (95.45 percent) returned useable questionnaires. The

descriptive survey method was used for this study. The questionnaire which was mailed to the subjects consisted of (a) a general information page for securing background data, and (b) a behavior rating scale to ascertain the perceptions of graduates regarding their doctoral program. Percentages and frequency counts were used to analyze the responses of the subjects.

Summary of the Findings

The behavior rating scale used in this study was adapted from an existing instrument and certainly was not intended to be comprehensive in scope. Each of the 20 behaviors listed on the instrument in this study were agreed to be essential in the work of 80 percent or more of the respondents with one exception, i.e., using theoretical models in administration. In regard to the exception, it was agreed to be essential in the work of 72 percent of the respondents. Two of the behaviors were agreed to be essential in the work of 100 percent of the respondents, and they were: (1) developing a receptivity to others through a knowledge of human behavior; and (2) utilizing knowledge and techniques of group process to facilitate interaction with faculty, students, peers, and supervisors. More than 50 percent of the respondents perceived that their program afforded the opportunity to acquire the following 15 behaviors.

- Defining and clarifying organizational goals and objectives
- Developing plans to achieve long and short range objectives
- Establishing priority rankings among administrative problems
- Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data related to administrative problems

Describing job responsibilities for self and subordinates

Planning and executing personnel evaluations

Utilizing knowledge of financial aspects of administration

Utilizing knowledge of public and private funding bases to secure financial support

Developing a receptivity to others through a knowledge of human behavior

Utilizing knowledge and techniques of group process to facilitate interaction with faculty, students, peers, and supervisors

Organizing presentations which effectively convey ideas

Enhancing others to increase cooperation and job satisfaction

Analyzing the relationships between school, community, and government in decisions which effect program administration

Over 50 percent of the respondents perceived that their program did not afford them the opportunity to acquire five of the behaviors, even though more than 80 percent of the respondents agreed that each of the behaviors was essential in their work. The five behaviors were: (1) utilizing techniques for systematic planning and implementation, e.g., PERT, PPBS, Task Analysis; (2) utilizing recruiting and selection procedures; (3) utilizing principles of accounting in the management of a departmental or program budget; (4) conducting effective conferences and meetings; and (5) attempting to influence legislation which influences education.

Implications

The findings of this summative evaluation were intended to be useful in the formative stages of continued curriculum development in the educational administration program of Oklahoma State University. Thus

in light of the results of this study it is appropriate to consider the implications for curriculum revision and/or development.

There were five behaviors which the graduates perceived as essential in their work while indicating that their doctoral program did not afford the opportunity to acquire the behaviors. The opportunity to acquire the behaviors may not have been present, or it may have been present and just not perceived to be present by the student. Regardless of which of the alternatives existed the implications for curricular analysis exist.

The first of the five behaviors to consider was using techniques for systematic planning and implementation, e.g., PERT, PPBS, and Task Analysis. While it is clear that the administrative program gave attention to the matter of systematic approaches in administration, the examples employed on the questionnaire referred to a more recent conceptualization of administrative process termed systems theory. Since systems theory was introduced into graduate programs in educational administration only around 1968, it would be expected that participants in this study who were students prior to 1968 would have had little or no opportunity to acquire the knowledge of systems theory in their doctoral program. Evidence is presented in Table XXIX which supports this expectation. However, approximately half of the more recent graduates (1969-1973) perceived their doctoral program as not affording them the opportunity to acquire the techniques needed for systematic planning and implementation using such tools as PERT, PPBS, and Task Analysis.

This would suggest that the respondents either (1) did not enroll in a course which included such concepts or (2) enrolled in a course which included the concepts but did not acquire the skills required to

use the techniques for systematic planning and implementation such as PERT, PPBS, and Task Analysis. The first possibility may be solved through advising; however the latter consideration is more complex. If the learner were foiled by methods of presentation, then other methods of presentation (alternative means) could enhance the acquisition of competence in using such tools as PERT and PPBS. One professor of educational administration at Oklahoma State University is currently developing a series of self paced learning packages which would provide alternative means for acquiring competencies in using techniques for systematic planning and implementation. When those means are incorporated into the program, steps should be taken to evaluate whether they met with greater success in providing graduates with skills deemed to be essential in their work.

The second of the five behaviors which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their doctoral program not affording the opportunity to acquire was using recruiting and selection procedures to maintain and/or increase human resources. The processes of recruitment and selection have been a part of educational administration for a long time, but those processes have been affected by contemporary history. Contemporary history, or what was happening at the time the study was being conducted, is one of several factors which can be a threat to the internal validity (i.e., how true are the findings) of a study. The nondiscrimination (i.e., Executive Order of the President - 11246, 1965) efforts of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action have had an impact on the processes of recruitment and selection, for recruitment and selection procedures today are far more apt to fall under the scrutiny of the courts as individuals realize that charges can be brought against a

potential employer if proper procedures are not followed. In light of this contemporary setting, the sometimes highly informal procedures utilized in the past are no longer appropriate. This change in method could easily have made graduates feel uneasy about the styles they employed and also points to a new need for graduate programs in educational administration. Therefore, events of contemporary history may have affected the respondents perception of the adequacy of the Ed.D. program, by affecting the respondents expressed need to know new information. However, this supports the need for continued program evaluation and updating.

The third of five behaviors which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their Ed.D. program not affording the opportunity to acquire was utilizing principles of accounting in the management of a departmental or program budget. The concept that seems to be the critical factor in this curricular area is accounting. The study of the theory and practice of finance and budget making have been a part of educational administration curricula for some time, but the study of the technical skill of accounting has been treated as though it were related to but apart from finance and budget planning. Eighty-three percent of the respondents agreed that in the management of a budget-accounting was essential in their work, even though 67.47 percent perceived their doctoral program as not affording the opportunity to acquire that behavior. Based on this finding it seems appropriate to suggest that accounting be included in the curriculum. The issues are (1) how much accounting should be included, and (2) how should learning activities be designed to acquire those skills and abilities. Learning activities which would emphasize the relationships between accounting systems and

budgetary decision making and between accounting systems and goal setting should enhance the graduate's ability to function as an effective manager.

The fourth of the five behaviors which more than 50 percent (60.98 percent) of the respondents perceived their doctoral program as not affording the opportunity to acquire was conducting effective conferences and meetings, even though 95 percent of the respondents agreed that the behavior was essential in their work. By comparison, 70.73 percent of the respondents perceived their doctoral program as affording the opportunity to acquire the behavior of organizing effective presentations with 98.81 percent regarding this behavior as essential in their work. In essence, the difference was between the two concepts of organizing and conducting. It can be said that the issue is whether the program can provide opportunities for conducting effective conferences and meetings--it is clear that there are already numerous opportunities for graduate students to conduct meetings. In light of this, it appears that the acquiring of this behavior would be enhanced if transfer of learning were not expected and if model statements of performance objectives were provided for the learner. These model statements would emphasize the importance of the process of conducting effective meetings and conferences as well as the importance of the content treated in such meetings. Another opportunity to enhance awareness of process would be to conduct small group evaluation conferences following a presentation (e.g., formal class presentation) by a student to enhance future presentations. Faculty, peer, and presenter feedback in the evaluation conference could enhance the opportunity to acquire the behavior of conducting effective conferences and meetings.

The last of the behaviors which more than 50 percent (72.50 percent) of the respondents perceived their doctoral program as not affording the opportunity to acquire was attempting to influence legislation which influences education. One concern is how to provide learning opportunities for influencing legislation which influences education. When considering planned learning activities, it comes to mind that legislation does not occur on the semester system within the state. However, within many educational organizations one or more persons are designated as liaison representatives between the educational organization and the legislature; within the office of such liaison representatives resides excellent opportunity for learning (e.g., practica or labs). Finally, the case study approach and computer assisted instruction might also be considered, for they have been described as means for providing learning opportunities related to influencing legislation.

If one evaluates each of these five neglected behaviors and attempts to establish ties among them, two larger groups seem to emerge. The first and third behaviors related to systems theory and accounting-budget management are conceptually related and could be grouped under the title of operations analysis. Based upon the related literature in this study there is support for curricular reconceptualization in this subject area.

The second, fourth, and fifth behaviors of (1) recruiting and selection procedures, (2) conducting effective conferences, and (3) influencing legislation are related to two contemporary conceptual areas of educational administration curriculum. The conceptual areas being resource management and organizational development. Again, based upon the related literature in this study there is support for curricular

reconceptualization in this subject area.

It should be emphasized that the graduate follow-up evaluation process is only one approach for determining the objectives of professional programs. The findings of this study should be considered in light of the widely-held belief that multiple sources (i.e., learners, subject specialists, potential employers, and graduates) should be consulted in the process of determining learning objectives. Therefore, this study is considered as only one important segment of the complex process of curriculum evaluation and development.

Hemphill (1969) charges that evaluation seeks to provide a basis for making decisions among alternatives. Some alternatives for action are discussed below.

Alternatives for Course Offerings

Determine as a faculty committee if the five behaviors, which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their program not affording the opportunity to acquire, are desirable graduate competencies.

Analyze existing courses to determine if opportunities exist for students to acquire each of the five behaviors, which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their program not affording the opportunity to acquire.

Provide other alternative means for achieving the same learning objectives, for example, the learner might choose among such alternatives as field assignment, team project, group seminar, and/or self-paced learning packages. One or several of these might be contracted by the learner to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the five behaviors, which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived

their program not affording the opportunity to acquire. Such alternative means for learning could be incorporated into already existing courses. Harned (1974) reported that--through the use of self-paced learning packages in an audio-visual (A-V) learning center--faculty were freed from teaching selected basic knowledge, skills, and abilities; and consequently were provided more time for the learner and instructor to work together on higher level learning objectives such as analyzing, synthesizing, and decision making. Therefore through released student time (up to one third time) from regular scheduled class, opportunity could be provided for laboratory or applied learning, especially related to basic knowledge, skills, and abilities.

Encourage students to participate in selecting and developing learning activities by providing written models of learning objectives and activities from which to choose. This mechanism would provide for increasing program flexibility as well as producing additional plans for learning.

Provide a mechanism (i.e., newsletter) for continuous input data from graduates and selected administrators for use in planning and evaluating the program, especially in the five conceptual areas which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their program not affording the opportunity to acquire. This same input data of expressed needs could also be used to develop continuing education courses.

Alternatives for Faculty Staffing

Consider differentiated staffing to support various types of learning activities, especially those related to basic knowledge, skills, and abilities (i.e., lower level learning objectives) from the five

behaviors which more than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their program not affording the opportunity to acquire.

Provide released time to selected faculty, or employ more faculty to develop learning packages. An alternative could be to employ a technical writer, who is a specialist in curriculum, to assist in developing learning packages. Lonsdale and Ohm (1971) report that, "there should be clear differentiation among researchers, developers, and disseminators" (p. 121). Another suggested alternative for action would be to employ a special assistant in the stat lab to provide alternative means for acquiring the ability of applying the principles of accounting. Therefore, differentiated staffing and/or additional faculty could support the development and implementation of various types of learning activities.

Alternatives for Field Learning and Internships

Develop more on campus learning opportunities which would permit students of administration to work directly with campus administrators; these experiences being a laboratory part of already existing courses rather than in addition to regular course work.

Prepare laboratory learning objectives, related to the five behaviors which respondents perceived their program not affording the opportunity to acquire.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Conduct a series of detailed formative investigations related to each of the conceptual areas of the educational administration curriculum.

2. Conduct further descriptive studies regarding additional behaviors often expected of administrators, as perceived by faculty, students, and practicing administrators.

3. Conduct more detailed research regarding task analysis of administrator behaviors in each of the five conceptual areas of educational administration curriculum.

4. Conduct cost effectiveness comparative studies between predominate modes of instruction and alternative means suggested from this study.

Concluding Statement

Among the most significant aspects of educational administration are planning, implementing, and evaluating an educational program. The purpose of this study was to provide a summative evaluation, by practicing administrators, of conceptual areas of an educational administration curriculum. ". . . there can be no curriculum evaluation that is not intertwined with curriculum development, and curriculum evaluation is an immediately important goal" (Westbury, 1970, p. 257).

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alciatoire, Robert T., and Ruth E. Eckert. Minnesota Ph.D.'s Evaluate Their Training. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968.
- Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1960.
- Beyers, William E. "An Appraisal of the Graduate Program of Educational Administration at the University of Pittsburgh." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 14, Part 2 (1954), pp. 784-785.
- Blendinger, Jack. "ABC's of the Systems Approach." Education, Volume 90 (September-October, 1969), pp. 56-58.
- Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I, Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay Company, 1956.
- Broertjes, Vernon H. "An Appraisal of the Doctoral Program in Higher Education in the School of Education, Indiana University, Based on a Follow-Up of Its Graduates." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 26, Part 9 (1965), pp. 5121-5122.
- Buswell, Guy T., T. R. McConnell, Ann M. Heiss, and Dorothy M. Knoell. Training for Educational Research. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 010 180, 1966, pp. 28-29.
- Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, and John H. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Incorporated, 1966.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Coley, Earl L. "A Follow-Up Study of Oklahoma School Superintendents Who Received Their Highest Degree From Oklahoma State University." (unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968.)
- Dressel, Paul L. College and University Curriculum. 2nd ed. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appelton Century-Crofts Company, 1959.

- Harned, Thomas L. Increasing Student-Teacher Ratio in a Core Health Occupations Curriculum. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Documents Reproduction Service, ED 083 489, VT 017 546, 1974, pp. 426-445.
- Hartley, Harry J. Educational Planning, Programming, Budgeting, a Systems Approach. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Heiner, Karl W. "Administrator Behavior Rating Scale." (unpublished research, University of California, San Francisco, 1973.)
- Heiss, Ann M. "Berkeley Doctoral Students Appraise Their Academic Programs." Educational Record, Volume 48 (Winter, 1967), pp. 30-44.
- Hemphill, John K. "The Relationships Between Research and Evaluation Studies." Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means. Sixty-eighth Yearbook, Part II, National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. "Perspectives on the Educational Program in 1985." Educational Futurism 1985. The 1985 Committee of The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Lonsdale, Richard C., and Robert E. Ohm. "Futuristic Planning: An Example and Procedures." Educational Futurism 1985. The 1985 Committee of The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Mayhew, Lewis B., and Patrick J. Ford. Reform in Graduate and Professional Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Incorporated, 1974.
- Moscato, Leonard D. "Perceived Effectiveness of Doctoral Programs in Education Administration in Preparing Local Chief School Officers for Instructional Leadership." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 23, Part 3 (1962), pp. 1987-1988.
- 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 to 1970." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 33, Part 1 (1971), p. 174A.
- Scriven, Michael. "The Methodology of Evaluation." The American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1967.
- Seagren, Alan T. "A Follow-Up Study of the Doctoral Graduates, Teachers College, University of Nebraska, From 1950 Through 1961." Dissertation Abstracts, Volume 23, Part 3 (1962), pp. 1990-1991.

- Self, Melvin. "A Study of the Helpfulness of the Graduate Program of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College Based on the Judgments of School Administrators." (unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1954.)
- Simon, Kenneth A., and W. Vance Grant. Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington: U. S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Publication No. (OE) 73-11103, 1972, pp. 22-25.
- The Panel on Alternative Approaches to Graduate Education. Scholarship for Society. Princeton, New Jersey: GRE Board, Educational Testing Service, 1973.
- Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- UCEA Newsletter. Volume 25, Number 4 (April, 1974), p. 6.
- Welch, Wayne W. "Curriculum Evaluation." Review of Educational Research, Volume 39, Number 4 (1969), pp. 429-443.
- Westbury, Ian. "Curriculum Evaluation." Review of Educational Research, Volume 40, Number 2 (1970), pp. 239-260.
- Yarnall, Edward A. "An Appraisal of the Doctoral Program in Educational Administration at the Ohio State University As Perceived by Its Graduates." (unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1965.)

APPENDIX A

STUDY INSTRUMENT

PART I. Please either check (X) the choice which best describes you or fill in the blank. The blanks at the extreme left of the page are for purposes of coding; please do not fill them in.

___ 1.-2.

___ 3. My primary job title is: _____

___ 4. I am presently employed in the following area:

- ___ 1. K-12
 ___ 2. Area Vocational-Technical School
 ___ 3. Two-year College
 ___ 4. Four-year College or University
 ___ 5. Other/Specify _____

___ 5. My teaching duties are:

- ___ 1. None ___ 2. Part-time ___ 3. Full-time

___ 6. I supervise, both directly and indirectly, the following number of employees:

- ___ 1. None ___ 5. 301-500
 ___ 2. 1-50 ___ 6. 501-1000
 ___ 3. 51-150 ___ 7. over 1000
 ___ 4. 151-300

___ 7. My total years professional experience including this year are:

- ___ 1. 5 or less ___ 5. 21-25
 ___ 2. 6-10 ___ 6. 26-30
 ___ 3. 11-15 ___ 7. over 30
 ___ 4. 16-20

___ 8. I've been employed in an administrative position(s) the following number of years:

- ___ 1. None ___ 5. 16-20
 ___ 2. 5 or less ___ 6. 21-25
 ___ 3. 6-10 ___ 7. 26-30
 ___ 4. 11-15 ___ 8. over 30

___ 9.-10. I graduated with the Ed.D. in:

- ___ 1. 1964 ___ 6. 1969
 ___ 2. 1965 ___ 7. 1970
 ___ 3. 1966 ___ 8. 1971
 ___ 4. 1967 ___ 9. 1972
 ___ 5. 1968 ___ 10. 1973

___ 11. I've held the following number of positions since completing the Ed.D.:

- ___ 1. None ___ 4. 5-7
 ___ 2. 1 ___ 5. 8-10
 ___ 3. 2-4 ___ 6. over 10

___ 12. My age is:

- ___ 1. Below 26 ___ 6. 46-50
 ___ 2. 26-30 ___ 7. 51-55
 ___ 3. 31-35 ___ 8. 56-60
 ___ 4. 36-40 ___ 9. over 60
 ___ 5. 41-45

PART II. For each of the behaviors below, please respond to both of the statements by circling the response which best describes your Ed.D. Program and your work.

Circle:

YES if in your judgment your Ed.D. Program afforded you opportunity to acquire the behavior

NO if in your judgment your Ed.D. Program did NOT afford the opportunity to acquire the behavior

Circle:

SA if you strongly agree that the behavior is essential

A if you agree moderately that the behavior is essential

D if you disagree moderately that the behavior is essential

SD if you strongly disagree that the behavior is essential

BEHAVIOR	My Ed.D. Program afforded me the opportunity to acquire the behavior		In my work the behavior is essential			
	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
13. Defining and clarifying organizational goals and objectives	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
14. Developing plans to achieve long and short range objectives	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
15. Utilizing techniques for systematic planning and implementation, e.g. PERT, PPBS, Task Analysis, etc.	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
16. Establishing priority rankings among administrative problems	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
17. Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data related to administrative problems	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
18. Utilizing theoretical models in the functions of administration, e.g. Getzels-Guba, Etzioni, etc.	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
19. Utilizing recruiting and selection procedures	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
20. Describing job responsibilities for self and subordinates	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
21. Planning and executing personnel evaluations	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
22. Utilizing knowledge of financial aspects of administration	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
23. Utilizing knowledge of public and private funding bases to secure financial support	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
24. Utilizing principles of accounting in the management of a departmental or program budget	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
25. Developing a receptivity to others through a knowledge of human behavior	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
26. Utilizing knowledge and techniques of group processes to facilitate interaction with faculty, students, peers, and supervisors	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
27. Organizing presentations which effectively convey ideas	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
28. Conducting effective conferences and meetings	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
29. Enhancing others to increase cooperation and job satisfaction	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
30. Analyzing the relationships between school, community, and government in decisions which affect program administration	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
31. Recognizing the general legal principles that affect program administration, e.g. liability and negotiations	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD
32. Attempting to influence legislation which influences education	YES	NO	SA	A	D	SD

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074
GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 372-6211, EXT. 6245

January 24, 1974

Dr. Richard Jay Mitchell
1800 Kickingbird
Edmond, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Mitchell:

As you well know, professional programs in education are constantly undergoing revision as the nature of the society and the needs of the professions are changing. Consequently, it is essential that people in the Universities be kept informed regarding the extent to which their programs are providing useful preparation.

At the present time, the Educational Administration doctoral program at Oklahoma State University is undergoing such a review, and to complete the evaluation, it is necessary for us to consider the judgments of graduates. We would appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire. It has been designed to gather professional judgments regarding behavioral statements, and your responses to each item will assist us in measuring the impact of the present program and also to alert us to areas which you believe that program revision might be appropriate.

The response sheets have been numbered simply to determine which questionnaires have been returned. No information regarding the responses of an individual will be released.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lee Harned
Graduate Student

Richard Jungers, Professor
College of Education

Kenneth St. Clair, Professor
College of Education

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER



Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074
GUNDERSEN HALL
(405) 372-6211, EXT. 6245

February 5, 1974

Dr. Thomas J. Smith
234 Center Street
Midtown, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Smith:

You were mailed a questionnaire on January 24th regarding your perceptions of and evaluation of the Ed.D. program offered at Oklahoma State University. As of today, 71% of the graduates have returned a questionnaire. If you have not yet had time to complete the questionnaire, I would appreciate it if you would take approximately 15 minutes to do so, for a complete and valid evaluation of the Ed.D. program depends on responses that only you can provide.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lee Harned
Graduate Student

APPENDIX D

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES

TABLE XXIV

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE FIVE SELECTED BEHAVIORS ACCORDING TO CLASSIFICATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Employment in Secondary Education				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Employment in Post-Secondary Education				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Employment in Other Areas of Education			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Using techniques for systematic planning	17	20.48	16	19.28	11	13.25	25	30.12	8	9.64	6	7.23
Using recruiting and selection procedures	16	19.75	16	19.75	18	22.22	17	20.99	6	7.41	8	9.88
Using principles of accounting in a budget	12	14.46	21	25.30	9	10.84	27	32.53	6	7.23	8	9.64
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	11	13.42	22	26.83	15	18.29	20	24.39	6	7.32	8	9.76
Attempting to influence legislation	8	10.00	23	28.75	9	11.25	26	32.50	5	6.25	9	11.25

TABLE XXV

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING
THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE FIVE SELECTED BEHAVIORS
ACCORDING TO TEACHING DUTIES

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Teaching Duties				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to No Teaching Duties			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Using techniques for systematic planning	7	8.43	23	27.71	29	34.94	24	28.92
Using recruiting and selection procedures	14	17.28	15	18.52	26	32.10	26	32.10
Using principles of accounting in a budget	6	7.23	24	28.92	21	25.30	32	38.55
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	10	12.20	19	23.17	22	26.83	31	37.81
Attempting to influence legislation	6	7.50	24	30.00	16	20.00	34	42.50

TABLE XXVI

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING
THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE FIVE SELECTED BEHAVIORS ACCORDING TO
NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Number of Employ- ees Supervised 0-50				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Number of Employ- ees Supervised 51-Over 1,000			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Using techniques for systematic planning	18	21.69	28	33.74	18	21.69	19	22.89
Using recruiting and selection procedures	21	25.93	23	28.40	19	23.46	18	22.22
Using principles of accounting in a budget	11	13.25	35	42.17	16	19.28	21	25.30
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	15	18.29	30	36.59	17	20.73	20	24.39
Attempting to influence legislation	14	17.50	30	37.50	8	10.00	28	35.00

TABLE XXVII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING
THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE FIVE SELECTED BEHAVIORS ACCORDING TO
YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Years of Profes- sional Experience 0-15				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Years of Profes- sional Experience 16-30			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Using techniques for systematic planning	15	18.07	17	20.48	21	25.30	30	36.15
Using recruiting and selection procedures	14	17.28	18	22.22	26	32.10	23	28.40
Using principles of accounting in a budget	9	10.84	23	27.71	18	21.69	33	39.76
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	11	13.42	21	25.61	21	25.61	29	35.37
Attempting to influence legislation	9	11.25	23	28.75	13	16.25	35	43.75

TABLE XXVIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING
THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE FIVE SELECTED BEHAVIORS ACCORDING TO
YEARS EMPLOYED IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION(S)

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Years of Adminis- trative Experience 0-10				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Years of Adminis- trative Experience 11-Over 30			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Using techniques for systematic planning	16	19.28	27	32.53	20	24.10	20	24.10
Using recruiting and selection procedures	17	20.99	25	30.86	23	28.40	16	19.75
Using principles of accounting in a budget	11	13.25	32	38.55	16	19.28	24	28.92
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	15	18.29	27	32.93	17	20.73	23	28.05
Attempting to influence legislation	12	15.00	30	37.50	10	12.50	28	35.00

TABLE XXIX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNING
THE OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE FIVE SELECTED BEHAVIORS ACCORDING TO
YEAR OF GRADUATION

Behavior	Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Year of Graduation 1964-1968				Opportunity to Acquire Behavior According to Year of Graduation 1969-1973			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Using techniques for systematic planning	11	13.25	24	28.92	25	30.12	23	27.71
Using recruiting and selection procedures	18	22.22	16	19.75	22	27.16	25	30.86
Using principles of accounting in a budget	13	15.66	22	26.51	14	16.87	34	40.96
Conducting effective conferences and meetings	14	17.07	20	24.39	18	21.95	30	36.59
Attempting to influence legislation	10	12.50	24	30.00	12	15.00	34	42.50

VITA ²

Thomas Lee Harned

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A SURVEY OF DOCTORAL GRADUATES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY 1964-1973

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Ardmore, Oklahoma, August 6, 1936, the son of Victor Daily Harned and Bonnie Echols Harned. Married Judith Blunk Harned on June 3, 1966. Father of one son, John Christopher (1969).

Education: Graduated from Duncan High School, Duncan, Oklahoma, in 1954. Attended the University of Oklahoma in Norman, Oklahoma, and Southwestern State College in Weatherford, Oklahoma. Graduated from St. John's Hospital School of Nursing in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1962. Received the Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Tulsa, with a major in Nursing in 1964. Received the Master of Public Health degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1968. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in July, 1974.

Professional Experience: The University of Oklahoma Student Health Service, Staff Nurse, 1962; St. John's Hospital, Tulsa, Oklahoma, Intensive Care Unit, Staff Nurse, 1963-1964; The Hissom Memorial Center, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, Assistant Director of Nursing, 1964-1967; Cameron State College, Lawton, Oklahoma, Instructor of Nursing, 1968-1970; Northern Oklahoma College, Tonkawa, Director of Nursing Education, 1970-1973, and Chairman of the Health Occupations Division, 1971-1973.

Professional Organizations: American Nurses Association, Oklahoma State Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Red Cross Nurse.