

DOCTORAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS  
IN COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL  
IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN  
THE UNITED STATES

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
MARYBELLE CHASE ROCKEY  
1972



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Doctoral Preparation Programs in College Student  
Personnel in Selected Universities in the United States

presented by

Marybelle C. Rockey

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Administration and  
Higher Education

Major professor

Date August 15, 1972

Q-7639



2052  
~~2052~~ 245

~~REC 23 178~~ 33

F-042

~~11-10-77~~ 202

13 ~~11-10-77~~ 287

M-346

P  
~~NOV 16 1977~~ 0321

DOCTORAL PREPARATION  
PERSONNEL IN SELECTION

Mar

The Purposes.

Investigate a selected

College Student Personnel

Student Personnel

The Procedure

Personnel preparation

study and include

states and four p

District of Colum

preparation prog

to elicit inform

coordinators. N

a descriptive ma

All of the

Student Personnel

sities were in

of the faculty

to gather dat



## ABSTRACT

### DOCTORAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Marybelle Chase Rockey

The Purposes. The purposes of this study were to investigate a selected number of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel and to develop a profile of College Student Personnel program faculty.

The Procedure. Twenty doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs were selected for the in-depth study and included sixteen public universities in fourteen states and four private universities in two states and the District of Columbia. In investigating the twenty doctoral preparation programs, the structured interview was utilized to elicit information from the preparation program coordinators. Most of the interview data was presented in a descriptive manner.

All of the faculty (N=113) involved in the College Student Personnel preparation programs at the twenty universities were included in the study. In developing a profile of the faculty members, a survey questionnaire was employed to gather data from the faculty. Ninety-two per cent of the

questionnaires were  
rate of 89.4 per c  
by descriptive tab  
square methods.

Findings. The  
with the preparati  
following conclusi  
sonnel preparation  
last ten years.  
have shifted over  
programs was to o  
serve as College  
colleges and comm  
doctoral student  
1971-1972 was tw  
students was for  
faculty involved  
ber of part-time  
methods of recr  
programs. (7)  
courses past th  
written exam  
tion and an or

Marybelle Chase Rockey

questionnaires were returned with a total usable response rate of 89.4 per cent (N=101). The profile data were analyzed by descriptive tables with selected responses tested by chi-square methods.

Findings. The major findings based on the interviews with the preparation program coordinators resulted in the following conclusions: (1) Many of the College Student Personnel preparation programs have been established during the last ten years. (2) The emphases in the preparation programs have shifted over the years. (3) The main objective of the programs was to offer preparation for persons who plan to serve as College Student Personnel workers in universities, colleges and community colleges. (4) The average number of doctoral students enrolled in each of the programs during 1971-1972 was twenty-three and the average number of master's students was forty-six. (5) The average number of full-time faculty involved in the programs was 1.4 and the average number of part-time faculty was 3.2. (6) Formal and informal methods of recruitment were used by eighty per cent of the programs. (7) Most programs required an average of twenty courses past the master's degree. (8) All programs required a written examination near the end of the program, a dissertation and an oral defense of the dissertation. (9) On the

average, nearly nine

the programs graduate

students in the pro

Evaluation procedure

The components of

eration program we

faculty, quality s

program, strong su

sources, a well co

practical work exp

led the leading d

Student Personnel

Indiana University

ers College and th

their selections

graduates and vis

nd graduates.

The findings

the faculty membe

The preparation

table (eighty-four

age. (2) Over

Student Personnel

Marybelle Chase Rocky

average, nearly ninety per cent of the students enrolled in the programs graduated. (10) A large percentage of doctoral students in the programs had financial assistance. (11) Evaluation procedures existed in all twenty programs. (12) The components of a quality College Student Personnel preparation program were identified by the coordinators as quality faculty, quality students, sufficient elaboration of the program, strong supporting departments, institutional resources, a well conceived curriculum and opportunity for practical work experiences. (13) The coordinators identified the leading doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel in rank order as Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota. They based their selections on quality of the faculty, quality of the graduates and visible leadership in the field by the faculty and graduates.

The findings based on the questionnaires completed by the faculty members yielded the following conclusions: (1) The preparation program faculty members are predominantly male (eighty-four per cent) and average forty-one years of age. (2) Over forty per cent of the faculty are College Student Personnel administrators. (3) Less than one-quarter

of the preparation

Nearly ninety per

5) Over ninety p

over fifteen years

age, each faculty

Nearly two-thirds

tant Personnel pro

last five years, t

at the average. (

published books, m

Chi-Square Test fo

significant differ

city. Full-time

the faculty tend

professional Coll

the faculty tend

tended to publish

tended to spend m

other activities

Marybelle Chase Rockey

of the preparation program faculty are full-time. (4)

Nearly ninety per cent of the faculty have doctoral degrees.

(5) Over ninety per cent of the faculty have had from one to over fifteen years experience in the field. (6) On the average, each faculty member taught 1.6 courses per term. (7)

Nearly two-thirds of the faculty were active in College Student Personnel professional organizations. (8) During the last five years, the faculty attended 4.9 national meetings on the average. (9) Nearly two-thirds of the faculty have published books, monographs or journal articles. (10) The Chi-Square Test for Independence indicated that there were significant differences between full-time and part-time faculty. Full-time faculty tended to participate more and part-time faculty tended to participate less than was expected in professional College Student Personnel organizations. Full-time faculty tended to publish more and part-time faculty tended to publish less than was expected. Part-time faculty tended to spend more time in administration and more time in other activities than was expected.

DOCTORAL PRE

PERSONNEL IN SE

M

in parti

Department o



DOCTORAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE STUDENT  
PERSONNEL IN SELECTED UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Marybelle Chase Rockey

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1972

679087

Copyright by  
MARYBELLE CHASE ROCKEY  
1972

The writer

Mr. Louis Stamat

and to the membe

and Dr. David He

patience and und

The writer

husband, Harry,

David and Daryl,

which made the d

Special ack

parents, Mr. and

Appreciatio

Mr. Robert Smaw

candidate to con

A word of t

Mr. Robert Kovac

their friendship

Appreciatio

Personnel educat

Interviews and t

in the study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses her sincere appreciation to Dr. Louis Stamatakos, chairman of her guidance committee, and to the members of the committee, Dr. Walter F. Johnson and Dr. David Heenan for their guidance, assistance, patience and understanding.

The writer expresses her love and appreciation to her husband, Harry, and to her children, Donald, Dale, Douglas, David and Daryl, for their sacrifices and encouragement which made the doctoral study possible.

Special acknowledgement is extended to the writer's parents, Mr. and Mrs. K. M. Chase, for their helpfulness.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Y. T. Witherspoon, Dr. Robert Smawley and Dr. Robert Coutts who inspired the candidate to continue graduate studies.

A word of thanks is extended to Elizabeth Jenkins, Dr. Robert Kovach, Grant Jensen and James Mansfield for their friendship and special assistance.

Appreciation is expressed to the College Student Personnel educators who so graciously agreed to the interviews and to the faculty members who participated in the study.

## CHAPTER

### I. INTRODUCT

Statement  
Purposes  
Signific  
Definiti  
Organiza

### II. REVIEW O

Special  
Discuss  
Speci  
Critici  
Discuss  
to Cr  
Roles a  
Discuss  
Roles  
Recomm  
and  
Discus  
Recon  
Facult  
Discus  
Facu  
Summar

### III. METHOD

Select  
Resear  
Develo  
Collec  
Treatm  
Limita  
Summar

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Statement of the Study. . . . .	3
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	4
Significance of the Study . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
Organization of the Study . . . . .	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. . . . .	9
Specialized Preparation . . . . .	9
Discussion of Literature Relevant to Specialized Preparation . . . . .	13
Criticisms. . . . .	15
Discussion of Literature Relevant to Criticisms . . . . .	22
Roles and Program Emphases. . . . .	24
Discussion of Literature Relevant to Roles and Program Emphasis. . . . .	31
Recommended Subject Matter Areas and Curricula . . . . .	32
Discussion of Literature Relevant to Recommended Curricula . . . . .	38
Faculty Preparation and Experience. . . . .	38
Discussion of Literature Relevant to Faculty Preparation and Experience. . . . .	40
Summary . . . . .	41
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	42
Selection of the Sample . . . . .	42
Research Methods. . . . .	45
Development of the Instruments. . . . .	47
Collection of the Data. . . . .	49
Treatment of the Data . . . . .	53
Limitations of the Methodology. . . . .	53
Summary . . . . .	55

CHAPTER

IV. ANALYSIS

History  
Emphasis  
Titles.  
Degrees  
Objective  
Kind of  
Strengths  
Graduates  
Numbers of  
Faculty  
Courses  
Admission  
Recruitment  
Typical  
Practical  
Examination  
Dissertation  
Percentage  
Completion  
Financial  
Percentage  
Travel  
Follow Up  
Evaluation  
Quality  
Leading  
Reasons  
Comparison  
Changes  
Changes  
Summary

V. ANALYSIS

Sex of  
Ages of  
Academic  
Time Spent  
Doctorate  
Doctorate

CHAPTER	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA--INTERVIEWS. . . . .	56
History . . . . .	56
Emphasis. . . . .	58
Titles. . . . .	58
Degrees . . . . .	59
Objectives. . . . .	59
Kind of Program Emphasis. . . . .	63
Strengths . . . . .	65
Graduates . . . . .	70
Numbers of Students . . . . .	71
Faculty . . . . .	72
Courses . . . . .	72
Admissions Requirements . . . . .	73
Recruitment . . . . .	79
Typical Doctoral Program. . . . .	81
Practical Work Experience . . . . .	84
Examinations. . . . .	89
Dissertation Credit . . . . .	90
Percentages of Graduates. . . . .	91
Completion Time . . . . .	92
Financial Assistance. . . . .	93
Percentage of Financial Assistance. . . . .	93
Travel Grants . . . . .	94
Follow Up of Graduates. . . . .	95
Evaluation. . . . .	96
Quality Programs. . . . .	99
Leading Programs. . . . .	102
Reasons for the Selections. . . . .	104
Comparisons . . . . .	105
Changes Desired . . . . .	106
Changes Predicted . . . . .	110
Summary . . . . .	115
V. ANALYSIS OF DATA--QUESTIONNAIRES. . . . .	124
Sex of Faculty Member . . . . .	125
Ages of Faculty . . . . .	125
Academic Rank or Title. . . . .	126
Time Spent in Preparation Program . . . . .	127
Doctoral Degree . . . . .	127
Doctoral Major. . . . .	128



# CHAPTER

Year of  
Instituti  
Master's  
Major of  
Year of  
Instituti  
Professi  
Percenta  
Number o  
Courses  
Professi  
Meetings  
Publicat  
Program  
Program  
Leading  
Comparis  
Part-1  
Pro:  
Pub  
Per  
Recomme  
Adm  
Rec  
Enr  
Dep  
Fac  
Fin  
Int  
W  
Res  
Stu  
Cou  
Ove  
Oth  
Cha

Summary

## IV. SUMMARY

Summary  
Findin  
Discus  
Implica

CHAPTER	Page
Year of Doctoral Degree. . . . .	129
Institution of Doctoral Degree . . . . .	129
Master's Degree. . . . .	130
Major of Master's Degree . . . . .	131
Year of Master's Degree. . . . .	132
Institution of Master's Degree . . . . .	132
Professional Experience. . . . .	134
Percentage of Time . . . . .	134
Number of Courses Taught Each Term . . . . .	139
Courses Taught . . . . .	139
Professional Organizations . . . . .	140
Meetings Attended Last Five Years. . . . .	143
Publications . . . . .	143
Program Emphasis . . . . .	145
Program Emphasis Comparisons . . . . .	146
Leading Programs . . . . .	147
Comparisons Between Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty. . . . .	149
Professional Organizations . . . . .	149
Publications . . . . .	150
Percentage of Time . . . . .	151
Recommended Program Changes. . . . .	152
Admissions . . . . .	152
Recruitment. . . . .	153
Enrollments. . . . .	153
Departmental Procedures. . . . .	153
Faculty. . . . .	153
Financial Support. . . . .	154
Internships-Practicum-Field Work Experiences . . . . .	154
Research . . . . .	155
Students . . . . .	155
Course Changes . . . . .	155
Overall Changes. . . . .	156
Other Comments . . . . .	158
Changes Unnecessary. . . . .	159
Summary. . . . .	159
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . .	168
Summary. . . . .	168
Findings and Conclusions . . . . .	170
Discussion . . . . .	183
Implications for Further Research. . . . .	188

BIBLIOGRAPHY. . .

APPENDICES. . .

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	192
APPENDICES. . . . .	199

## TABLE

- 3.1. Summary
- 3.2. Summary  
by Univ
- 4.1. Kind of
- 4.2. Number  
in Col  
Progra
- 5.1. Sex of
- 5.2. Ages  
Prepa
- 5.3. Acade
- 5.4. Time  
Prep
- 5.5. Doct
- 5.6. Doct
- 5.7. Year
- 5.8. Mast
- 5.9. Majo
- 5.10. Year
- 5.11. Prof
- 5.12. Perc  
Admi  
Acti
- 5.13. Perc  
Advi

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
3.1. Summary of Responses to Questionnaire. . . .	51
3.2. Summary of Responses to Questionnaire by University. . . . .	52
4.1. Kind of Program Emphasis . . . . .	63
4.2. Numbers of Students Enrolled in 1971-1972 in College Student Personnel Preparation Programs . . . . .	71
5.1. Sex of the Faculty Member. . . . .	125
5.2. Ages of the College Student Personnel Preparation Program Faculty. . . . .	125
5.3. Academic Rank or Title . . . . .	126
5.4. Time Spent in College Student Personnel Preparation Program Responsibilities . . . .	127
5.5. Doctoral Degree. . . . .	127
5.6. Doctoral Major . . . . .	128
5.7. Year of Doctoral Degree. . . . .	129
5.8. Master's Degrees . . . . .	130
5.9. Major of Master's Degree . . . . .	131
5.10. Year of Master's Degree. . . . .	132
5.11. Professional Experience. . . . .	133
5.12. Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching, Administration, Advisement and Other Activities . . . . .	135
5.13. Percentage of Time Spent Teaching and Advising Doctoral Candidates . . . . .	137

# TABLE

5.14. Numi  
Each

5.15. Cou  
Pro

5.16. Par  
Org

5.17. Num  
in

5.18. Pub

5.19. Co  
Pr

5.20. Fr  
Pa  
Me

5.21. Fr  
Pa

5.22. Me  
Ad  
Ac  
Fa

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
5.14. Number of Courses Taught on the Average Each Term. . . . .	138
5.15. Courses Taught by the Preparation Program Faculty. . . . .	139
5.16. Participation in Professional Organizations. . . . .	141
5.17. Number of Professional Meetings Attended in the Last Five Years . . . . .	142
5.18. Publications . . . . .	144
5.19. College Student Personnel Preparation Program Emphasis . . . . .	145
5.20. Frequency Distribution of Full-Time and Part-Time Preparation Program Faculty Members-Professional Organizations . . . . .	149
5.21. Frequency Distribution of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Members--Publications. . .	150
5.22. Mean Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching, Administration, Advisement and Other Activities for Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Members. . . . .	151



## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Colleges and Universities Included in the Initial Survey to Determine Institutions Offering Doctoral Programs in College Student Personnel. . . . .	199
B. Letter and Information Sheet for the Initial Survey . . . . .	201
C. Responses to Initial Survey With Name of Program . . . . .	203
D. Universities Included in the Study . . . . .	206
E. Structured Interview Outline . . . . .	207
F. Faculty Cover Letter . . . . .	210
G. Faculty Questionnaire. . . . .	211

The  
Personnel  
field. H  
One contr  
fessional  
do not.

Many  
Preparati  
look aska  
relevant

Num  
field fro  
special t  
istrators  
faculty.

A nu  
currently  
tion. In

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The professional preparation of College Student Personnel workers is a major concern to leaders in the field. Historically, this issue has been controversial. One controversy has been between those who recommend professional preparation for personnel workers and those who do not. Another disagreement has been about program emphases.

Many institutions prefer and require professional preparation for College Student Personnel workers. Others look askance at such preparation and do not recognize it as relevant or meaningful. (Kauffman, 1964)

Numerous student personnel workers have entered the field from a variety of backgrounds and do not advocate special training. By custom many student personnel administrators have been recruited from the ranks of teaching faculty.

A number of College Student Personnel practitioners currently employed in the field have had no formal preparation. In a study conducted by Upcraft (1971), less than half

of his sample

tutors in un

professionall

However,

that college

functions to

pecially ed

Bolman, 19

professiona

are varying

differences

is philosop

Reparatio

stress adm

philosophy

Another

staffing

and the c

programs.

topic. E

currently

College S

training

Personnel

of his sample of chief College Student Personnel administrators in universities of over 10,000 students had been professionally trained.

However, ". . . there appears to be a growing conviction that college and university administrators have unique functions to perform and that they perform them best when specially equipped with distinctive academic capabilities." (Bolman, 1964, p. 276) Among those who recommend professional training in College Student Personnel, there are varying opinions about appropriate preparation emphases. Differences of opinion exist on theoretical grounds, as well as philosophical bases. Some College Student Personnel preparation programs emphasize counseling, while others stress administration, student development, educational philosophy, research or behavioral sciences.

Another concern ripe for investigation concerns the staffing of College Student Personnel preparation programs and the content of preparation for those who staff the programs. Almost nothing has been written about this topic. Exactly what are the qualifications of those currently teaching in the preparation programs? Have the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty had training and experience in the field of College Student Personnel?

A review

research is

preparation

The s

with the p

directors

administra

Monte

in College

Tracy

College S

and was c

requireme

financial

graduates

The

doctoral

This inve

number of

Personnel

Two

first iss

A review of recent literature reveals that little research is being conducted about College Student Personnel preparation programs or about their faculty.

The study by Rhatigan and Hoyt (1970) was concerned with the perceptions of doctoral preparation program directors in assessing the work of student personnel administrators in large institutions.

Montgomery (1971) evaluated the Master's degree program in College Student Personnel at Indiana University.

Tracy (1971) investigated Master's programs in College Student Personnel. He surveyed fifty-six programs and was concerned about factors associated with entrance requirements, number of graduates, factors relating to financial support and factors relating to the placement of graduates.

The research cited provides scant insight into the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs. This investigation, then, was an attempt to examine a number of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel, their nature, and their faculty.

#### Statement of the Study

Two major concerns are examined in this study. The first issue is to investigate a selected number of doctoral

preparation  
facets of t  
objectives,  
program con

The s  
Student Pe  
characteri  
experience  
rank, perc  
activities  
pation in  
tions. F  
changes f  
doctoral  
are ascer

The  
ffering  
umber of  
at the de  
requireme



preparation programs in College Student Personnel. Various facets of the programs are studied including emphases, objectives, admissions requirements, curriculum, quality program components, leading programs and predicted changes.

The second issue is to develop a profile of College Student Personnel preparation program faculty. The characteristics of the faculty examined are professional experience, educational background, age, sex, title or rank, percentage of time spent in College Student Personnel activities, numbers and emphasis of courses taught, participation in professional organization activities and publications. Faculty perceptions of program emphasis, recommended changes for the program and an opinion of the leading doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs are ascertained.

#### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are to:

1. identify the colleges and universities offering a doctorate in College Student Personnel;
2. conduct an intensive analysis of a selected number of College Student Personnel preparation programs at the doctoral level;
3. compare selected aspects of program requirements among universities;

4. ca  
emphases of prog

5. de  
program in Colle  
perceived by tho

6. as  
experience of th

7. ma  
College Student  
of purposes #2,

Other speci

include the foll

1. Ar  
preparation prog

2. Ar  
to College Studen

3. Is  
in College Studen

4. How  
Personnel prepar

5. Wha  
Personnel prepar

6. Whi  
Personnel prepar

4. categorize the philosophical and curricular emphases of programs included in the study;

5. determine the characteristics of a quality program in College Student Personnel preparation as perceived by those who conduct such programs;

6. ascertain the professional education and experience of the preparation program faculty; and

7. make recommendations for the improvement of College Student Personnel preparation programs as an outcome of purposes #2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Other specific questions considered in the study include the following:

1. Are the emphases in College Student Personnel preparation programs easily identified?

2. Are there standardized criteria for admission to College Student Personnel preparation programs?

3. Is the curriculum primarily multi-disciplinary in College Student Personnel preparation programs?

4. How, when and by whom are College Student Personnel preparation programs evaluated?

5. What changes in the College Student Personnel preparation programs are predicted for the future?

6. Which are the leading College Student Personnel preparation programs at the present time and why?

The significance  
educators who are  
workers have part  
tion programs at  
recommends that  
"share their thi  
future generation

Second, th  
be helpful in e  
if the character  
be determined,  
of College Stu

Third, in  
prospective st  
appropriate pr  
and educators  
clarification

Fourth,  
by the profes  
for College S

### Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is fivefold. First, educators who are preparing College Student Personnel workers have particular need for information about preparation programs at other universities. Miller (1967) recommends that faculties of various preparation programs "share their thinking and approaches to the education of future generations of student personnel workers." (p. 176)

Second, the information gathered in this study should be helpful in evaluating and improving existing programs. If the characteristics of a quality preparation program can be determined, they should be of value to the entire field of College Student Personnel.

Third, in identifying and categorizing program types, prospective students may be assisted in determining an appropriate program in which to seek admission. Practitioners and educators in the field should also benefit by the clarification of program emphases.

Fourth, the data collected in this study might be used by the professional organizations for establishing standards for College Student Personnel preparation programs.

Fifth,

preparation

of College

for prepara

The f

university

the student

of the cla

employed i

may serve

or as a fa

graduate

prepare p

student P

chairman

preparati

Faculty M

to prepa

student P

Lite

Chapter I

outlined

Fifth, a profile of College Student Personnel preparation program faculty should be useful to the field of College Student Personnel in determining qualifications for preparation program faculty.

### Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined for use in this study:

College Student Personnel--the college or university program particularly concerned with enhancing the student's learning experiences beyond the confines of the classroom.

College Student Personnel Workers--an educator employed in the field of College Student Personnel. He may serve as an administrator, a counselor, a consultant or as a faculty member.

College Student Personnel Preparation Program--a graduate program of preparation or training designed to prepare persons for professional positions in College Student Personnel.

Coordinator--for the purposes of this study, the chairman or director of the College Student Personnel preparation program.

College Student Personnel Preparation Program Faculty Member--a college or university faculty member who prepares graduate students for the field of College Student Personnel.

### Organization of the Study

Literature related to the study is reviewed in Chapter II. The instruments and methodology used are outlined in Chapter III. Chapter IV consists of the

analysis

Personne

of the C

is prese

summary,

implicat



analysis of the interviews with the College Student Personnel preparation program coordinators. The profile of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty is presented in Chapter V. Contained in Chapter VI are the summary, findings and conclusions, discussion, and implications for further research.

One

Student

Personne

issues

Personne

and pro

curricu

program

review

Specia

S

value

Person

Colle

that

comp

pers

sec

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

One of the basic issues in the field of College Student Personnel is whether or not College Student Personnel workers need specialized preparation. Other issues focus on the criticisms of the College Student Personnel preparation programs, student personnel roles and program emphases, recommended preparation program curricula and preparation of the faculty teaching in the programs. The literature pertinent to these issues is reviewed in this chapter.

#### Specialized Preparation

Several authors and researchers have discussed the value of specialized preparation in College Student Personnel while others have discussed the irrelevance of College Student Personnel preparation.

Nearly fifteen years ago, Williamson (1958) urged that College Student Personnel workers needed special competencies and preparation. He recommended that personnel people be "liberally educated as well as technically competent." (p. 3)

The necessity for persons in College Student Personnel work to have special knowledge, skills and leadership qualities has been underscored by Fitzgerald, Johnson, and Norris (1970). They felt there was general agreement among the writers in the field that the need for professionally trained student personnel workers would increase.

Matson (1966) was not only supportive of professional preparation for College Student Personnel workers, but she argued that specially designed graduate programs were necessary for preparing junior college administrators.

In spite of the recommendations for professional preparation, the appointments of academicians to dean of student positions have been repeatedly reported. (Grant, 1968; Schultz, 1968; Crane, 1965; Hulet, 1966; and Kauffman, 1964) Schultz questioned whether it was even realistic to expect a change in the long established practice of selecting deans from academic ranks.

In his study on the role expectations of chief student personnel administrators, Upcraft (1967) questioned student personnel administrators about desirable preparation for those working in the field. His sample consisted of eighty-three chief student personnel administrators in institutions enrolling more than 10,000 students. Less

than sixteen per cent of the chief student personnel administrators recommended training primarily in student personnel administration. Thirteen per cent felt that student personnel administrators should not have formal training in student personnel administration and seventy-one per cent thought that student personnel administrators may or may not be trained in student personnel administration. No clear consensus concerning the preparation of College Student Personnel administrators was reported by the student personnel administrators included in Upcraft's study.

According to Rhatigan and Hoyt (1970), considerable interest has been expressed in the academic preparation of student personnel administrators. Their investigation was concerned with the accuracy with which faculty trainers in the preparation programs perceived the work of student personnel administrators. The sample consisted of forty-five senior college and forty-eight junior college chief student personnel administrators and twenty-four chief faculty trainers in doctoral preparation programs. Both practitioners and faculty judged academic training to be helpful in performing most administrative functions. Practitioners and faculty agreed that the value of academic training was doubtful in preparing budgets, performing



administrative details, conducting informational functions and in performing committee work. Academic preparation was thought to be essential in teaching, research and counseling functions. The faculty trainers gave academic training a stronger relevancy rating than the student personnel administrators did.

Rhatigan and Hoyt suggested three implications of the findings of their study. First, that the "doctoral degree will not produce the 'complete' administrator." (p. 162) Secondly, that increased attention must be given to practice and internship opportunities because of the perceived relevance of on-the-job training. Thirdly, the researchers predicted that many top administrators will probably continue to be employed on the basis of their experience and personal characteristics even though they have had little or no relevant academic background. They concluded that practitioners and faculty trainers believed that academic preparation was relevant to the performance of most administrative functions. However, administrators rated on-the-job training more helpful than academic training while faculty members tended to rate academic training more helpful than on-the-job training.

Foy (1969) surveyed 1320 members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators to determine the career patterns of student personnel administrators. One of his questions dealt with the desirability of specialized preparation for student personnel administrators. Over eighty per cent of the respondents felt that formal training of new student personnel administrators was of great importance. Foy concluded that the attitudes of practicing student personnel administrators had changed from those reported previously by other researchers and that an increase in value had been placed upon formal training in student personnel administration.

#### Discussion of Literature Relevant to Specialized Preparation

The literature dealing with specialized preparation for College Student Personnel administrators appeared to be of two varieties. One variety might be classified as "opinions of the authorities." The other might be called "research findings on the impressions of student personnel practitioners." The leading educators in the field have pointed to the importance of specialized preparation for College Student Personnel workers, while practitioners surveyed by several researchers have responded negatively,



in most cases,  
that less than  
personnel admini  
training. The  
study rated or  
academic train  
untrained admini  
top positions  
characteristic

The opini  
related to the  
half of the pr  
professionally  
less than half  
work or relate

Foy found  
preparation of  
than half of t  
their highest  
College Studen

While edu  
preparation fo  
practitioners

in most cases, to specialized preparation. Upcraft found that less than sixteen per cent of the chief student personnel administrators in his study recommended formal training. The practitioners in the Rhatigan and Hoyt study rated on-the-job training as more helpful than academic training. Rhatigan and Hoyt predicted that untrained administrators would continue to be appointed to top positions on the basis of their experience and personal characteristics.

The opinions of the practitioners may be directly related to their own professional preparation. Less than half of the practitioners in Upcraft's study had been professionally trained. Of the Rhatigan and Hoyt sample, less than half had doctoral degrees in student personnel work or related fields.

Foy found a more acceptant attitude toward professional preparation of student personnel workers, even though less than half of the practitioners in his study had received their highest academic degree in counseling, guidance or College Student Personnel.

While educators continue to encourage professional preparation for College Student Personnel workers, the practitioners in the field have not supported specialized

training as enth

lack of professi

### Criticisms

Several aut

preparation prog

and Wolf (1963)

of various orien

upon the persona

out that the fi

required in var

whether or not

student person

personnel cours

mixture of cou

were felt to b

students if th

materials in p

trainees were

field suffere

Hester (

ing systemati

of preparatio

However, seve

training as enthusiastically, perhaps because of their own lack of professional preparation.

### Criticisms

Several authors have written critically about the preparation programs in College Student Personnel. Barry and Wolf (1963) labeled personnel training a "hodgepodge" of various orientations with the primary focus dependent upon the personal predilection of the trainer. They pointed out that the field had not examined the competencies required in various student personnel positions or determined whether or not a common core of training was needed by all student personnel workers. Barry and Wolf criticized the personnel course work and asserted that it consisted of a mixture of courses from various disciplines. The courses were felt to be useful, but probably not meaningful to students if they could not synthesize and apply the materials in practice. The authors thought that the trainees were probably unable to do so because the whole field suffered from lack of synthesis.

Hester (1971) pointed out that there was a void regarding systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of programs of preparation for student personnel administrators. However, several doctoral dissertations have dealt with

preparation

(1958), Kell

Wright

training pro

workers in c

in the North

one-hundred

chief prepar

tions. His

training exp

the programs

Keller

at Indiana U

evaluate the

survey of th

trainees per

Personnel to

personnel wo

in the train

program. The

reported to

internships.

preparation program evaluation, including those by Wright (1958), Keller (1962) and Montgomery (1971).

Wright sought to identify the status of doctoral training programs for counselors and other personnel workers in colleges and universities holding membership in the North Central Association. His sample included one-hundred graduates of sixteen institutions and the chief preparation program trainer in each of the institutions. His findings indicated that nearly all of the basic training experiences were highly rated by the graduates of the programs.

Keller investigated the doctoral preparation program at Indiana University. The purpose of his study was to evaluate the student personnel training program through a survey of the opinions of its trainees. The alumni and trainees perceived their course work in College Student Personnel to be helpful in preparing them for student personnel work. The interest shown by the staff members in the trainees was found to be the major strength of the program. The most negative aspect of the program was reported to be the limited opportunity for supervised internships.

Montgomery  
that would best  
and functions d  
to evaluate the  
practical work  
in the Master's  
program at Indi  
of the program v  
participated in  
the practical e  
preparation in  
recommended tha  
sociology of th  
relations skill  
student person

The evalua  
was suggested b  
should be desi  
of each of the  
kinds of recom  
Super (1962).  
students decid

Montgomery was concerned about the types of training that would best prepare personnel workers for the roles and functions demanded by higher education. She sought to evaluate the contributions of the course work and the practical work experiences (practicum, internships, etc.) in the Master's College Student Personnel preparation program at Indiana University. Two-hundred eighty alumni of the program who had graduated between 1959 and 1969 participated in the study. In the opinion of the graduates, the practical experience preparation surpassed the academic preparation in the program. In summary the researcher recommended that courses in psychology, counseling, the sociology of the university, group dynamics and human relations skills and practicum experiences in several student personnel service areas be emphasized in the future.

The evaluation and improvement of existing programs was suggested by Tracy (1971). He thought that "inquiry should be designed to define and assess the appropriateness of each of the existing programs." (p. 110) These same kinds of recommendations were offered nine years before by Super (1962). He advocated that "we need to help graduate students decide early in their preparation, whether they



are going to be

differentiate the

Other writ

literature and

preparation. In

Student Personnel

writers have co

of questionable

quantity. Stri

research in the

questionnaire

Penney (1

basic literatu

In his opinion

textbooks and

and of short-

basic literat

materials ha

second categ

about admini

matters whic

questioned b

and prosaic

are going to be counselors or administrators, and then differentiate the training programs." (p. 236)

Other writers have commented about the research, literature and approaches to College Student Personnel preparation. In analyzing doctoral research in College Student Personnel work, Gladstein (1968) reported that many writers have concluded that student personnel research was of questionable quality and was limited in both scope and quantity. Stripling and Lister (1963) summarized the research in the field of College Student Personnel as questionnaire surveys and position papers.

Penney (1969) observed that there was a scarcity of basic literature in the field of College Student Personnel. In his opinion, the field had produced few fundamental textbooks and most of the writings were problem-centered and of short-term value. In assessing the quality of the basic literature, he asserted that a large quantity of the materials had been taken "wholesale" from psychology. A second category of materials was classified as writings about administrative, organizational and coordinating matters which Penney labeled as housekeeping activities. He questioned how the publications could appear so irrelevant and prosaic in a decade of monumental change. The third

category of mat

personnel point

In another

critical of the

Student Personn

three approache

workers--guidan

The guidance ba

common and prov

was an ext

school guidanc

College Studen

education, org

tion and studi

The secon

described as b

motivational p

relations skil

these program

experiences,

in their occu

Penney l

approach whic

category of materials was termed elaborations of the personnel point of view.

In another article also published in 1969, Penney was critical of the emphases in preparation programs in College Student Personnel. From his observations, he pointed out three approaches to the education of student personnel workers--guidance based, human relations, and counseling. The guidance based approach appeared to Penney as the most common and provided a generalist orientation. The curriculum was an extension of a preparation program for secondary school guidance personnel with additional courses for the College Student Personnel worker in philosophy of higher education, organization and administration of higher education and studies in College Student Personnel work.

The second approach, a human relations program, was described as basically group oriented and one in which motivational psychology, group work and interpersonal relations skill training were emphasized. He noted that these programs usually exposed students to varied group experiences, so that they could become group "trainers" in their occupational settings.

Penney labeled the third orientation a counseling approach which resulted from the philosophy that counseling

was the most common  
personnel jobs.

Penney decided  
needed by students  
their jobs did not  
education offered  
prepare them for  
maintained that  
student personnel  
education. He  
education was  
dissertations  
it was rarely

Penney was  
which suggested  
personnel work  
appeared to be  
and that the  
He concluded  
current literature  
creative adaptation  
tion of student

was the most common and important aspect of all student personnel jobs.

Penney declared that a common core of basic information needed by student personnel workers in the performance of their jobs did not exist. He was of the opinion that the education offered to student personnel workers did not prepare them for entry into the field. Furthermore, Penney maintained that there was little evidence to indicate that student personnel educators were concerned about professional education. He observed that discussion about professional education was limited in the relevant journals, that few dissertations had been written about the subject and that it was rarely found on convention programs.

Penney was also disapproving of the COSPA document which suggested guidelines for the preparation of student personnel workers. He commented that the recommendations appeared to represent an elucidation of the current thinking and that the proposal had not established new directions. He concluded that there was practically nothing in the current literature suggesting "significant innovations or creative adaptations in either the functioning or the preparation of student personnel workers. . ." (p. 63)

Dewey (197

change "if they

(p. 63) Prepar

similarity of a

specificity of

preparation pro

imaginative a

recommended th

reconstructed

substantive ar

become more fl

structures an

Student Person

Dewey co

preparation p

average perso

driving forwa

be all over i

Also rec

preparation p

Bigelow (1971

many educator

programs were

Dewey (1972) argued that preparation programs must change "if they are to help avoid extinguishing the field." (p. 63) Preparation programs were described as having a similarity of approach and focusing too much on the specificity of student services. In addition the professional preparation programs have been limited in design, repetitive, unimaginative and reluctant to question themselves. She recommended that professional preparation programs be reconstructed to offer preparation previously lacking in substantive areas. It was urged that preparation programs become more flexible and that they create new degree structures and new approaches to the study of College Student Personnel.

Dewey concluded by pronouncing that if the professional preparation programs "choose McLuhan's description of the average person's approach to the future--that is, happily driving forward looking into the rearview mirror, it will be all over in the year 2000." (p. 64)

Also recommending that the College Student Personnel preparation programs be revised were Wallenfeldt and Bigelow (1971). They reported that in the opinion of many educators, College Student Personnel preparation programs were "characterized by a dearth of subject matter,



sparse literature

generally require

suggested that

should focus upon

national recommendations

However, they find

and that consider

control. They

itself in the

national community

Fitzgerald

professional

to be dealt with

Discussion of

Criticism

the College

of the community

substantiate

that evaluation

accomplished

thoroughly evaluated

regional in

to be system

programs have

sparse literature and a lack of scholarly qualities generally required of graduate education." (p. 184) They suggested that the College Student Personnel profession should focus upon the preparation programs and that national recommendations on program ingredients be drafted. However, they felt that recommendations were only a beginning and that considerably more was needed in the form of quality control. They strongly urged the profession to police itself in the area of graduate instruction and to form a national committee on standards and accreditation.

Fitzgerald, Johnson, and Norris (1970) also urged that professional preparation and accreditation must continue to be dealt with as pertinent issues.

#### Discussion of Literature Relevant to Criticisms

Criticisms have been levied about various aspects of the College Student Personnel preparation programs. Some of the comments may be valid, but others have not been substantiated by the authors. Several researchers commented that evaluations of preparation programs had not been accomplished. On the contrary, several programs have been thoroughly evaluated. However, the studies have been regional in character; the investigations do not appear to be systematic; and comparisons among various preparation programs have not been conducted.

Several w  
and program emp  
Personnel. Als  
of College Stud  
preparation. T  
about the scarc  
field and abou  
Evidence does  
personnel educ  
in the profes  
workers. (Ny  
Rhatigan and

Numerous  
can be tease  
Personnel pr  
be improved  
could be di  
appropriate  
become more  
themselves  
organizati  
and accred  
some form

Several writers have been critical about the literature and program emphases in the field of College Student Personnel. Also reported was a lack of concern on the part of College Student Personnel educators about professional preparation. The writers may be accurate in their perceptions about the scarcity of basic and profound literature in the field and about the poorly defined program emphases. Evidence does exist, however, to indicate that student personnel educators have expressed considerable interest in the professional preparation of College Student Personnel workers. (Nygreen, 1968; Greenleaf, 1968; O'Banion, 1969; Rhatigan and Hoyt, 1970; and others)

Numerous acceptable and meaningful recommendations can be teased out of the criticisms of the College Student Personnel preparation programs. Research in the field can be improved in quantity and in quality. Program emphases could be differentiated, so that students might choose the appropriate programs for their interests. Programs could become more innovative, imaginative and able to question themselves. The College Student Personnel professional organizations have formed national committees on standards and accreditation and they could become more involved in some form of quality control.

Roles and Program

Educators

College Students

program emphasis

predicted that

must be education

1964; Miller, 1

Cross urged that

become education

have "student

specialists in

people." (p.

Miller ex

personnel work

technical-spec

second." (p.

personnel work

provider of s

Johnson antic

ahead will be

to help stude

understand th

(p. 11) He a

### Roles and Program Emphases

Educators recommending professional preparation in College Student Personnel have discussed diverse roles and program emphases. Many authorities in the field have predicted that student personnel workers of the future must be educators. (Cross, 1972; Johnson, 1970; Kauffman, 1964; Miller, 1967; Trueblood, 1966; and Williamson, 1958) Cross urged that student personnel administrators must become educators, rather than administrators. She would have "student personnel administrators become educational specialists in the sphere of excellence in working with people." (p. 57)

Miller explained that the future role of the student personnel worker would be as "an educator first and a technical-specialist or a service-oriented specialist second." (p. 173) According to Johnson, the student personnel worker will combine the roles of educator, provider of services and student development specialist. Johnson anticipated that the "greatest demands in the years ahead will be for those who are qualified professionally to help students--individually and in peer groups--to understand themselves and their educational environments." (p. 11) He also pointed out that personnel workers "will

be expected to

administration

developmental re

meaningful educ

Kauffman (

administrator's

conditions and

cultural and ar

The unique cont

administrator t

student person

cent with the t

Greenleaf

generalists sho

of the young ad

and a broad know

that student per

counseling and

provide in servi

operations and

According t

worker must have

public and priva

be expected to serve as consultants to the faculty and administration in interpreting students' behavioral and developmental needs, which can be met through more meaningful educational programs." (p. 11)

Kauffman (1964) elaborated the student personnel administrator's role as assisting in the creation of "conditions and opportunities for reinforcing the intellectual, cultural and artistic purposes of the institution." (p. 292)

The unique contribution made by the student personnel administrator to his university was linked with the student personnel administrator's awareness of and involvement with the total student community.

Greenleaf (1968) professed that student personnel generalists should have a knowledge of the characteristics of the young adult, as well as knowledge of legal procedures and a broad knowledge of world affairs. She recommended that student personnel workers have the ability to use counseling and interview skills and also the skills to provide in service training for staff responsible for operations and management.

According to Mueller (1967) the student personnel worker must have an intellectual grasp of the facts of public and private education, a personalized internalized



hierarchy of va

management of

personnel work

and future tren

uncertainties

Grant (196

student develop

personnel worke

able in the art

and as a resear

A variety

sciences, admin

experience have

A counseli

College Student

debated by a nu

that counseling

student person

observation "th

ment of person

on human develo

professional ch

hierarchy of values and priorities and a maturity in the management of feeling. She recommended that the student personnel worker be able to look for current developments and future trends and be able to tolerate the annoying uncertainties of an arduous professional life.

Grant (1968) urged student personnel workers to become student development specialists. He described the student personnel worker as a behavioral artist, as one knowledgeable in the arts, as a student of the behavioral sciences and as a researcher.

A variety of emphases, including counseling, behavioral sciences, administration, educational theory and practical experience have been stressed in the preparation programs.

A counseling or a counseling psychology emphasis in College Student Personnel preparation programs has been debated by a number of authorities. Dressel (1957) recommended that counseling psychology be the basic discipline for student personnel administrators. Shoeben (1967) made the observation "that the relevance of psychology to the attainment of personnel goals lies in the general light it throws on human development and the human condition, not in its professional character." (p. 243)

E  
Dunn (   
deans  
techni  
practi  
adoles  
I  
that c  
Person  
I  
member  
exclus  
and c  
Person  
resour  
tion,  
art, h  
sustai  
person  
to ass  
the di  
in her  
refuge

Based on a 1965-66 study of Deans of Women in Texas, Dunn (1967) suggested that preparation programs for women deans needed an emphasis in counseling, including counseling techniques, individual and group counseling, counseling practica and courses in mental health, psychology of adolescence and human growth and development.

In total disagreement was Penney (1969) who contended that counseling was an insufficient base for College Student Personnel administrators.

Lloyd-Jones (1968) argued that student affairs staff members would not become qualified by concentrating exclusively on personality theory, psychological testing and clinical counseling. She foresaw College Student Personnel staff members working "with others using the resources and techniques of discussion, symposia, exposition, colloquia, dialogue, clarifying questions, literature, art, history, religion, philosophy, social fellowship, and sustained search." (p. 28) Lloyd-Jones felt that student personnel workers must be qualified to help students learn to assess their environments and environmental changes in the direction of carefully determined values. Therefore, in her opinion, the student personnel worker cannot take refuge in narrow specializations.

Par

for coun

student

counsel

workers

taking,

Em

by a num

student

interes

the beh

Tr

level, t

the beh

and on t

skills,

Chi

and tea

sociolog

The

Personne

direct a

world, t

Parker (1966) thought that the education appropriate for counselors was an important part of the preparation for student personnel workers. However, other skills beside counseling skills were recommended for student personnel workers, including administrative decision making, consensus taking, record keeping, budget making and speciality skills.

Emphasis in the behavioral sciences has been encouraged by a number of authors. McConnell (1970) proposed that all student personnel workers, regardless of their particular interests, must have a broad and extensive background in the behavioral sciences.

Trueblood (1966) recommended that on the doctoral level, the emphasis be "on deepening the understanding of the behavioral sciences, the context of higher education and on the philosophy and skill of counseling, research skills, and philosophy of inquiry." (p. 83)

Chickering (1967) urged college deans, counselors and teachers to study psychology, social psychology and sociology of the young adult.

The contributions of sociology to College Student Personnel work were enumerated by Stroup (1967) as both direct and indirect. An understanding of man and his world, the distribution and organization of people and of

social ins

relevant t

The b

tors, acco

psycholog

managemen

other mor

In a

and gradu

(1964) ob

theoretic

her view

flow from

of studen

workers

students

Sev

as a par

ing to P

preparat

vised wo

universi

in Colle

social institutions were listed as sociological concepts relevant to College Student Personnel.

The basic principles for student personnel administrators, according to Crane (1965) were found in philosophy, psychology, sociology and the humanities, as well as in management, administration (public and educational) and other more specialized areas.

In a speech to College Student Personnel professionals and graduate students in College Student Personnel, Useem (1964) observed that increasing attention had been paid to theoretical principles in the student personnel field. From her viewpoint she reasoned that skilled performances should flow from theory. She thought that the professionalization of student personnel work depended upon student personnel workers becoming authorities on handling growing numbers of students in large bureaucratized institutions.

Several authors have discussed the value of internships as a part of College Student Personnel preparation. According to Pierson (1967), the major emphasis in programs of preparation should be upon supervised practice and supervised work experience. He was of the opinion that few universities were equipped to provide professional training in College Student Personnel work.



Two  
the eff  
College  
(1967)  
master  
inform  
questi  
worker  
would  
profe  
areas  
found  
those  
resea  
prov  
to p  
tion  
Fort  
whic  
and  
tha  
non

Two recent studies have been conducted to determine the effectiveness and the status of the internship in College Student Personnel preparation programs. Houtz (1967) surveyed the 1961, 1962, and 1963 doctoral and master's graduates of twelve preparation programs to elicit information about their internship experiences. She also questioned twelve professionally active student personnel workers with respect to the internship experiences they would recommend. She reported that the student personnel professionals advised internships in one or two specialized areas for College Student Personnel students. However, she found discrepancies between the activities recommended and those offered by the institutions. On the basis of her research, Houtz developed a proposed internship plan which provided an opportunity for the individual to apply theory to practice.

Wallenfeldt and Bigelow (1970) sought to gain information concerning the status of student personnel internships. Forty-two institutions responded to their questionnaire which sought data about the philosophy, structure, mechanics and evaluation of internships. The researchers reported that a standard definition of the term, internship, was non-existent and stated, "What one institution considers an

internship a

Wallenfeldt

internship p

consensus r

for the stu

ship was pe

education i

move toward

in this are

Nygree

that there

about the t

opinion abo

Discussion

Emphases

Nearl

for Colleg

tion progr

in the fie

College St

educator f

a student

internship another regards as a practicum." (p. 181)

Wallenfeldt and Bigelow concluded that student personnel internship programs seemed to be characterized by lack of consensus regarding what these experiences should accomplish for the student personnel worker. They felt that the internship was perhaps the most valuable portion of graduate education in student personnel and that the profession must move toward standard definitions and common understandings in this area.

Nygreen (1968) differed with many writers and argued that there was basic agreement and common understanding about the training programs in spite of the differences of opinion about some aspects of the programs.

#### Discussion of Literature Relevant to Roles and Program Emphases

Nearly all of the literature dealing with future roles for College Student Personnel workers and recommended preparation program emphases represent opinions of leading educators in the field. Most of the educators anticipate that the College Student Personnel worker of the future will be an educator first, but he will also be a provider of services, a student development specialist and a researcher.

While

emphasis

writing t

base for

recommend

preparati

education

principle

practical

Thre

emphases.

internshi

select po

the studi

internshi

to apply

undersco

but it a

definiti

Recommen

Rec

the prej

(1965),

While several authorities have suggested a counseling emphasis for student personnel workers, most of those writing today agree that counseling is an insufficient base for College Student Personnel preparation. Widely recommended emphases at the present time for inclusion in preparation programs are the behavioral sciences, higher education foundations, administration and management principles, counseling techniques, research skills and practical experiences.

Three research studies related to preparation program emphases. Two investigated the College Student Personnel internship and one recommended a program emphasis for a select population (Deans of Women) in one state. One of the studies exploring the internship recommended a proposed internship plan which provided an opportunity for students to apply theory to practice. In essence, the other study underscored the importance of the practical work experience, but it also reported the lack of consensus in terms of the definitions and understandings in this area.

#### Recommended Subject Matter Areas and Curricula

Recommended subject matter areas and curricula for the preparation programs have been suggested by Cosby (1965), Trueblood (1966), Miller (1967), and O'Banion (1969).

Most of the  
have also be  
and accredit

Cosby s  
be develop  
education."  
personnel w  
the "chang  
faculty, ac  
causal to c

Cosby  
also study  
processes.  
be a part  
questions  
practice i  
students b  
In her opi  
riable "mu  
process an

In ou  
Student Pe  
following

Most of the student personnel professional organizations have also been actively involved in professional preparation and accreditation matters.

Cosby suggested that the "student personnel curriculum be developed within the context of the study of higher education." (p. 17) She explained that the student personnel worker must understand and be able to cope with the "changing role concepts and the relationships of students, faculty, administration and of those forces which were causal to change. . ." (p. 17)

Cosby thought that student personnel trainees should also study the sociology of undergraduate life and group processes. She felt that supervised work experience should be a part of the preparation programs, but she raised questions about the balance of the academic program and practice in the student's experience. She warned against students beginning study and internships simultaneously. In her opinion, preparation programs in order to be viable "must produce persons knowledgeable in both social process and social issues." (p. 18)

In outlining a preparation program for College Student Personnel workers, Trueblood (1966) included the following areas in an ideal program:



1

2

3

Will

areas of

College

1. One major core in psychology
2. A second major core in the study of culture change and societal forces
3. Study aimed toward a comprehensive understanding of the context, philosophy, finance, planning and curriculum of higher education
4. "Skill" courses in counseling and measurement
5. Supervised experience in work with individual students and groups of students in a higher education setting
6. An understanding of research goals, methods and skills
7. A thorough understanding of the ethical responsibilities and legal relationships in College Student Personnel work

Miller (1967) proposed ten fundamental subject matter areas of knowledge and practice needed by the student in College Student Personnel preparation.

1. "To be introduced to the field in such a way as to obtain a meaningful orientation to, and overview of, student personnel work.
2. To obtain a clear understanding of the context and foundations of higher education in America and elsewhere.
3. To bridge the gaps between the academic disciplines, especially the behavioral sciences and practical application to work with students.
4. To learn the psychological and sociological bases of behavior and general characteristics of the college age student.

5. To develop the human helping relationship concepts and attitudes essential to individuals in a "helping" profession.
6. To obtain a comprehensive grasp of research and evaluation--their value and function for College Student Personnel.
7. To understand the basic principles and practices necessary to implement and coordinate student personnel programs.
8. To become skillful in methods and approaches used by counselors and educators in working with students in formal and informal, group and individual, situations.
9. To assimilate and integrate the theoretical with the practical by way of supervised practicum field work experiences.
10. To have ample opportunity to obtain a grasp of certain of the specialized substantive areas of student personnel work."  
(pp. 174-175)

On the basis of her research findings in defining the future role of the highest ranking woman student personnel administrator, Haller (1967) suggested a training program which would prepare her for the role. The recommended program included a study of the individual, the group, the campus, the institution and the community. Techniques for working with the individual, the group, the community and colleagues were felt to be essential, as well as administrative, communications and research skills. Also suggested were courses in sociology, cultural anthropology,

social psych

science and

ships in st

A mode

in C'Banion

in psychol

practicum

personnel

college st

education

Train

dynamics

because o

Othe

preparati

Developme

and the A

(1966) a

the Coll

in the b

sociolog

College S

principle

social psychology, education, economics, business, political science and philosophy. The program would include internships in student personnel services.

A model College Student Personnel preparation program in O'Banion's opinion would consist of a core of experiences in psychology, counseling principles and techniques, practicum in student personnel work, an overview of student personnel work in higher education, the study of the college student, sociology and anthropology and higher education.

Training in group work, sensitivity perception and group dynamics have been recommended by Schreck and Shaffer (1968) because of the changing nature of campus organizations.

Other programs of studies in College Student Personnel preparation have been suggested by the COSPA Professional Development Committee, the APGA Interdivisional Committee, and the ACPA Commission XII. According to Robinson's (1966) analysis of the COSPA, APGA, and ACPA documents, the College Student Personnel worker must have a grounding in the behavioral sciences with emphasis on psychology and sociology. Other basic understandings recommended for the College Student Personnel worker included higher education principles, philosophy and administration; human development,

the college

work, pract

necessary,

methodology

Approv

Programs i

in Higher

the Interd

and Guidar

competenc

was recom

Supr

integrat

in the p

the college student and college culture. Formal course work, practica and internship experience were deemed necessary, as well as counseling, testing and research methodology.

Approved in 1968 were the "Guidelines for Graduate Programs in the Preparation of Student Personnel Workers in Higher Education," prepared cooperatively by COSPA and the Interdivisional Committee of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. A program of studies including competencies and understandings in the following areas was recommended:

1. Student personnel work in higher education
2. Higher education as a social institution
3. Human growth and development
4. Social and cultural foundations
5. Methods, techniques and concepts used by student personnel workers
6. Research and evaluation
7. Preparation in specialized fields

Supervised experiences were also suggested for the integration and application of knowledge and skills gained in the program of studies.

Discussion of

The lit

College Stud

kinds. One

individuals

tion undert

programs or

Trueblood,

their philo

should be

profession

the thinki

Student Pe

All e

curricula

stantial

include t

administ

groups, :

work exp

Faculty

Few

the prof



### Discussion of Literature Relevant to Recommended Curricula

The literature relevant to recommended curricula for College Student Personnel preparation programs was of two kinds. One type represented research and opinions of individuals and the other represented professional organization undertakings. Haller and O'Banion based their ideal programs on research findings while the publications by Trueblood, Miller, Cosby, Schreck and Shaffer reflected their philosophical orientations. Possibly more credence should be given to the model programs suggested by the professional associations, since their guidelines represent the thinking of many experts in the field of College Student Personnel.

All of the recommendations for College Student Personnel curricula reviewed by this writer appeared to be in substantial agreement. A basic core of preparation would include the behavioral sciences, higher education, administration, counseling, working with individuals and groups, research, specialized preparation and practical work experiences.

### Faculty Preparation and Experience

Few authors have discussed the recommended content of the professional education or experience of those who

prepare Co

APGA Conve

of Educat

Participat

Hubert Hou

their rem

Personnel

the unequ

psycholog

He observ

their tin

able to

and soci

College

their ba

Be

enter a

profess

of that

educato

scholar

recomme

Program

prepare College Student Personnel workers. During the 1967 APGA Convention, a symposium was held on the "Qualifications of Educators of Counselors and Student Personnel Workers." Participating were Drs. C. Winfield Scott, Ralph Berdie, Hubert Houghton and Roger Myers. Scott and Berdie addressed their remarks in part to the education of College Student Personnel preparation program faculty members. Scott took the unequivocal position that a good understanding of psychology was fundamental for preparation program faculty. He observed that Student Personnel workers spend most of their time "helping individuals and groups choose and become able to function in ways that will be personally satisfying and socially useful." (p. 27) He urged the educators of College Student Personnel workers to adopt psychology as their basic discipline.

Berdie felt that a person who prepared students to enter a profession must be well acquainted with the profession and must understand the problems and functions of that profession. He emphasized, however, that the educator's most important characteristics were his scholarly, humane and scientific qualifications. Berdie recommended that the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty member be as well informed, competent, and

intereste

in counse

tion for

and warne

for conti

graduate

the stud

as techn

Hes

fessiona

selectio

developm

that the

to under

and "the

Discussi

and Expe

Aln

content

for thos

Exp

was rec

member

interested in broad aspects of higher education as he was in counseling and guidance. He urged a broad liberal education for the College Student Personnel preparation program and warned that educators must incorporate opportunities for continuing liberal and humane education into the graduate programs. Berdie reasoned that otherwise many of the students in the programs will be able to serve only as technicians in a community of professional educators.

Hester (1971) commented about the selection of professional trainers in the preparation programs. Careful selection of trainers was considered to be important to the development of preparation programs. It was recommended that the trainers have had experience in the field in order to understand College Student Personnel roles and functions and "the degree of importance of each in practice." (p. 69)

#### Discussion of Literature Relevant to Faculty Preparation and Experience

Almost nothing has appeared in the literature about the content of professional education and experience recommended for those who prepare College Student Personnel workers.

Experience in the field of College Student Personnel was recommended for the preparation program faculty member so that they might understand the roles, functions

and proble

preparatio

recommende

urged that

were his

So little

and exper

that reco

### Summary

The

College S

programs,

recommen

of the fa

and disc

No

This stu

level Co

their fa

and problems of the profession. As far as academic preparation for faculty was concerned, one authority recommended psychology as the basic discipline. Another urged that the trainer's most important characteristics were his scholarly, humane and scientific qualifications. So little has been written about the appropriate education and experience for College Student Personnel faculty members that recommendations about the topic appear to be presumptuous.

#### Summary

The literature relevant to specialized preparation in College Student Personnel, criticism of the preparation programs, student personnel roles and program emphases, recommended preparation program curricula and preparation of the faculty teaching in the programs has been reviewed and discussed in this chapter.

No studies were found similar to the one being reported. This study was designed to investigate a number of doctoral level College Student Personnel preparation programs and their faculty.

This  
purpose w  
selected  
Student  
profile o

Thi  
sample, :  
collecti  
of the m

Uni  
in Colle  
Director  
Personne  
Guidance  
universi  
doctoral



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This study consisted of two major purposes. One purpose was to conduct an intensive investigation of a selected number of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel. The other purpose was to develop a profile of preparation program faculty.

This chapter is concerned with the selection of the sample, research methods, development of the instruments, collection of data, treatment of the data and limitations of the methodology.

#### Selection of the Sample

Universities offering doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel were identified from the Directory of Preparation Programs in College Student Personnel 1970-71 and Financial Aid for Personnel and Guidance Graduate Study 1970-71. Seventy-one colleges and universities were listed in these publications as having doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel.

To co

at these i

tion sheet

coordinato

Programs i

Appendix A

included i

letter and

asked for

preparatio

Ninet

were compl

Appendix C

An examina

fifty inst

Personnel

instituti

discontin

to initia

not recei

offered C

but only

offered d

in College

To confirm the existence of a doctoral level program at these institutions, a letter and a preliminary information sheet were sent to each of the preparation program coordinators as identified in the Directory of Preparation Programs in College Student Personnel 1970-71. (See Appendix A for a listing of the colleges and universities included in the initial survey and Appendix B for the letter and information sheet) The coordinators were asked for the exact name of the College Student Personnel preparation program at their college or university.

Ninety-four per cent (N=67) of the information sheets were completed by the coordinators and returned. (See Appendix C for the responses to the information sheet) An examination of the information sheets revealed that fifty institutions offered doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs. Of the other seventeen institutions that returned an information sheet, one had discontinued its program. Another university had planned to initiate the College Student Personnel major, but had not received funding for the program. Three institutions offered College Student Personnel preparation programs, but only on the master's level. Twelve universities offered doctoral programs in closely related areas but not in College Student Personnel.

Of t

College S

research

preparat

the twen

Personne

thought

United S

faculty

Universi

Professi

Higher E

Si

sities v

the pri

New Yor

Columbi

Oregon,

Alabama

Michiga

Wyoming

include

Of the fifty universities offering the doctorate in College Student Personnel, it was determined that the researcher would conduct an in-depth study of twenty preparation programs and of all the faculty involved in the twenty programs. A select group of College Student Personnel educators assisted in the choice of universities thought to have representative programs throughout the United States. The group was composed of members of the faculty at Michigan State University, Oregon State University and members of ACPA Commission XII, the Professional Education of Student Personnel Workers in Higher Education.

Sixteen public universities and four private universities were selected for inclusion in the study. Two of the private institutions were located in the state of New York, one in Illinois and one in the District of Columbia. Two of the public universities were located in Oregon, two in Iowa and one in each of the states of Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Tennessee and Wyoming. (See Appendix D for a listing of the universities included in the study) Coordinators of the doctoral

preparat

of the i

study.

It

members

preparat

were se

Tw

investi

College

techniq

faculty

questio

S.

felt th

in obt.

Studen

have s

such s

Borg p

preparation programs in College Student Personnel in all of the institutions chosen, agreed to participate in the study.

It was determined by the coordinators that 113 faculty members were involved in the College Student Personnel preparation programs at the twenty universities. All were selected to be included in the study.

#### Research Methods

Two research methods were used in this study. In investigating the twenty doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel, the structured interview technique was utilized. In developing a profile of the faculty members involved in the programs, a survey questionnaire was employed.

Since this was an exploratory research study, it was felt that the interview would be a suitable technique in obtaining detailed information about the College Student Personnel preparation programs. Several authors have suggested the appropriateness of the interview for such studies. (Borg, 1963 and Macoby and Macoby, 1954) Borg pointed out the uniqueness of the interview in

descripti

of data t

individua

The

advantage

primary a

researche

complex s

"opens th

(p. 32)

much grea

collectin

Disa

the possi

addition,

data anal

Borg

source of

interview



descriptive research in that it involved the collection of data through direct verbal interaction between individuals.

The interview as a research technique has a number of advantages over other methods of investigation. Its primary advantage is its adaptability. It allows the researcher to follow-up leads and to probe subtle and complex situations. Hillway noted that the interview "opens the way to finding very detailed bits of information." (p. 32) More data and greater clarity can be obtained and much greater depth is permitted than in other methods of collecting research data. According to Van Dalen (1962),

Many people are more willing to communicate information verbally than in writing and therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire. (p. 258)

Disadvantages of the interview technique include the possible introduction of bias and subjectivity. In addition, the interview is time consuming, expensive and data analysis can be difficult.

Borg contended that the "direct interaction is the source of most of the advantages and disadvantages of the interview as a research technique." (p. 221)

inter

has th

does p

opinio

written

them in

Bo

should

the ques

on the b

in a sim

The

structure

coordinate

teaching i

the struct

questionna

The re

studying the

elicit facul

Borg and Hillway both recommended the structured interview for researchers. The structured interview has the advantage of being reasonably objective, but it does permit a more thorough understanding of the respondent's opinions. Hillway suggested that the researcher prepare a written schedule of questions in advance and then ask them in the same way at each interview.

Borg recommended that the research interview questions should be based upon the objectives of the study. Therefore, the questions for the structured interview were developed on the basis of the objectives of the study and utilized in a similar manner throughout the interviewing process.

#### Development of the Instruments

The instruments designed for this study included a structured interview for use with the preparation program coordinators and a questionnaire for faculty members teaching in the preparation programs. (See Appendix E for the structured interview and Appendix G for the faculty questionnaire)

The researcher designed a structured interview for studying the preparation programs and a questionnaire to elicit faculty profile information. After the initial

questions were formulated, they were reviewed for clarity, validity and appropriateness by College Student Personnel educators at Michigan State University. On the basis of their recommendations, the questions were revised.

For the structured interview, questions were formulated about the following topics: History and Stages of Development of the Program, Program Emphasis, Program Titles, Degrees Offered, Objectives of the Program, Kind of Emphasis (Pragmatic-Theoretical), Program Strengths, Numbers of Students, Numbers of Graduates, Numbers of Faculty, Numbers of Courses, Admissions Requirements, Recruitment, Practicum-Internship-Field Work Experiences, Typical Doctoral Programs, Examinations, Dissertation Credit, Percentage of Graduates, Average Completion Time, Financial Assistance, Travel Grants, Follow-up of Graduates, Evaluation of Programs, Components of a Quality Program, Leading Programs, Reasons for Program Selections, Comparisons, Changes Desired and Changes Predicted.

The questionnaire was developed to gather data directly from the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty. The items were designed to collect information

al

Ed

Pe

Re

Pa

Pub

Rec

Stud

Stud

the c

March

and o

on the

tors a

Nationa

Profess

of the

coordina

The

on the ou

about the following topics: Academic Rank or Title,  
Educational Background, Age, Sex, Professional Experience,  
Percentages of Time Spent in Preparation Program  
Responsibilities, Numbers and Emphasis of Courses Taught,  
Participation in Professional Organization Activities,  
Publications, Perceptions of the Program Emphasis,  
Recommended Changes for the Program and the Leading College  
Student Personnel Preparation Programs.

#### Collection of the Data

Interviews were conducted with eighteen College  
Student Personnel preparation program coordinators and  
the other two with the coordinator's representative during  
March, April and May, 1972. Nine of the coordinators  
and one representative were interviewed in their offices  
on their respective campuses and the other nine coordina-  
tors and one representative were interviewed at the 1972  
National Conventions of the College Student Personnel  
professional organizations. Throughout the study all  
of the interview respondents have been identified as  
coordinators.

The researcher noted the responses to the questions  
on the outline of topics to be covered in the interview.

The interviews were also tape recorded. All respondents were willing to have the interview recorded, although several requested that the tape recorder be stopped for certain "off-the-record" comments.

The questionnaire and a cover letter were either mailed directly or personally delivered to the faculty members teaching in the College Student Personnel preparation programs during March, April and May, 1972. (See Appendix F for the cover letter) An addressed, stamped envelope was included with the questionnaire for each respondent. The names and addresses of the preparation program faculty were provided by the program coordinators.

The questionnaires were distributed to the faculty members after the interviews had been conducted with the coordinators. The faculty members were requested to return the completed questionnaire within two weeks. If the questionnaire had not been returned in three weeks, the research sent another copy of the letter and questionnaire to the faculty member with a personal hand-written note.

the

resp

TABLL

R

U

U

N

a

employ

A

questi

expres

study.

Of

questio

were pa

program

who did

differen

universi

at six un



By June 26, 1972, a total of 104 (92.0 per cent) of the questionnaires had been returned. A summary of the responses is presented in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1--Summary of Responses to Questionnaire

Responses	Number	Per Cent
Usable Returns	101	89.4
Unusable Returns	3	2.7
No Response	<u>9</u>	<u>8.0</u>
Totals	113	100.1 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100.0 due to rounding procedures employed

A total of 101 usable returns was obtained. Three questionnaires were returned by faculty members with notes expressing their professional incompatibility with the study.

Of the nine faculty who did not return their questionnaires, four were from the same university and were part-time College Student Personnel preparation program faculty members. The other five faculty members who did not respond to the questionnaire represented five different programs. In other words, the faculty at fourteen universities had a one-hundred per cent rate of return and at six universities had a return rate of 82.7 per cent.

1

1

Table 3.2 indicates the number of questionnaires distributed and the number returned by the faculty members at each university.

TABLE 3.2--Summary of Responses to Questionnaire by University

University	Distributed	Returned
1	5	5
2	3	2
3	7	3
4	8	8
5	10	9
6	6	6
7	1	1
8	3	3
9	7	6
10	6	5
11	8	8
12	6	6
13	3	3
14	4	4
15	5	5
16	2	2
17	3	3
18	2	2
19	18	17
20	6	6
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals	113	104

The  
transcr  
to the  
statist  
tabulat  
present

Qu  
and pun  
several  
counts  
appropri  
the CD  
State  
Square  
select

I  
interv  
The in  
tions  
bias.  
was in

### Treatment of the Data

The responses from the structured interviews were transcribed from the tapes and were grouped as they related to the questions. No attempt was made to prepare a statistical analysis of the interview information. Numerical tabulations were prepared and all interview data have been presented in a descriptive manner.

Questionnaire data were coded for computer analysis and punched onto IBM cards. In order to analyze the data, several statistical techniques were employed. Frequency counts, percentages, means and standard deviations, where appropriate, were computed for certain variables by using the CDC 6500 CISSR Percount Program available at Michigan State University. (Thiel and Patrick, 1968) The Chi-Square Test for Independence was used in analyzing selected questionnaire responses.

### Limitations of the Methodology

This study has the limiting factors common to the interview and questionnaire methods of gathering data. The interview, even though structured, can present limitations as a method of obtaining data due to interviewer bias. Another limitation may be that only one individual was interviewed at each university.

The

because

intent o

In addit

utilized

nation.

there ma

transfer

this fur

improve

were use

opinions

may also

Al

educator

reliabi

been te

Ger

study an

program

drawn.

The questionnaire method of data collection is limited because it assumes that the respondent understands the intent of the questions and that he answers honestly. In addition, the questionnaire is impersonal and cannot be utilized to probe for clarifications or for detailed information. Several of the questions were unstructured and there may have been inconsistency in coding the data for transfer from the questionnaire to computer cards. However, this function was performed by one individual in order to improve preciseness and standardized coding procedures were used whenever possible. Personal information and opinions on controversial topics were called for which may also have affected responses.

Although the questionnaire was carefully examined by educators in the field of College Student Personnel, the reliability and validity of the questionnaire have not been tested.

Generalizations between the sample included in this study and other College Student Personnel preparation programs and preparation program faculty should be carefully drawn.

This

methods

data an

Two

were ex

designe

tion fr

Th

prepar

designe

tics o

rate w

T

in a d

and pu

For ce

means

variab

The an

Michig

T

in Cha



Summary

This chapter was concerned with the sample, research methods, instrumentation, collection, treatment of the data and limitations of the methodology.

Twenty College Student Personnel preparation programs were examined in the study. A structured interview was designed by the researcher and was used to elicit information from the coordinators about their programs.

The 113 faculty members associated with the twenty preparation programs were surveyed with a questionnaire designed by the researcher to determine the characteristics of the preparation program faculty. The response rate was 92.0 per cent with 101 usable returns.

The data collected during the interviews were reported in a descriptive manner. The questionnaire data were coded and punched cards were prepared for computer analysis. For certain variables, frequency counts, percentages, means and standard deviations were computed. For other variables, the Chi-Square Test for Independence was used. The analyses were carried out on the CDC 6500 Computer at Michigan State University.

The data obtained from the interviews are discussed in Chapter IV.

1

In

structu

data we

prepara

their r

Th

basis o

History

Th

program

and sta

in the

and 19

and ei

Approx

program

A.

program

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA--INTERVIEWS

In this chapter the data collected through the structured interviews are presented and analyzed. The data were gathered from twenty coordinators of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel or their representatives.

The analysis is divided into thirty sections on the basis of the interview questions.

#### History

The twenty College Student Personnel preparation programs included in this study were replete with history and stages of development. Two of the programs originated in the early 1930's; three in the period between 1940 and 1950; two in the 1950's; five between 1961 and 1965; and eight were established between 1966 and 1970. Approximately sixty-five per cent or thirteen of the twenty programs have been in existence less than ten years.

As coordinators were relating the histories of their programs, a number of well known names in the field crept

into t

Jones,

Eugeni

Marjor

instru

Studen

M

need f

studen

includ

number

the ne

tion :

more a

A

Guida

Psycho

Colleg

enroll

and th

depart

into the conversations, including those of Esther Lloyd-Jones, J.B. Stroud, Maude Stewart, Dennis Trueblood, Eugenie Leonard, Robert Shaffer, M. Eunice Hilton and Marjorie C. Smith. These recognized authorities were instrumental in founding and developing various College Student Personnel preparation programs.

Most of the preparation programs were begun when a need for additional graduate training was expressed by student personnel practitioners. Two of the older programs included in the study were started at the request of a number of Counselors of Women and Deans of Women who felt the need for professional preparation. As professionalization increased in the field of College Student Personnel, more and more graduate programs were established.

A number of the programs began in a Department of Guidance and Counseling or in a Department of Educational Psychology with a specialization offered in the area of College Student Personnel. Typically, as more students enrolled in the personnel programs, a transition occurred and the College Student Personnel programs became separate departments.

Emphas

Th

cent o

psycho

emphas

have n

T

in cat

Severa

Basica

as adm

develo

trativ

counse

and on

Titles

F

doctor

titled

Studen

Educat

Higher

### Emphasis

The original emphasis in approximately eight-five per cent of the programs was either counseling or educational psychology. Several of the newer programs began with an emphasis on College Student Personnel Administration and have not changed their orientations.

The coordinators had a considerable amount of difficulty in categorizing the current emphases in their programs. Several of the programs reportedly had multiple foci. Basically, the respondents classified their program emphases as administration, counseling, research and student development. Ten programs (fifty per cent) had an administrative emphasis; eight programs (forty per cent) had a counseling emphasis; one (five per cent) stressed research and one (five per cent) had a student development focus.

### Titles

Fourteen different titles designated the twenty doctoral programs included in this study. Three were titled College Personnel Work; three were labeled College Student Personnel Administration; three were called Higher Education and two were named Student Personnel Work in Higher Education.

T  
progra

Degree

T

the tw

M.S.,

seven

Ed.D.

Specia

doctor

at ten

three.

Object:

Th

Personn

obtaine

the pro

purposes



Ten different titles were used by the other ten programs. They included:

- College Student Personnel
- College Student Personnel Services
- College Student Personnel in Higher Education
- College Student Personnel Work
- Counseling and Personnel Services
- Higher Education Administration
- Higher Education with Concentrations in College  
Personnel Administration
- Student Personnel Administration
- Student Personnel in Higher Education
- Student Personnel Work in Higher Education

### Degrees

The degrees offered in College Student Personnel at the twenty universities were the Ph.D., Ed.D., Ed.S., M.A., M.S., and M.Ed. Both the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. were given at seven universities, only the Ph.D. at seven and only the Ed.D. at six. Eight universities offered an Education Specialist program. Seventeen universities offered both a doctoral and a master's program. The M.A. was available at ten institutions, the M.S. at seven and the M.Ed. at three.

### Objectives

The purposes and objectives of the College Student Personnel preparation programs included in this study were obtained from the interviews and from brochures describing the programs. The following statements represent the purposes and objectives of the twenty programs.

Pr

person

develon

indivi

higher

P

studen

P

studen

P

practi

the fi

learn

P

person

sities

P

tive

P

ional

P

academ

on co

Program 1. To improve the qualifications of student personnel workers and to provide experiences for the development of professional competence and skills for individuals preparing to assume responsibilities in higher education.

Program 2. To prepare a generalist who will work in student personnel.

Program 3. To explore areas of specialization in student services.

Program 4. To provide both academic education and practical experience to individuals who plan to work in the field of student personnel in institutions of higher learning.

Program 5. To prepare men and women to serve as student personnel workers or administrators in colleges or universities including junior and community colleges.

Program 6. To prepare students for general administrative positions in student personnel work in higher education.

Program 7. To prepare persons who can make a professional contribution to the field of higher education.

Program 8. To provide training in depth through an academic, research oriented curriculum which draws heavily on counseling psychology.

perso

struc

affec

will

of s

pers

of p

help

its

rese

incl

prim

as t

of t

admi

in p

inst.

Program 9. To provide a generalist in student personnel administration who understands the administrative structure of an institution and understands the forces that affect the decision making process.

Program 10. To prepare competent practitioners who will also make a professional contribution to the field of student personnel.

Program 11. To provide professional preparation for persons who will function in the various levels and types of programs represented in the field; give leadership in helping the College Student Personnel profession achieve its appropriate identity; participate in continuing research activities; strive for quality in whatever is included, particularly in the graduates who represent the primary products of its endeavors.

Program 12. To consider the student personnel offices as they influence university life and learning experiences.

Program 13. To develop generalists with a grasp of the total field of student personnel.

Program 14. To prepare persons who will serve as administrators, counselors, researchers and consultants in programs and services related to student development in institutions of higher education.

P

top pe

R

R

posit

unive

posi

serv

posi

wor

pro

ser

pro

ser

se

con

id

(S

"C

Program 15. To offer a program that will qualify top personnel, practitioners, researchers and faculty.

Program 16. To prepare a student development educator.

Program 17. To prepare men and women for professional positions in student services departments of colleges and universities.

Program 18. To prepare graduates for professional positions in the administration of student personnel services.

Program 19. To prepare persons for student personnel positions.

Program 20. To prepare College Student Personnel workers for smaller institutions.

It would appear that the purpose of most of the programs was to offer preparation for persons who will serve as College Student Personnel workers. Many of the programs provided preparation for student personnel generalists, as opposed to specialized preparation. Others felt they were preparing not only administrators, but also counselors, researchers, faculty and consultants. Several identified their purpose as student development preparation. (Student development as defined by Johnson (1970) is "creating a campus environment which facilitates the

indiv

progr

for t

parti

in va

Colle

TABLE

---

Emp

---

Pr

Mo

Ba

Th

No

Ne

---

Kind

---

a va

prog

prog

for

for

of t



individual's behavioral development.") (p. 10) One program prepared student personnel workers specifically for the smaller institutions and community colleges in a particular geographical region. Several offered training in various speciality areas, such as residence halls and College Unions.

TABLE 4.1--Kind of Program Emphasis

Emphasis	Number	Per Cent
Pragmatic	2	10.0
More Pragmatic than Theoretical	4	20.0
Balance Between Pragmatic and Theoretical	8	40.0
Theoretical	3	15.0
No Emphasis	1	5.0
Neither Pragmatic or Theoretical	2	10.0
	N=20	100.0

#### Kind of Program Emphasis

As indicated in Table 4.1, coordinators responded in a variety of ways to the question, "Is your doctoral program emphasis theoretical or pragmatic? Why?" One program reportedly had little or no emphasis but allowed for field work and had the capability of being practical for students. Another coordinator refused to choose either of the emphases, pragmatic or theoretical, and opted to call

his

cate

disc

disc

out

more

resp

and

thei

The

arr

poi

pro

sta

emp

men

wor

pra

at

cr

Pr

his program research oriented. Another would not categorize his program as practical or theoretical and discussed the merits of his program, which he called interdisciplinary.

Two coordinators labeled their programs pragmatic without qualifications. Four felt that their programs were more pragmatic than theoretical. According to eight respondents, their programs were a balance of theoretical and pragmatic orientations. Three coordinators described their programs as theoretical in nature.

The reasons given for the program emphases were varied. The program with little or no emphasis was an individualized arrangement. The research oriented program coordinator pointed to the need for research. The interdisciplinary program concentrated upon giving the student a broad understanding of higher education. The pragmatic programs emphasized the background of experience and general commitment of their staffs to practical experience in direct working relationship with students. One of the more pragmatic than theoretical programs had dealt with theory at the master's level and felt that the "real issues" were crucial at the doctoral level. Another of the more pragmatic than theoretical programs held to this

orienta

the pre

practi

T

as bal

They d

the ga

their

empha

educa

feel

havin

on cu

Strer

in tl

attr

desc

inte

cour

be o

orientation because there were no full-time faculty in the preparation program and all were student personnel practitioners.

The coordinators who perceived their program emphases as balanced felt that the two were inextricably intertwined. They definitely wanted the individual to "integrate and bridge the gap between theory and practice." They reported that their faculty members had both kinds of experience.

The coordinators of the theoretical programs emphasized that theory and concept were a basis for educational practice. One respondent stated, "We don't feel we serve the needs of doctoral students simply by having the core of their program consist of group discussions on current problems that students or institutions are facing."

### Strengths

Coordinators identified a number of unique strengths in their programs. Flexibility was a commonly listed attribute. At several universities, flexibility was described as arranging a student's program around his interests, work experience and goals. The student's course work, as well as his practical experiences, could be organized in as much depth as a student desired. In

most

throu

line

of p

univ

felt

from

als

inc

pra

for

no

fr

ar

co

ed

la

ks

ca

pa

most instances, the student was able to take courses throughout the campus and to cut across departmental lines.

To one coordinator, flexibility connoted unique kinds of practical work experiences. He was located on a large university campus with several colleges close by, and he felt that there were many authorities with much expertise from whom his students could learn. Another respondent also equated flexibility with various experiences in an internship program. His university required seven separate practical experiences and provided a variety of internships for doctoral candidates.

On another campus, flexibility meant that there were no required courses and that students could choose courses from any department. The candidate was expected to acquire areas of strength in his program, rather than specific courses, in order to gain a broad perspective of higher education.

Another unique characteristic of three programs was labeled as individuality. In one instance, the term was used to indicate an individualized program for the candidate. In another, individuality meant the attention paid to each candidate. At that university, the coordinator

felt t

each s

instar

creat

univer

disse

tradi

T

was si

as a p

ident

as un

as t

inst

lec

an

w

in

as

pri



felt that the faculty-student ratio was very desirable and each student received special consideration. In the other instance, an individualized program included new and creative methods of research and exploration. This university did not have the usual restrictions on the dissertation and the research did not need to follow traditional lines.

The interdisciplinary orientation of three programs was singled out as a strength. Research was emphasized as a positive factor on three campuses. Six coordinators identified opportunities for meaningful work experiences as unique in their programs.

Three urban universities pointed to their location as the strength of their program. With many kinds of institutions in their areas, they could draw upon guest lecturers, could sponsor field trips to various colleges and could also utilize the other institutions for field work assignments.

One university felt it was exceptional in the teaching of counseling skills. The faculty at this institution assumed that counseling skills, broadly defined, were the primary skill behaviors needed in student personnel work.

The co

contro

Person

and g

for

and

and

fiv

The

tea

an

Th

ap

be

h

t

c

The coordinator quickly pointed out that this was a controversial assumption in the field of College Student Personnel.

Two other institutions felt that their counseling and group work training were outstanding. The opportunity for group learning included obtaining experience, skills and competencies in the use of groups in staff development and in various other settings.

Student personnel faculty members were mentioned by five respondents as the unique strength of their programs. These programs drew on student personnel practitioners to teach courses and seminars, to serve as advisers for students and to serve as supervisors for practical work experiences. These coordinators felt that programs needed to include applied experience as well as academic theory in order to be viable.

According to one respondent, the unique attribute of his program was related to the adaptability of his students to succeed in the smaller school structure. The purpose of his program was to train administrators for the community colleges and the smaller colleges in that region of the country.

main

stude

under

cultu

prog

empl

fact

sin

exi

wit

shi

an

"S

or

le

s

s

At another university, the coordinator felt that the main strength of the program was the emphasis on the student. He suggested that his graduates had a thorough understanding of the college student--his behavior, mores, culture, and interests.

Financial aid was identified as a strength in one program. Many assistantships, fellowships and part-time employment opportunities were available on that campus.

The newness of one program was pointed out as a positive factor. The coordinator felt he was at a real advantage, since his program was not locked into a set pattern.

Higher education associations for graduate students existed on two campuses and the respondents pointed to them with pride. Students had an opportunity to develop leadership within such organizations and to develop programs and committee work within it. According to one coordinator, "Students in their own organization function in professional organization ways which I think gives good guidance and leadership for later professional life."

Another strength described by one coordinator was size of the doctoral program. He thought that a program should be large enough for the students to challenge each

othe

cand

a p

ide

kin

sty

fo

an

Ge

t

P

4

9

other and felt that his program with forty doctoral candidates was an optimum size.

Special campus resources such as a school of business, a psychology department, a library and the like were identified as unique strengths in various programs. These kinds of facilities were listed by six coordinators.

The most frequently identified preparation program strengths were flexibility, individuality, opportunities for meaningful work experiences, special campus resources and the College Student Personnel faculty members.

### Graduates

During 1969-1970 the number of graduates of the twenty doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs ranged from zero to twenty-seven with a mean of 4.7. During 1970-1971, the number of graduates ranged from zero to nineteen with a mean of 5.6.

TABLE 4.2--Numbers of Students Enrolled in 1971-1972 in  
College Student Personnel Preparation Programs

		Doctoral	Ed. Specialist	Master's
TOTAL	Range	6-47	0-6	10-126
	Mean	23.2	3.2	46.4
MEN	Range	3-35	0-6	3-74
	Mean	16.6	1.8	23.4
WOMEN	Range	1-21	0-4	4-52
	Mean	6.6	1.4	23.1

Numbers of Students

As indicated in Table 4.2, the number of students enrolled during the 1971-1972 year in the doctoral College Student Personnel programs included in this study ranged from 6 to 47 with a mean of 23.2. The number of men in the programs ranged from 3 to 35 with a mean of 16.6 and the number of women ranged from 1 to 21 with a mean of 6.6.

Ten of the universities offered an Education Specialist degree. During the 1971-1972 year, the number of students enrolled ranged from 0 to 6 with a mean of 3.2. The number of men in the programs ranged from 0 to 6 with a mean of 1.8 and the number of women ranged from 0 to 4 with a mean of 1.4.



deg

126

with

a m

Fac

pre

of

a m

ful

six

was

Col

Co.

Th.

Co.

wa

de

at

in

Seventeen of the universities offered a master's degree. The number of students enrolled ranged from 10 to 126 with a mean of 46.4. The men ranged from 3 to 74 with a mean of 23.4 and the women ranged from 4 to 52 with a mean of 23.1.

### Faculty

Full-time faculty in the College Student Personnel preparation programs ranged from zero to three with a mean of 1.4. Part-time faculty ranged from zero to nine with a mean of 3.2. Coordinators were unable to estimate the full time equivalency (FTE) in four programs. Of the sixteen respondents able to compute the FTE, the range was from zero to 5.75 with a mean of 2.8.

### Courses

Coordinators were asked to identify the number of College Student Personnel courses taught in their programs. The range was from five to twenty with a mean of 8.8.

In an academic term, the range was from two to twelve courses taught with a mean of 4.4. In a year, the range was from five to twenty with a mean of 8.8. It was determined that most student personnel courses were taught at least once in a year and that the sequence was completed in two years in all programs.

Adm.

Col

inc

pro

Beh

tha

acc

in

hou

it

con

in

av

co

on

to

to

to

le

### Admissions Requirements

Admissions requirements to the doctoral programs in College Student Personnel were diverse among the universities included in the study.

Coordinators were relatively unconcerned about the prospective candidates' undergraduate and graduate majors. Behavioral science majors were preferred at slightly more than one-fourth of the universities. As prerequisites for acceptance, students were required to have sixteen hours in the behavioral sciences at one institution and sixteen hours of education at another university. In all instances, it was possible for a student to register for appropriate courses and practical experiences to qualify him in areas in which he was deficient.

Admissions policies spelled out certain grade point averages that a prospective student should present to be considered for admission to a doctoral program. "B" averages on the master's level were sufficiently high for students to be admitted to several doctoral programs. Slightly more than one-fourth (six universities) recommended, however, that a prospective doctoral student present at least a 3.5 average on a 4.0 scale from the master's

program. One university examined the student's grades from his last sixty hours. Another university required that a student have a "B" average on his last one-hundred hours which included undergraduate and graduate course work. One respondent stated that grade point averages were not important and that his university was not concerned about them. Instead, the goals of the prospective doctoral student were emphasized and carefully scrutinized.

The recommended grade point averages, in practice, were not rigidly adhered to. If students had other attributes, such as minority group status or extensive experience, they were admitted to doctoral programs without the requisite grade point average.

All but one of the universities (nineteen out of twenty) required a prospective student to take an examination as part of the admissions procedure. The Miller Analogies Test and the Graduate Record Examination were the most often used tests. Six universities required the Miller Analogies Test; six required the Graduate Record Examination; four required both tests; and three universities required one or the other.

Other examinations were also compulsory at several institutions. The Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory

was used for screening purposes at two universities. To a much lesser extent, the Cooperative English, the Watson-Blazer, the National Teacher Examination, and the Advanced Graduate Record Examination were other instruments utilized by various universities. The Advanced Graduate Record Examination was a requirement at two universities. The Cooperative English and the Watson-Blazer were both given at one university and the National Teacher Examination was used by only one institution.

When the Graduate Record Examination was the preferred test, the recommended scores for admission ranged from 870 to 1200 with 1000 as the most often mentioned score. From 50 to above 60 were the suggested scores on the Miller Analogies Test. No specific levels on the tests were required at seven universities. Even at the universities where certain levels were recommended on the tests, the requirements were flexible. The scores were an indication of the students' abilities along with his other attributes and were used more or less as a weighting factor.

Personal interviews were required for a prospective candidate at eleven universities, while they were highly recommended at five other institutions. Interviews were not a part of the admission procedure at four universities.

Most often the interviews were conducted on the campus, but they were also held at professional conferences. Usually the interview was conducted by one College Student Personnel faculty member, but student-faculty committees and faculty committees were occasionally utilized. Where distance and other factors made a personal interview infeasible, colleagues at other institutions were requested to conduct the interview and make recommendations. Or in other cases, an interview might not be required if the coordinator knew the institution and the individuals with whom the prospective candidate had worked.

Without exception, prospective doctoral students were required to present written recommendations in support of their applications for admission. From three to five letters of recommendation were necessary at all institutions. One university wanted letters from all places where the student had had significant employment experience. Another institution was mainly concerned about academic potential. Mostly the universities wanted letters from people who knew the prospective candidate well in terms of either his previous work experience or his potential for College Student Personnel work.

Another criteria for admission to a doctoral program in College Student Personnel was work experience. Fourteen universities required some kind of full-time employment after the master's degree. Three years teaching or its equivalent was required at one university. At four universities, the work experience needed to be in the field of higher education or in College Student Personnel for at least two or three years. The other ten universities did not specify the kind of full-time work experience that was necessary, but they did recommend a minimum of two years. Occasionally, the justification for the work experience was in terms of employability after the doctorate was earned.

Three universities did not require any full-time employment and three other universities considered the student's work experiences along with other factors when they were reviewing his application for admission.

Commitment was a quality that nearly all of the coordinators were concerned about. A student needed to be committed to the field of higher education in most cases and in other instances the commitment needed to be to a career in College Student Personnel. A student's attitudes about commitment were often times explored in the personal



interviews. Some coordinators made assessments of this quality through statements on the application form, from recommendations and from the student's work experiences.

Coordinators listed a number of personal characteristics that they desired in prospective doctoral students. Human relations skills, the ability to communicate, leadership skills and maturity were the most commonly mentioned characteristics. Other attributes cited were creativity, motivation, independence and cooperation. One coordinator made these comments, "He (the prospective candidate) should have personality characteristics that give evidence of being able to work with people and he should be able to tolerate a reasonable amount of ambiguity. He should have the kind of personality where he can function in stress settings and yet come through effectively in working with young people." Another respondent stated, "Of course the student should have basic, natural intelligence and ability to conceptualize, but also the ability to relate to other people and to be sensitive to others. The ability to integrate theory and practice is a must. He should also have appropriate values for working with college students and have more or less proven that he is positive in regard towards other people versus being harmful and hurtful."

The percentage of students accepted into the doctoral programs varied considerably. One coordinator had no figures available on this question and another could only reply that a high percentage of students was admitted. Many of the other institutions had only "guesstimates" of the percentage accepted. Of the eighteen who supplied percentages, the range was from ten per cent to ninety per cent with a mean of 43.5 per cent of those applying who were admitted into the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs.

### Recruitment

Several methods of recruitment of doctoral candidates were employed by the College Student Personnel program coordinators. Formal and informal recruitment activities were utilized in the programs.

Formal recruitment was characterized by the sponsorship of off-campus visitations by faculty and by the preparation and distribution of publications describing the programs. Seven coordinators reported formal recruitment procedures. In four cases, letters and fliers were sent to administrators and student personnel deans in selected colleges and universities. One university had actively attempted to attract minority students and

had sponsored visitations and brochures for minority recruitment. Formal recruitment for another university consisted of a four to five page program description that was distributed at conventions. Brochures were sent to those inquiring about the doctoral program from another institution. According to the coordinator at one university, the purpose of formal recruitment "was for the purpose of getting good candidates, not to the extent of getting new, strange names."

One coordinator reported that he had done a considerable amount of recruiting when his institution had NDEA Institutes and Fellowships, but that without funding he had not been recruiting.

Four universities did not recruit at all. One coordinator stated that students recruited themselves at his institution. Another commented that his candidates were mostly part-time or full-time staff members. All four of these universities had few doctoral candidates in their College Student Personnel preparation program and three of them had part-time coordinators.

Sixteen universities reported informal recruitment activities. Eight of the sixteen respondents felt that a great deal of their recruitment and contacts came from

former graduates. Two coordinators commented that they traveled extensively in their states in conjunction with their internship programs and that their contacts worked greatly to the advantage of their programs. Another thought that attracting students was based upon the reputation of the university, the program and word of mouth, in that order.

Two of the larger programs sponsored student produced College Student Personnel journals and the coordinators felt that the journals reached many potential doctoral students through mailings to alumni and College Student Personnel educators.

According to another respondent, professional staff attending and participating in professional meetings publicized their programs through word of mouth.

Another interviewee commented, "We are also assisted in recruitment by colleagues from other institutions who have students they feel would profit from our program and who recommend that these students make application here."

#### Typical Doctoral Program

A typical doctoral program in College Student Personnel at each university was described by the respondents. Most

d

f

w

C

a

A

a

e

H

C

e

u

P

t

h

c

Pa

E

ts

doctoral programs in College Student Personnel required from fifteen to thirty courses past the master's degree with twenty courses as the median and the mean.

The major areas of study in all the programs included College Student Personnel, Higher Education, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Administrative Theory, Applied Administration, Historical and Philosophical Foundations and Research. Some similarities and many differences existed among the requisites from campus to campus. A Higher Education course on one campus might be called a College Student Personnel course on another campus. No examination was conducted by the researcher to determine uniformity of course content.

Programs required from one course in College Student Personnel to eleven courses, with students on most campuses taking three College Student Personnel courses.

Higher Education courses were a part of more than half of the programs. The range was from one to six courses with an average of four courses.

Counseling and Educational Psychology courses were a part of eighty per cent of the programs. Students carried from one to ten courses in this area with five courses as the average.

Administrative Theory courses were taken by College Student Personnel doctoral students in five programs. Students took from one to four courses in Administrative Theory with an average of two courses. Applied Administration courses were a part of three preparation programs with students carrying an average of one course.

Research courses, including statistics, computer and methodology courses, were mandatory in all of the programs. From two to five courses were required with three as the average.

Historical and Philosophical Foundations courses were a requisite in about half of the programs. The range was from one to seven courses with three as the mean.

Students studying for the Ph.D. on four campuses were required to successfully complete a language examination or to take research courses in lieu of a language.

Cognates or minors outside the College where the major was taught were a requirement in slightly more than half of the programs. The minimum number of courses recommended was three; the maximum was ten; and the mean was six courses.

Internships-field work-practica were a part of all the programs and the number of hours credit awarded for the

practical experiences ranged from no credit to fourteen hours credit with a mean of eight hours credit.

In summary, students in College Student Personnel at the twenty universities included in this study could expect to complete approximately twenty courses on the doctoral level. The areas of study common to the various programs were College Student Personnel, Higher Education, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Administrative Theory, Applied Administration, Historical and Philosophical Foundations, Research, a cognate or minor and an internship-practicum experience. In addition, students in all programs were expected to conduct research upon which to base a dissertation.

### Practical Work Experiences

The terms--field work, practicum, and internship--appeared to be used interchangeably. An internship in one setting might be called a practicum or field work experience in another setting. Sixteen universities offered internships; four had field work experiences and six had practicum arrangements.

At several universities, the internship for doctoral students provided for a rotation of experiences in various student personnel offices, depending upon the previous work



1

experience and goals of the student. These assignments carried credit and required from ten to twenty hours of work a week.

In one location, an internship was a year-long in-depth experience in one office. At another university, the internship was a part-time position within a related student personnel service. It was usually an experience for a master's student and it carried credit. Another institution defined the internship as a quarter-time or half-time assistantship in the residence halls, the College Union, or the activities office. At one university, human relations training could be substituted for an internship experience.

Field work or field work experience was thought of by several respondents as a job. One coordinator differentiated field work from a practicum by the location of the experience. Field work took place at another university while a practicum was arranged on the student's campus.

The field work experience at one institution consisted of an assignment at an agency for twenty hours a week for two semesters. This experience might or might not carry credit and it might or might not be a paid position. The student would be assigned specific kinds of responsibilities

within the agency categorized by "interaction functions," "administrative functions," "need to know functions," "research functions," and "problem encounter functions."

The practicum consisted of practical work in student personnel offices, with academic departments, or in general university administration. The student might spend four hours a week for one semester in one office or he might spend fifteen to twenty hours a week for one term in several offices. Usually the practicum experience carried credit for the students.

The practicum at another university was a practical work experience for the master's student, while the internship was a practical work experience for the doctoral student.

Practical work experiences were available in these kinds of offices: Activities, Admissions, Campus Ombudsman, Career Planning and Placement, Counseling Center, Dean of Students, Extension Division, Financial Aids, Foreign Student Advising, Fraternity Affairs, Housing, Judicial Affairs, Institutional Research, Minority Affairs, Off-Campus Housing, Registrar, Sorority Affairs, Student Health, Student Publications, Student Union, Vice-Chancellor, Vice-President for Administration and

Vice-President for Business. Many universities had elicited cooperation from agencies and colleges in the immediate vicinity to provide practical experiences. One urban university counted a possibility of ninety institutional settings where practical work experiences were available. Internship experiences were being developed in community colleges and in church-related institutions. Students were also interning with Boards of Trustees, Community Mental Health Clinics and State Law Libraries. Students on several campuses completed an internship by planning, teaching, and coordinating an ongoing workshop for residence hall staff.

Most doctoral candidates in College Student Personnel were experienced in the field before entering a preparation program. When a student came into a doctoral program with extensive experience in College Student Personnel, the field work-practicum-internship was often waived. However, it was not unusual for advisers to recommend a practical experience if the student needed to fill in a void in some area.

Some programs required the student to take several Practical experiences. One university required seven separate internships. Conversely, students were discouraged from taking more than a few hours in internships in other

programs. At one university the student could count no more than six hours in practical experiences toward the degree. Several universities had no requirements at all for any field work-practicum-internship experiences.

The supervisors of the practical experiences were the professionals responsible for the agencies. Typical titles of the supervisors might be Dean, Associate Dean or Director. At one university, the supervisor had to have at least the equivalent of an Education Specialist degree in terms of background preparation and must be a successfully functioning person in his own office. At another university, the supervisor either had to have a doctoral degree or extensive experience. In addition, the quality of his program had to have been established as being appropriate.

Most preparation program coordinators met periodically with the on-site supervisors. Sometimes this was done individually and sometimes in a group. One coordinator commented that ideally he would bring together the students and the supervisors by office area several times a semester. However, for lack of time, this was not possible.

In essence, the practicum-internship-field work arrangements consisted of practical work experience for the student. Consistency did not exist from campus to campus

on terminology of the experience, on amount of time spent in the activity, on number of required experiences, or on the location of the experience.

### Examinations

A written examination toward the completion of the student's course work was a requisite at all twenty universities. This examination was identified as a "candidacy" examination at one university, a "certification" examination at one university, a "comprehensive" examination at nine universities, a "preliminary" examination (even though it came near the end of the student's program) at five universities, and a "qualifying" examination at four universities. These written examinations ranged in duration from four hours to twenty-four hours and from one day to six days with twelve hours as the average.

Two universities had an additional hurdle at the beginning of the program. One required a two hour preliminary oral with the student and the other had a six hour written preliminary examination which the student must pass to be admitted to candidacy.

Oral examinations followed the written examinations at eight universities. If the student's performance was marginal on the written examinations, orals might be requested at five other universities.

A distinctively different approach to the oral examination was indicated at one university. Each doctoral examinee was assigned to an institution of higher learning as a consultant for a week. The student was scheduled to spend three days consulting at the institution and then return to his campus for four days to write a twenty-five to fifty page consultant's report. This report became the basis for the student's oral examination.

All of the twenty universities also required an oral defense of the dissertation which might take anywhere from one and one-half to three hours with two hours as the average.

#### Dissertation Credit

The number of hours granted for the dissertation varied from no credit to forty-five quarter hours.

Of the eleven institutions on a semester hour basis, five offered no credit for the dissertation and the range was from zero to thirty semester hours. The average number of credits granted for the dissertation at these institutions was nine semester hours.

At the nine universities granting quarter hour credit, dissertation credit ranged from nine to forty-five hours with twenty-seven quarter hours as the mean.

With all credits converted to a semester hour equivalency, the average number of hours awarded for the dissertation was thirteen credits.

#### Percentage of Graduates

The percentage of College Student Personnel doctoral students who graduated from their universities ranged from sixty per cent in one institution to one-hundred per cent in five institutions. The programs that had a one-hundred per cent graduation rate enrolled few students and began in the last five years. In fifteen of the twenty universities, more than ninety per cent of the doctoral students graduated. Among the twenty universities, the median graduation rate was ninety-three per cent, the mean was eighty-nine per cent and the standard deviation was eleven per cent.

One coordinator commented that his program would have a higher graduation rate if more of the women in the program would complete their dissertations. He felt that these women did not have the drive "career-wise" that the men may have. He thought that some of these women may not even see themselves going into the job market.

Another coordinator stated that once a student was accepted into the College Student Personnel program, about



the only basis on which he did not graduate was when it was detected early in the program that he was not going to "work out." In such instances the student was encouraged to transfer to another program, to drop, or in some cases to take an Educational Specialist degree instead. At that university, it was felt that the student should not experience a pure failure.

Two philosophies of admissions seemed evident from these graduation percentages. One embraced giving the student a chance, but had a high attrition rate. The other involved a strict policy with admissions being granted only to students with a high probability of success.

#### Completion Time

Of those who graduated from the College Student Personnel doctoral preparation programs, the average amount of time taken for completion ranged from two years to five years. Among the twenty universities, the median was three years, the mean was 3.3 and the standard deviation was .07.

In the program where the average amount of time taken for completion was five years, most of the students were working full-time and were pursuing doctoral studies on a part-time basis. Another coordinator commented that a

number of his students carried full-time residence hall assignments while doing graduate work and he encouraged them to spend at least three to four years completing their doctoral work.

#### Financial Assistance

Varying amounts of financial assistance administered through the institutions were available for College Student Personnel candidates. Virtually all of the universities had assistantships either in the department or in other campus locations for doctoral students. Three universities had a limited number of fellowships reserved for College Student Personnel candidates. Fellowships on a competitive basis were available for all doctoral students at eleven universities. Scholarships in the form of out-of-state tuition remission were also a possibility on three campuses. One university offered an \$1800 scholarship for a College Student Personnel doctoral student. Part-time employment was obtainable on nearly every campus.

#### Percentage of Financial Assistance

The percentage of doctoral College Student Personnel candidates who had financial assistance administered through the institution ranged from ten per cent to one-hundred per cent. One coordinator had no figures about

the percentage of his students having assistance, but he commented that there was "not much." Another respondent stated that nearly all of his students were employed full-time and "money was not a factor."

Eighteen coordinators ventured estimates of the percentage of their students with financial assistance. At five universities all doctoral College Student Personnel students had financial assistance. In the eighteen programs, the median percentage of students with assistance was ninety per cent and the mean was seventy-six per cent.

#### Travel Grants

Travel grants for doctoral candidates to attend professional meetings were regularly available at only one of the universities. At this university, \$100 travel grants were provided for doctoral students once during their candidacy. Two other universities on occasion were able to provide travel grants ranging in value from fifty to one-hundred dollars. Two universities were sometimes able to furnish state cars for doctoral students to drive to meetings. One university occasionally was in a position to present a fifty dollar award to a student if he were presenting a paper at a meeting.

Fifteen of the twenty universities were unable at any time to provide travel grants or any financial assistance to a student to attend a professional meeting.

#### Follow Up of Graduates

The follow up of graduates of the College Student Personnel preparation programs varied from none to an annual formal study. One university reported that a follow up had not been done, because there was no one with that kind of concern.

Eleven of the twenty coordinators commented that follow ups were conducted informally through personal correspondence and professional meetings. Nine universities prepared an address list and sent out a newsletter at least once a year. Two sent internal professional publications to all their former students.

Follow up studies had been conducted at several of the universities. One administered a study two years ago to determine if their graduates were employed in occupations related to their training. In another university a fairly comprehensive study was undertaken by doctoral candidates every five to seven years. One program which had been in existence over twenty years was in the process of a study and had gone back to the original graduates. One institution

followed up its graduates once a year with a questionnaire. The graduates of this university were also asked to identify from their perspective the current issues in higher education each year.

Several coordinators expressed an interest in doing more with follow up but felt handicapped by lack of time or by lack of secretarial assistance. Only a handful of students had graduated from some of the programs and the coordinators planned to conduct more extensive studies after more students had received their degrees.

#### Evaluation.

On all twenty campuses, some kind of evaluation procedures were in existence. Informal evaluations were most common, but highly structured formal evaluations were also indicated. Constant and continuing evaluations were reported by several coordinators.

Course evaluations were conducted by many instructors at the conclusion of their classes each term. At some universities, these were mandatory and were written evaluations. At others, they were informal and were often times handled in a seminar or as a group discussion.

Other types of informal evaluations were also mentioned. At one university, informal get-togethers with

faculty and students were held each term to keep in contact with one another and to get the students' feedback about what should be happening. At this same university, graduates were asked informally what they would change about the program.

Various kinds of committees also were formed to study the curricula, the programs and the style of the programs. Three coordinators pointed to their on-going student advisory committees which concerned themselves with program and course content. On most campuses, the departmental faculties reviewed their programs and course offerings periodically. Five respondents mentioned the effectiveness of the student-faculty committees at their universities. One student-faculty committee had been meeting for several hours a week for many months to develop an alternate curriculum for the student who wanted a different kind of preparation, perhaps through field work and independent study.

In discussing evaluation, one respondent commented, "New faculty will tell you what you should be doing."

At ten universities, questionnaires had been developed and sent to graduates of the programs. Alumni had been asked to evaluate their courses as viewed from the

perspective of some work experience. Most coordinators found the responses to be valuable, but one commented that the feedback was not terribly helpful. The most common questions asked were: "What course experiences were most helpful?" "Least helpful?" "What were the strengths and weakness of the program?" "What recommendations do you have?" Several of the programs made major changes after receiving the recommendations of the alumni. Courses in accounting, law and politics were added at one university on the basis of requests from the graduates. At another university group work was recommended by the alumni and has now been incorporated into the program.

Several coordinators reported that they were working on instruments to determine alumni reactions to their programs. At least three colleges were planning a formal evaluation for next year. A few of the programs reported few graduates to date and were waiting for more students to finish before undertaking formal evaluations.

Three universities evaluated their programs regularly every two years. However, formal evaluations followed no time pattern on most of the campuses. Two others seemed to evaluate whenever they had available graduate students to assist with a study.

A semi-structured interview was held with the practicum supervisors at one university to evaluate the practica experiences. No references to other formal or semi-formal evaluations of internship, practicum, or field work experiences were made by other respondents. Informal evaluations of practicum arrangements were mentioned by two other coordinators.

Another type of evaluation was reported by one respondent. He felt that his program was being effectively received by practitioners in the field, since all of his students had been placed upon graduation.

#### Quality Programs

Coordinators were asked, "In your opinion what makes a quality College Student Personnel preparation program?" Most coordinators concluded that a quality program required quality people, including faculty and students. Quality faculty members were described as people who were enthusiastic about what they were doing and were attitudinally inspired by the kinds of concepts existing in the field. It was felt that faculty must have a sound theoretical and philosophical background, as well as considerable practical experience in the field. It was recommended that faculty members should be full-time and that they should be



professional change agents, eager to make an impact on the field. The coordinators thought that faculty members needed to role model innovation and change, even though it could be a painful experience.

According to the respondents, quality programs must have quality students. Programs should admit only the best qualified applicants, according to the respondents, and should have a large number of candidates from which to choose. Better screening processes were recommended in order to assure that students would be successful in the academic program and in the profession.

The interaction between faculty and students was deemed to be a critical factor in a quality program. The atmosphere in the program should be supportive and promote equality between faculty and students. Ideally it would exude a mutuality in learning and should encourage an openness toward growth in faculty and students together. Faculty should use all the known ways of determining motivations and ability.

Other major ingredients listed by the respondents in a quality program included sufficient elaboration of the program and the institutional resources to accommodate the elaboration. The program must respond to the interests,

needs, abilities and professional goals of a diverse student population enrolled in the program. Most coordinators felt that student programs needed to be developed individually because the notion of a standardized program was philosophically unsuited to student personnel work.

The coordinators wanted a quality program to be well conceived on a theoretical and an academic basis. Strong supporting departments and excellent library facilities were viewed as a must. Innovative curriculum changes were encouraged and meeting and anticipating the real and current needs of students were felt to be important. Rigor in terms of assessment was also mentioned as a part of a quality program. This was not felt to be contradictory to the mutuality and support dimension, according to those who discussed this topic. They felt that most students really wanted to be tested in showing what they have learned. Several respondents underscored the need for a broad orientation in a quality program and stated that the emphasis should be on administration and not on counseling.

Ample opportunity for practical experience was another component in a quality program. Internships in a variety of vicinities, collegiate as well as community settings, were strongly recommended.

Cooperation with the student affairs staff was also an element thought to be necessary in a quality program. Constant articulation between the student affairs staff and the preparation program was deemed essential. With a direct tie between the two, the student affairs staff could be constantly revitalized by the presence of an academic program and the academic program could be confronted with the reality of the practical application.

Quality programs must be an adequate size to support an adequate number of courses, seminars, and practica. The criticism was voiced that too many College Student Personnel preparation programs were being "bootlegged" under other departments with only one or two courses addressing themselves to the College Student Personnel area.

Another aspect of a quality program concerned a student's performance in the field after graduation and his involvement in professional organizations. "How do people respond to him?" "How does he perform?"

### Leading Programs

Coordinators had a great deal of difficulty listing in rank order the five leading College Student Personnel Preparation programs in the United States at the present time. Several commented that they had little information

about programs and that they really did not know which were outstanding. Others could identify some leading programs but could not put them into a priority listing.

Fifteen coordinators listed from three to six leading programs in rank order. Five coordinators listed from three to seven programs in no order. All told, thirty College Student Personnel programs were identified by the coordinators.

A point system was devised in order to compare the relative rankings of the programs. Five points were given for a number one ranking, four for a number two, three for a number three, two for a number four and one for a number five. The programs which were not ranked were handled as tied scores. For example, if three programs were listed, each was given four points. (Five plus four plus three divided by three) If five were listed, each was given three points. (Five plus four plus three plus two plus one divided by five) The number of points for each program was computed and the comparisons were made.

According to the coordinators interviewed, the leading College Student Personnel doctoral preparation programs in rank order in the United States at the present time are: Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State

University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota.

### Reasons for the Selections

After the coordinators had listed the five leading doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel, they were asked the reasons for their selections. The most frequently listed reasons were the faculty and graduates of the programs. These people were visible in the field as effective spokesmen and researchers. Several coordinators stated that they saw more leadership from both faculty and graduates of the institutions they had chosen than from any others. Another respondent stated his observations negatively. He felt some of the programs were poor because they were not producing very competent graduates. Many coordinators thought that if the College Student Personnel faculty members were good, their graduates would be good. When graduates were in positions of leadership and their performances were outstanding, they represented their doctoral granting institution creditably. Respondents thought that another indication of a leading program consisted of their graduates being sought for employment.

Programs were also selected on the basis of significant literature and research coming from the programs and of

practical and innovative approaches to program development. Several coordinators felt the number of years a program had been in existence, the size of the staff and an optimum number of students were other factors to be considered in the selection of a leading program. Other criteria included the quality of the institution, the adequacy of the curriculum and the breadth and history of the program. Also mentioned were the opportunities for a variety of practical experiences, diverse resources, sufficient financing and flexibility.

While it was difficult to ascertain the reasons a program gained a reputation for excellence, most coordinators posited that it was based on the quality of the faculty and the quality of the students produced.

### Comparisons

Each coordinator was asked to compare his program with the ones he listed as the leading programs. Four coordinators felt that their programs compared favorably with the leading programs. Three out of the four programs were listed in the leading five by the respondents.

One coordinator felt that he could not compare the programs overall because each had a special emphasis. Two others avoided answering the question. One pointed to the

strengths in his university's program. Another rated his program at the midpoint.

Eleven respondents felt that their programs could not compare with the leading programs at all. Several commented about their institutional problems and indicated that it would be possible for them to have stronger programs if they had money and staff. According to one, his program was not even in the "same league" as far as output was concerned. Several did not envision their programs as specializing in College Student Personnel preparation. Another, almost defensively, stated that his graduates could compete successfully with graduates of the leading programs.

#### Changes Desired

Without exception all of the preparation program coordinators desired some changes in their programs. These changes included more staff and financial support, new modes of instruction, expanded field experiences, greater flexibility, selective admissions policies and philosophical modifications.

Eight coordinators felt a real need for additional staff. Three of these wanted a full-time director for their programs. Two needed staff to provide more supervision in the internship and practical activities. One desired

new staff members to help both in diversity of philosophy and emphasis.

Financial support for other needs besides staff was mentioned by four additional respondents. Three universities would use additional funds for assistantships and fellowships. Two coordinators thought that workshops, institutes and short courses should be a part of their programs. One talked at length about the need to offer opportunities for professional people to update and "retool" themselves.

Two respondents representing programs without full-time coordinators wanted institutional commitments to their programs. Incorporated with commitment would be the identification of the program, the establishment of specific goals and objectives and the determination of admission and graduation standards. Articulation between the program faculty and the student personnel practitioners to coordinate efforts would also be necessary.

One coordinator had no immediate desires to change his total program except to encourage open appraisal and interaction among faculty and students to develop new kinds of experiences together.



Several respondents commented about course work. Two thought that new courses should be added to their programs. Two wanted to drop irrelevant required course work. Another wanted to increase the research component in his program. Another felt that technique courses could be taught more appropriately by teaching them specifically for institutional and personal purposes. Two universities had moved toward more mini-courses and another was experimenting with individualized instruction. A part-time coordinator lamented the fact that he did not have time to develop courses as he would like. Two respondents hoped to develop more field work experiences. To encourage student personnel graduates to listen and relate to students, another coordinator wanted to include more individual counseling, but not psychological counseling, in his program. Two respondents desired greater flexibility in planning individualized programs of study for their students.

Several coordinators felt a need for shifts in program emphases and philosophies. Three discussed their institution's efforts in implementing a developmental approach. Two hoped to see a marriage between College Student Personnel and Higher Education, stressing the desirability of broad leadership preparation at the doctoral level.

Admissions selections were a concern on five campuses. One respondent commented that he would not recommend taking young students for the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation program. Another felt that his institution would be more selective in admissions and would cut down in numbers. Two others made similar statements that their universities were not planning to enroll more students, since job opportunities after graduation were not available.

Other changes desired included the active recruitment of minorities and women students. According to one respondent, he would like to have twenty per cent minority and a few more women students. He felt that women were being told not to enroll in his program because it had the reputation of being very difficult.

Two coordinators wanted to involve their faculties and doctoral students in research efforts. They felt this would be a good experience for everyone concerned. The faculty would publish and the students would obtain research experience. Both coordinators thought that generating research within the programs was an extremely important aspect of the programs.

Changes Predicted

Coordinators predicted a number of changes in their programs in the next five years and the reasons for many of the changes. Most commented that the future was difficult to foresee because College Student Personnel had been under constant change.

Half of the respondents anticipated a leveling off or even a drop in the numbers of students being admitted to the College Student Personnel preparation programs. Three coordinators felt very pessimistic about the future of their preparation programs. One saw a cutting back in students and staff and had serious questions about the financial support of the doctoral program. Another coordinator thought that the future of his program depended upon the economy. He stated that his institution needed to make a decision regarding the preparation program. In his opinion the program was "muddling" and was in a holding pattern with students. The other coordinator who could be characterized as discouraged felt that his program would either be eliminated or would move in the direction of hiring a full-time coordinator.

Most coordinators speculated that only the master's programs would be cut back significantly because of the

lack of employment opportunities for graduates. A number of respondents felt that the number of College Student Personnel doctoral students would remain at nearly the same level, but that the composition would change. Six indicated that special attention would be paid to minority group and women students. One stated, "It is going to be difficult for the young, Anglo-Saxon male to get into a College Student Personnel program." Another hoped to change the proportion of women and minorities in his program, but felt that it was difficult to interest them in the field. According to another respondent, admissions would be contingent upon who could be placed upon graduation.

Three respondents previewed new administrative structures. In their opinion, the College Student Personnel preparation programs would become associated with other areas of education. They discussed relationships between College Student Personnel and higher education, between College Student Personnel and adult education, and between College Student Personnel, higher education, research and educational administration.

Several coordinators felt that a review of curriculum, content, and quality of the College Student Personnel programs must be systematic and continual to make them

relevant to changes that occur in higher education in general. Another coordinator felt that there would be little change in the philosophical orientation and goals of his program because of budgetary and practical considerations. Future objectives for one program included reanalyzing what they had, strengthening the student development emphasis and developing more quality.

Another coordinator predicted that the quality in the doctoral preparation programs would increase, since he thought the trend would be for practitioners to return to college for the doctorate while they were relatively young. In his opinion, older student personnel people never really grasped the whole picture when they took a course here and a course there in a piecemeal approach. He also felt that much more counseling and guidance expertise would be needed by student personnel people in the future. He reasoned that there would be more vocational-technical schools and that more counselors and fewer administrators would be needed.

One coordinator was concerned about student personnel practitioners maintaining relationships with the academic world. He felt that the student personnel roles were being challenged and that student personnel administrators must make an impact on the university.

One respondent felt that more input in terms of humanistic, group kinds of experiences was needed and that significance would be placed on group counseling and working with groups.

Preparation for diversity was stressed by several respondents. With such a diversity of students being admitted to colleges in the future, their needs will require new procedures for working with them.

The need for administrative theory in doctoral preparation programs was stressed, as well as a need for a broader curriculum. Other curricular changes predicted were the expansion of internship and practicum opportunities, the addition of courses on the legal aspects of College Student Personnel administration, the addition of systems analysis courses and a shift from teaching about the individual student to teaching about student subcultures.

One university was thinking about a center kind of approach to College Student Personnel preparation. This would be an open kind of program with more hurdles built in. Courses and grades would be eliminated and a student's progress would be recorded in a cumulative file. Future oriented classes were a major concern of the faculty at that university. They wanted to move away from courses

which merely distributed information and were discussing the construction of a curriculum that would be relevant to someone ten to twenty years from now. They were dealing with such questions as, "What will happen to College Student Personnel and counseling if the counter-culture takes over?" or "What will happen when collective bargaining comes onto the campus?" The gathering and rejecting of information was emphasized. According to the coordinator, "Today's fact is tomorrow's piece of misinformation." He felt that educators could stay current by doing research.

Another coordinator predicted that faculty will surface who will bring expertise in research, analysis and interpretation of the literature that has come out of personality development psychology. These experts will interpret the data which speak directly to colleges and universities.

New roles for College Student Personnel administrators were anticipated by many respondents. The consultative model was mentioned by three coordinators and the student development model was also discussed. As a consultant, the student personnel administrator would be sought out for his expertise in working with groups and with individuals. The student development specialist would be concerned with facilitating the students' behavioral development. One

educator thought that the student personnel administrator might become a combination of a student development specialist and a political administrator. As a student development specialist, he could use and interpret the data about student clienteles and as a political administrator, he would know how to make use of the data for institutional change.

### Summary

Twenty College Student Personnel preparation programs were included in this study. Two of the programs originated in the 1930's, but nearly two-thirds of the programs had been in existence less than ten years. Counseling or educational psychology was the original emphasis in seventeen of the programs. Currently, ten of the programs have an administrative emphasis, eight have a counseling emphasis, one has a student development focus, and one stresses research.

Fourteen different titles identified the programs. The most commonly used titles were College Personnel Work and College Student Personnel Administration.

Six degrees were awarded in College Student Personnel, including the Ph.D., Ed.D., Ed.S., M.A., M.S., and M.Ed. Both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. were offered at seven universities,



only the Ph.D. at seven and only the Ed.D. at six universities.

The main purpose of the College Student Personnel programs was to offer preparation for persons who plan to serve as College Student Personnel workers. Most of the programs provided preparation for student personnel generalists, while a few offered training in specialty areas.

More of the programs embraced a pragmatic emphasis than a theoretical orientation. The reasons given for a pragmatic basis involved the experience and commitment of the staff. The need for a theoretical foundation was stressed in that theory and concept were felt to be a basis for educational practice.

Program strengths were identified as flexibility, individuality, campus resources and opportunities for meaningful work experiences. Faculty members were also singled out as the unique strengths in several of the programs.

The average number of doctoral students enrolled in the preparation programs during the 1971-1972 academic year was twenty-three and the average number of master's students was forty-six. The average number of full-time

faculty involved in the programs was 1.4 and the average number of part-time faculty in the programs was 3.2. During 1970-1971 the number of graduates of the twenty doctoral programs averaged 5.6 students from each program.

Admissions requirements were flexible on most of the campuses. Recommended grade point averages and levels of achievement on examinations were waived when a student had other attributes. Personal interviews were either required or recommended in eighty per cent of the programs. Work experience after the master's degree was necessary at seventy per cent of the institutions. The work experience was justified in terms of employability after the doctorate was granted.

The personal characteristics that the coordinators hoped to find in their candidates were human relations skills, the ability to communicate, leadership and maturity. The coordinators were also concerned about the degree of commitment on the part of the prospective student. It was felt in some cases that a student must be committed to a career in College Student Personnel and in all instances, he must be committed to the field of higher education.

A student's chances of admission into a doctoral College Student Personnel preparation program varied from

university to university. Only ten per cent of the applicants were accepted into one program, while ninety per cent were accepted on another campus. The average percentage of applicants accepted into the programs was slightly more than forty-three per cent.

Formal and informal methods of recruitment of doctoral candidates were employed by eighty per cent of the preparation programs. Formal recruitment was not as common as informal recruitment. Formal recruitment usually consisted of visitations by preparation program faculty and the preparation and distribution of publications describing the programs. Informal recruitment was practiced by sixteen universities. Reportedly more than half of the contacts came from former graduates.

Practical work experiences were available in all programs. The terminology was inconsistent from campus to campus and the experience might be called a practicum, an internship or field work. The requirements for the work experience also varied in amount of time spent in the activity, on the number of experiences required and on the location of the activity.

The typical doctoral program consisted of courses in College Student Personnel, Higher Education, Counseling and

Educational Psychology, Administrative Theory, Applied Administration, Historical and Philosophical Foundations and Research. Most programs required an average of twenty courses past the master's degree.

Written examinations were required at all twenty universities. They were called a candidacy examination, a certification examination, a comprehensive examination or a preliminary examination. These occurred near the end of the student's program and lasted from four hours to twenty-four hours. Oral examinations followed the written examinations in forty per cent of the programs.

Credits awarded for the dissertation ranged from no hours to forty-five quarter hours. All universities required an oral defense of the dissertation.

Nearly ninety per cent of the College Student Personnel doctoral students graduated from their universities. In one program only sixty per cent completed the requirements for a doctorate, but in five institutions the graduation rate was one-hundred per cent. For those who graduated, the average completion time was 3.3 years.

Financial assistance in the form of assistantships and part-time employment was available on all campuses. Slightly more than one-half of the universities had fellowships

available for all doctoral students on a competitive basis. All of the doctoral College Student Personnel students had financial assistance at five universities. The average number of students in the twenty institutions having assistantships, fellowships, scholarships and part-time employment was seventy-six per cent. Only one university was regularly able to provide travel grants for doctoral students to attend professional meetings.

Graduate follow up was an informal activity in most of the programs. Newsletters were prepared and sent out in about one-half of the universities to determine alumni evaluations of their programs. Student-faculty committees were in existence on five campuses and their recommendations for program modifications were considered.

Coordinators were asked to identify the components of a quality College Student Personnel program. Quality faculty and quality students were the most often mentioned ingredients. The interaction between faculty and students was felt to be a crucial factor. Other elements in a quality program were listed as sufficient elaboration of the program, strong supporting departments, institutional resources to accommodate the program and a well conceived curriculum. Opportunities for practical work experiences

were also underscored as an important facet of a quality program.

The coordinators felt that the leading doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel in rank order at the present time are: Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota. The respondents verbalized that they based their selections on the quality of the faculty and the graduates of the programs. Reportedly more leadership in the field was visible from both faculty and graduates of the programs mentioned. Literature and research coming from several of the programs were also criteria for selection. More than half of the coordinators felt that their programs could not compare at all with the leading programs.

All coordinators desired some changes in their programs. Forty per cent wanted staff and fifteen per cent needed a full-time director. Financial support was also needed for fellowships, assistantships, workshops, institutes and short courses. Other changes desired included new modes of instruction, expanded field experiences, greater flexibility, selective admissions policies and philosophical modifications. Coordinators emphasized the need for the recruitment of

minorities and women and several also wanted to involve their faculties and doctoral students in research efforts.

Coordinators were requested to forecast the next five years in their programs and the reasons for their predictions. One-half of the coordinators predicted a leveling off or a drop in the number of students being admitted to the preparation programs in College Student Personnel. They cited the cutback because of the reduced demand for College Student Personnel workers. Most foresaw the composition changing in the doctoral programs to include a larger proportion of women and minority students. Several coordinators previewed new administrative structures with College Student Personnel programs melding with other education specialties, such as Adult Education.

According to several respondents, a review of curriculum, content and quality of the College Student Personnel preparation programs must be undertaken to make them relevant to changes that occur in higher education in general. The need for theory and a broader curriculum were thought to be important requirements in the preparation programs. New approaches to College Student Personnel preparation were anticipated. Future oriented classes and open kinds of programs without courses and grades were also forecast. It was predicted that faculty will come forward who will

bring expertise in research, analysis and interpretation of the literature that has come from personality development theory.

New roles for College Student Personnel administrators were previewed. The consultative and student development models were mentioned. Another model discussed was the combination student development specialist and political administrator who would know how to make use of the data about student clienteles for institutional change.

The data from the faculty questionnaire are presented and analyzed in Chapter V.



## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Questionnaires

In this chapter the profile of the faculty member in the College Student Personnel preparation programs included in this study is presented. Data for this profile were obtained from responses to a survey instrument distributed to one hundred and thirteen preparation program faculty members. The total number of usable responses was one hundred and one.

The characteristics of the faculty members are presented in the areas of academic rank or title, educational background, professional experience, age, sex, percentage of time spent in College Student Personnel activities, numbers and emphasis of courses taught, participation in professional organization activities and publications. Faculty perceptions of the preparation program emphasis, of recommended program changes and of the leading doctoral programs are also examined. Comparisons are made between full-time and part-time faculty on selected characteristics.

TABLE 5.1--Sex of the Faculty Member

Sex	Number	Per Cent
Male	85	84.0
Female	<u>16</u>	<u>16.0</u>
	N=101	100.0

Sex of Faculty Member

The data show that eighty-four per cent of the faculty teaching in the College Student Personnel preparation programs were male and that sixteen per cent were female.

TABLE 5.2--Ages of the College Student Personnel Preparation Program Faculty

Ages	Number	Per Cent
30 or less	11	10.9
31-35	21	20.8
36-40	21	20.8
41-45	23	22.8
46-50	8	7.9
51-55	8	7.9
56-60	6	5.9
over 60	<u>3</u>	<u>2.9</u>
	N=101	99.9 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100.0 due to rounding procedures employed

Ages of Faculty

It was found that the majority of the faculty members were between the ages of 31 and 45 with 64.4 per cent in

this age range. Nearly eleven per cent of the faculty members were 30 years of age or younger. The age range of 46 to 55 included 15.8 per cent while the range of 56 to over 60 included 8.8 per cent. The youngest faculty member was 25 and the oldest was 63 with a mean of 40.8.

TABLE 5.3--Academic Rank or Title

Rank or Title	Number	Per Cent
Professor	19	18.8
Associate Professor	11	10.9
Assistant Professor	7	6.9
Instructor	2	2.0
Vice-President for Student Affairs, Dean of Students	11	10.9
Associate or Assistant Dean of Students	14	13.9
Counselor	19	18.8
Other	<u>18</u>	<u>17.8</u>
	N=101	100.0

#### Academic Rank or Title

Table 5.3 reveals the titles of those teaching in the College Student Personnel preparation programs. 38.6 per cent are faculty members; 18.8 per cent are counselors and over forty per cent are College Student Personnel administrators. Titles included in the "Other" category (17.8 per cent) are Directors of Housing, Residence Hall Programming, Admissions, Financial Aid, University Center;

Vice Presidents for Administration and Finance and Public Affairs and Assistants to the President.

TABLE 5.4--Time Spent in College Student Personnel Preparation Program Responsibilities

Time	Number	Per Cent
Full Time	22	22.0
3/4 Time	2	2.0
1/2 Time	11	11.0
1/4 Time	22	22.0
Occasional	42	42.0
No Time	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>
	N=100	100.0

Time Spent in College Student Personnel Preparation Program Responsibilities

The data indicate that twenty-two per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty were full-time and seventy-eight per cent were part-time.

TABLE 5.5--Doctoral Degree

Degree	Number	Per Cent
Ph.D.	47	46.5
Ed.D	42	41.6
Other	1	1.0
None	<u>11</u>	<u>10.9</u>
	N=101	100.0

Doctoral Degree

Examination of the data reveals that eighty-nine per cent of the faculty teaching in the College Student

Personnel preparation programs have doctoral degrees.

TABLE 5.6--Doctoral Major

Major	Number	Per Cent
College Student Personnel	30	33.7
Higher Education	7	7.9
Counseling Psychology	8	9.0
Psychology	4	4.5
Guidance and Counseling	9	10.1
Educational Psychology	7	7.9
Counseling	13	14.6
Other	<u>11</u>	<u>12.3</u>
	N=89	100.0

#### Doctoral Major

Slightly more than thirty-three per cent of the faculty in the College Student Personnel preparation programs received their doctorate in College Student Personnel. Fifty-four per cent majored in Higher Education, Counseling Psychology, Psychology, Guidance and Counseling, Educational Psychology or Counseling. Twelve per cent indicated that their doctoral majors were in "Other" areas. Among those areas listed were Political Science, Law, English Communication, Educational Administration and Education.

TABLE 5.7--Year of Doctoral Degree

Year	Number	Per Cent
Before 1950	10	11.2
1951-1955	5	5.6
1956-1960	11	12.4
1961-1965	18	20.2
1966-1970	35	39.3
After 1970	<u>10</u>	<u>11.2</u>
	N=89	99.9 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100.0 due to rounding procedures employed

#### Year of Doctoral Degree

Slightly more than fifty per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty received their doctoral degrees after 1966. 32.6 per cent of the doctoral degrees were awarded between 1956 and 1965 and 16.8 per cent before 1955.

#### Institution of Doctoral Degree

It will be recalled from the previous chapter that in the opinion of the coordinators, the leading College Student Personnel preparation programs in rank order at the present time are Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota. 38.9 per cent of the faculty teaching in the preparation programs earned

their doctorates at these five universities. 14.4 per cent of the preparation program faculty graduated from the university ranked number one; 5.6 per cent from the number two ranked program; 1.1 per cent from number three; 11.1 per cent from number four and 6.7 per cent from number five. 61.1 per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty received their doctoral degrees from twenty-nine other colleges and universities.

TABLE 5.8--Master's Degrees

Degree	Number	Per Cent
M.A.	55	54.5
M.S.	17	16.8
M.Ed.	18	17.8
None	7	6.9
Other	<u>4</u>	<u>3.9</u>
	N=101	99.9 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100.0 due to rounding procedures employed

### Master's Degrees

Table 5.8 shows that ninety-three per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty have a master's degree. Four faculty members earned other degrees such as the M.B.A. or the M.S.W. Of the individuals listing no master's degree, several indicated

that they had proceeded to a doctoral degree from the baccalaureate degree and the others did not identify the master's degree.

TABLE 5.9--Major of Master's Degree

Major	Number	Per Cent
College Student Personnel	7	7.6
Higher Education	2	2.2
Counseling Psychology	1	1.1
Psychology	4	4.4
Guidance and Counseling	31	33.7
Educational Psychology	6	6.5
Counseling	12	13.0
Other	<u>29</u>	<u>31.5</u>
	N=92	100.0

Major of Master's Degree

33.7 per cent of the College Student Personnel faculty members majored in Guidance and Counseling on the master's level. 27.1 per cent were granted degrees in Higher Education, Counseling Psychology, Psychology, Educational Psychology and Counseling. 7.6 per cent earned a master's degree in College Student Personnel. Fields represented by those who listed other majors were Education, Business, Political Science and History, Math, French, Philosophy, English, Social Work and Human Relations.



TABLE 5.10--Year of Master's Degree

Year	Number	Per Cent
Before 1950	15	16.1
1951-1955	15	16.1
1956-1960	22	23.7
1961-1965	25	26.9
1966-1970	15	16.1
Since 1970	1	1.1
	<hr/> N=93	<hr/> 100.0

Year of the Master's Degree

According to the data, 32.2 per cent of the master's degrees were awarded before 1955. 50.6 per cent were granted between 1956 and 1965 and 17.2 per cent were earned since 1966.

Institution of Master's Degree

21.3 per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty received their master's degrees from the universities adjudged by the coordinators to have the five leading programs. 78.7 per cent were awarded their master's degrees by forty-seven other colleges and universities.

TABLE 5.11--Professional Experience

Years	College St. Personnel		Other College Administration		College St. Pers. Teaching	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
None	7	6.9	80	79.2	74	73.3
1-2	10	9.9	7	6.9	5	4.9
3-4	19	18.8	7	6.9	7	6.9
5-6	10	9.9	2	2.0	7	6.9
7-8	9	8.9	2	2.0	3	3.0
9-10	5	4.9	2	2.0	3	3.0
11-12	11	10.9	0	0.0	0	0.0
13-14	12	11.9	0	0.0	1	1.0
15+	18	17.8	1	1.0	1	1.0
TOTALS	101	99.9 <sup>a</sup>	101	100.0	101	100.0

  

Years	Other College Teaching		K-12 Teaching		Other Experience	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
None	75	74.3	75	74.3	77	76.2
1-2	14	13.9	5	4.9	9	8.9
3-4	5	4.9	9	8.9	10	9.9
5-6	4	3.9	4	3.9	1	1.0
7-8	1	1.0	3	3.0	1	1.0
9-10	0	0.0	2	2.0	1	1.0
11-12	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13-14	0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
15+	2	2.0	2	2.0	1	1.0
	101	100.0	101	100.0	101	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100.0% due to rounding procedures employed

### Professional Experience

Table 5.11 indicates the professional experience of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty members. 6.9 per cent had no experience in College Student Personnel while ninety-three per cent had from one to over fifteen years in the field. Nearly forty per cent had more than ten years experience.

19.8 per cent had worked from one to over fifteen years in other college or university administrative positions. Slightly more than 25 per cent had been involved in teaching College Student Personnel courses as their major responsibility from one to over fifteen years. Those with other college teaching experience totaled 25.7 per cent. 25.7 per cent also had public school teaching experience.

23.8 per cent had worked outside the field of education. 18.8 per cent had been employed from one to four years and five per cent from five to over fifteen years in other than education positions.

### Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching, Administration, Advisement and Other Typical Work Week Activities

As shown in Table 5.12, nine per cent of the preparation program faculty spent no time and fifty-eight per cent

TABLE 5.12--Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching, Administration, Advisement,  
and Other Activities

Amount of Time	Teaching		Administration		Advisement		Other	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
None	9	9.0	14	14.0	19	19.0	18	18.0
10% or less	36	36.0	15	15.0	39	39.0	36	36.0
11%-25%	22	22.0	16	16.0	32	32.0	28	28.0
26%-50%	21	21.0	16	16.0	7	7.0	6	6.0
51%-75%	11	11.0	14	14.0	3	3.0	3	3.0
76%-90%	0	0.0	16	16.0	0	0.0	5	5.0
91%-100%	1	1.0	9	9.0	0	0.0	4	4.0
TOTALS	100	100.0	100	100.0	100	100.0	100	100.0

135

spent less than one-fourth of their time teaching. Most were counselors or administrators and taught part-time in the preparation programs. One faculty member spent one-hundred per cent of his time teaching while eleven per cent taught from one-half to three-quarter time and twenty-one per cent taught from one-fourth to one-half time.

Fourteen per cent of the faculty expend no time in administrative activities. Thirty-one per cent performed administrative functions for less than one-tenth to one-quarter of their time. Thirty per cent of the faculty spent from one-quarter to three-quarter time in administrative responsibilities and twenty-five per cent served as administrators from seventy-five to one-hundred per cent of their time.

No College Student Personnel faculty member spent more than three-quarters of his time advising students. Nineteen per cent performed no advisement and seventy-one per cent advised less than one-quarter time. Ten per cent of the faculty members spent from one-quarter to three-quarters of their time in advisement activities.

The category labeled "Other" included such activities as committee meetings, research, consulting and professional organizations. While a number of faculty

listed counseling as one of the "Other" activities, eighteen per cent of the preparation program faculty listed no time in this category. Eighteen per cent calculated that they spent from one-quarter to all of their time in other activities. Thirty-six per cent estimated that they performed other activities less than ten per cent of their time and twenty-eight per cent spent from eleven to twenty-five per cent of their time in other activities.

The average amount of time spent in each activity by the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty was as follows: 23.9 per cent teaching, 42.0 per cent administration, 13.4 per cent advisement and 20.6 per cent other.

TABLE 5.13--Percentage of Time Spent Teaching and Advising Doctoral Candidates

Percentage of Time	Number	Per Cent
None	13	13.7
10% or less	40	42.1
11%-25%	27	28.4
26%-50%	10	10.5
51%-75%	5	5.3
76%-100%	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	N=95	100.0

Percentage of Time Spent Teaching and Advising Doctoral Candidates

The data in Table 5.13 show that nearly fourteen per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty spent no time working with doctoral candidates. Of the time involved in teaching and advising activities, forty-two per cent of the preparation program faculty spent less than ten per cent of that time with doctoral students. Twenty-eight per cent worked with doctoral candidates from one-tenth to one-quarter of their teaching and advising time and 15.8 per cent spent from one-quarter to three-quarters of their teaching and advising time with doctoral students.

TABLE 5.14--Number of Courses Taught on the Average Each Term

Courses	Number	Per Cent
0	9	9.0
Less than 1	7	7.0
1	47	47.0
2	16	16.0
3	19	19.0
4	<u>2</u>	<u>2.0</u>
	N=100	100.0

Number of Courses Taught on the Average Each Term

Table 5.14 indicates that sixteen per cent of the College Student Personnel faculty taught no courses or less than one per term. Forty-seven per cent of the preparation program faculty taught on the average of one class each term. From two to four courses were taught each term by thirty-seven per cent of the faculty. The mean number of courses taught by each faculty member was 1.56.

TABLE 5.15--Courses Taught by the Preparation Program Faculty

Course Emphasis	Number	Per Cent
Undergraduate	6	2.3
Undergraduate College St. Pers.	1	.4
Graduate	45	17.4
Graduate College St. Personnel	197	76.1
Both Undergraduate & Graduate	9	3.4
Both Undergrad. & Grad. C.S.P.	<u>1</u>	<u>.4</u>
	N=259	100.0

Courses Taught by the Preparation Program Faculty

As indicated in Table 5.15, the one-hundred one faculty members in the College Student Personnel preparation programs taught a total of 259 courses. Faculty taught from zero to seven different classes with 2.6 as the average.



76.1 per cent of the courses taught by the preparation program faculty were graduate courses with a College Student Personnel emphasis. The preparation program faculty taught other graduate courses which totaled 17.4 per cent of their teaching load. 2.7 per cent of the courses were undergraduate and 3.8 per cent of the courses enrolled both graduate and undergraduate students. 76.9 per cent of the courses taught by the preparation program faculty had a College Student Personnel emphasis.

#### Professional Organizations

The data show that 64.4 per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty are active in the College Student Personnel professional organizations as either an officer or as a committee chairman or participant. Table 5.16 reveals that 15.8 per cent have served in the American Personnel and Guidance Association, 40.6 per cent in the American College Personnel Association, 10.9 per cent in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 7.9 per cent in the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 25.7 per cent in other national organizations, 13.9 per cent in regional organizations and 25.7 per cent in local organizations.

Eleven of the eighty-five men (12.9 per cent) involved in the College Student Personnel preparation programs have

TABLE 5.16--Participation in Professional Organizations

	APGA		ACPA	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Office or Committee Participation	16	15.8	41	40.6
No Offices or Committee	85	84.2	60	59.4
TOTALS	101	100.0	101	100.0
	NASPA		NAWDC	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Office or Committee Participation	11	10.9	8	7.9
No Offices or Committee	90	89.1	93	92.1
TOTALS	101	100.0	101	100.0
	Other National		Regional	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Office or Committee Participation	26	25.7	14	13.9
No Offices or Committee	75	74.3	87	86.1
TOTALS	101	100.0	101	100.0
	State			
	Number	Per Cent		
Office or Committee Participation	26	25.7		
No Offices or Committee	75	74.3		
TOTALS	101	100.0		

been active in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Eight of the sixteen women (50 per cent) in the preparation programs have participated in the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors as an officer or as a committee member.

TABLE 5.17--Number of Professional Meetings Attended in the Last Five Years

National Meetings		
	Number	Per Cent
No meetings	8	7.9
1-21 meetings	<u>93</u>	<u>92.1</u>
	N=101	100.0
Mean 4.9	Standard Deviation 3.5	

Regional Meetings		
	Number	Per Cent
No meetings	43	42.6
1-15 meetings	<u>58</u>	<u>57.4</u>
	N=101	100.0
Mean 2.5	Standard Deviation 3.2	

State Meetings		
	Number	Per Cent
No meetings	33	33.0
1-30 meetings	<u>67</u>	<u>67.0</u>
	N=100	100.0
Mean 3.2	Standard Deviation 4.3	

Local Meetings		
	Number	Per Cent
No meetings	67	68.4
1-40 meetings	<u>31</u>	<u>31.6</u>
	N=98	100.0
Mean 2.0	Standard Deviation 5.2	

Number of Professional Meetings Attended in the Last Five Years

Table 5.17 reveals that on the average, College Student Personnel preparation program faculty attended 4.9 national meetings in the last five years, 2.4 regional meetings, 3.2 state meetings and 1.9 local meetings.

Publications in College Student Personnel or Closely Related Areas

The data in Table 5.18 indicate that sixty-two per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty have published. Of these sixty-two per cent, 23.8 per cent have written or contributed to books; 25.7 per cent have authored or contributed to monographs and fifty-six per cent have published journal articles. In the last five years, 20.8 per cent have published from one to seven books; 16.8 per cent have written from one to five monographs and 47.5 per cent have authored from one to thirty-four journal articles. On the average, each preparation program faculty member has published .49 books, .54 monographs and 4.6 journal articles.

TABLE 5.18--Publications

Books		
	Number	Per Cent
None	77	76.2
1-7 Books	<u>24</u>	<u>23.8</u>
	N=101	100.0
Mean .495	Standard Deviation 1.25	
Books Last Five Years		
None	80	79.2
1-7 Books	<u>21</u>	<u>20.8</u>
	N=101	100.0
Mean .31	Standard Deviation .86	
Monographs		
None	75	74.3
1-8 Monographs	<u>26</u>	<u>25.7</u>
	N=101	100.0
Mean .54	Standard Deviation 1.29	
Monographs Last Five Years		
None	84	83.2
1-5 Monographs	<u>17</u>	<u>16.8</u>
	N=101	100.0
Mean .27	Standard Deviation .75	
Journals		
None	44	44.0
1-54 Journals	<u>56</u>	<u>56.0</u>
	N=100	100.0
Mean 4.6	Standard Deviation 9.2	
Journals Last Five Years		
None	52	52.5
1-34 Journals	<u>47</u>	<u>47.5</u>
	N=99	100.0
Mean 2.7	Standard Deviation 5.6	

TABLE 5.19--College Student Personnel Preparation Program  
Emphasis

Emphasis	Doctoral		Master's	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Administration	26	28.3	12	13.2
Counseling	16	17.4	14	15.4
Educational Psychology	3	3.3	3	3.3
Student Development	13	14.1	17	18.7
Other	4	4.3	2	2.2
No Program	0	0.0	18	19.8
Multiple Choices	30	32.6	25	27.5
	N=92	100.0	N=91	100.1 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not add to 100.0 due to rounding procedures employed

#### Program Emphasis

Nearly thirty-three per cent of the faculty teaching in the doctoral programs selected more than one category to describe the emphasis of their programs. (See Table 5.19) The emphasis was felt to be administration by twenty-eight per cent of the faculty teaching in the programs. Seventeen per cent described their program emphasis as counseling and fourteen per cent labeled their focus as student development. Slightly more than six per cent called their program emphasis either educational psychology or other.

The master's program emphases were categorized as administration by thirteen per cent, counseling by fifteen per cent, student development by nineteen per cent and

educational psychology or other by 5.5 per cent. Nearly twenty per cent of the faculty respondents worked at universities that had no master's program in College Student Personnel. 27.5 per cent of the faculty selected multiple categories to describe the program with which they were involved.

Comparisons Between Coordinators and Faculty on Perceptions of Program Emphasis

Comparisons were made between the responses of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty members and of the preparation program coordinators about the emphasis in the doctoral program with which they were associated. Thirty-five per cent of the coordinators thought that the emphasis in their doctoral program was administration, while only twenty-six per cent of the faculty members thought the emphasis was administration.

According to eighteen per cent of the faculty and fifteen per cent of the coordinators their doctoral preparation program had a counseling focus.

No coordinators felt that their program emphasis was educational psychology, but 4.2 per cent of the faculty members thought that educational psychology was the emphasis in their program.

Five per cent of the coordinators and 16.7 per cent of the faculty thought their program emphasis was student development.

No coordinators selected "Other" for the program emphasis, but 5.6 per cent of the faculty felt their program had an "Other" emphasis.

Forty-five per cent of the coordinators and twenty-nine per cent of the faculty checked more than one category to describe the doctoral program emphasis.

The coordinators were also asked to identify the emphasis in the preparation program in the interview. In that setting, several discussed multiple foci, but when pressed for one emphasis, fifty per cent described their program emphasis as administration, forty per cent as counseling, five per cent as "Other" and five per cent as student development.

In summary, it would appear that faculty and coordinators have quite different perceptions about the emphases in the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs.

#### Leading Programs

College Student Personnel preparation program faculty were asked to list the five leading doctoral College



Student Personnel preparation programs in rank order. Thirty-eight either gave no response or commented "don't know" or "don't understand the question." Five gave meaningless responses such as counseling or administration. (The responses of the twenty program coordinators were listed in the previous chapter and were not included with the faculty rankings.) The data reported are based on the selections of thirty-eight faculty members who listed from two to six programs. In all, thirty-eight College Student Personnel preparation programs were identified as leading programs.

The point system previously discussed in Chapter IV was utilized to compare the relative rankings of the programs. The number of points for each program was computed and the comparisons were made.

According to the thirty-eight faculty (46.9 per cent) responding to this question, the leading College Student Personnel preparation programs in rank order are Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, the University of Minnesota and the University of Missouri.

In grouping all the faculty rankings and all the coordinator rankings of the leading programs together, the

leading doctoral programs are the same programs in the exact order as those selected by the coordinators which were Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota.

TABLE 5.20--Frequency Distribution of Full-Time and Part-Time Preparation Program Faculty Members--Participation in Professional Organizations

	Participate	Do Not Participate	Total
Full-Time	20	2	22
Part-Time	<u>45</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>79</u>
	N=65	N=36	N=101

Chi-Square = 7.21\*, df=1\*\*, p < .01\*\*\*

Legend: \*Yates' correction for continuity applied,  
\*\*=degrees of freedom, \*\*\*= probability

Comparisons Between Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty--  
Professional Organizations

Participation of the full-time and part-time faculty in professional organizations was compared. (Table 5.20) Slightly more than ninety per cent of the full-time faculty and fifty-seven per cent of the part-time faculty served as officers or committee members in a professional College Student Personnel organization. The Chi-Square Test for Independence was used to determine whether participation in professional organizations was associated with full-time or part-time faculty status in the preparation programs. The

results of this analysis revealed that there was a significant association between whether an individual participated in professional organizations and his status as a full-time or part-time faculty member. Further analysis of this association revealed that full-time faculty tended to participate more and part-time faculty tended to participate less than was expected.\*

\*Expected values for this analysis were computed as part of the Chi-Square statistical analysis.

TABLE 5.21--Frequency Distribution of Full-Time and Part-Time Preparation Program Faculty Members--  
Publications

	Published	Have Not Published	Total
Full-Time	19	3	22
Part-Time	<u>44</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>79</u>
	N=63	N=38	N=101

Chi-Square = 5.52\*, df=1,  $p < .05$

Legend: \*Yates' correction for continuity applied

Comparisons Between Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty--  
Publications

Comparisons were made between the full-time and part-time faculty on professional publications in College Student Personnel or related areas. (Table 5.21) The Chi-Square Test for Independence was used in determining whether publication of College Student Personnel books, monographs or journal articles was associated with

full-time or part-time faculty status. The results of the analysis indicated that there was a significant association between whether a faculty member had published and his status as a full-time or part-time faculty member. Further analysis of this association revealed that full-time faculty tended to publish more and part-time faculty tended to publish less than was expected.

TABLE 5.22--Mean Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching, Administration, Advisement and Other for Full-Time and Part-Time Preparation Program Faculty Members

	Teaching	Adminis- tration	Advisement	Other	Total
Full-Time	47.5%	15.9%	20.0%	16.6%	100.0%
Part-Time	17.2%	49.6%	11.5%	21.8%	100.0%
TOTALS	64.7%	65.5%	31.5%	38.4%	200.0%

Chi-Square = 7.93, df=3,  $p < .05$

Comparisons Between Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty--  
Percentage of Time Spent in Teaching, Administration,  
Advisement and Other Activities

Comparisons were made between the mean percentages of time spent by the full-time and part-time faculty in teaching, administration, advisement and other activities. (Table 5.22) The Chi-Square Test for Independence was used to determine whether percentages of time spent in teaching, administration, advisement and other activities were

associated with full-time and part-time faculty status. The results of the analysis indicated that there was a significant association between percentages of time spent in teaching, administration, advisement and other activities and full-time and part-time faculty status. Further analysis of this association revealed that part-time faculty tended to spend more time in administration and more time in other activities than was expected.

#### Recommended Program Changes

Faculty were asked for the changes they would recommend in the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation program at their university. Eighteen respondents gave no response or commented "none" or "don't know." (The responses of the twenty coordinators were presented in the previous chapter.) The following data is based on the comments of sixty-three program faculty members.

The recommendations for program changes made by the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty are organized into thirteen categories.

#### Admissions

Admissions was mentioned by one respondent who urged a more thorough and personal selection procedure.

Recruitment

The one faculty member who was concerned about recruitment urged that more minority group members be recruited.

Enrollments

Five respondents discussed enrollments. Four recommended limiting the enrollment in the preparation programs to a small number of students. One wanted to place more emphasis on full-time student enrollments rather than part-time enrollments.

Departmental Procedures

One faculty member made a plea for regular departmental meetings to discuss the preparation program and individual students. He also pointed out a need for a centralized responsibility for the placement of graduates. Another respondent felt that College Student Personnel faculty should limit their consulting activities. The insinuation was that faculty members were away consulting more than was advisable. Another recommended that more emphasis be placed upon student advisement.

Faculty

A number of faculty members made requests for full-time College Student Personnel preparation program faculty. One articulated his feelings in the following statement,

"We are a scab outfit. Most of us have split appointments between the College Student Personnel academic department and service areas such as deans, counseling, admissions, etc. We need more full-time faculty who have no service responsibilities." Another wrote, "Fire all the part-time faculty and replace them with full-time personnel." Another was concerned about the quality of the preparation program faculty. The implication was that the quality of the faculty should be improved.

#### Financial Support

A need for financial support was pointed out by four faculty members. More overall aid for the preparation program was needed on one campus. Others desired funds for additional staff and assistantships for doctoral students.

#### Internships-Practicum-Field Work Experiences

Fifteen respondents recommended that more practicum-internship-field work opportunities be provided in the preparation programs. Several suggested additional locations for the experiences. Others felt that the intensity of the experience should be increased and that the experience should be extended over a longer period of time. Another thought that the supervision of the practical experience should be strengthened.

### Research

A number of faculty members commented about research. Several felt that greater emphasis should be placed upon research in the preparation programs. Another urged that preparation program faculty carry on more research. It was also recommended that greater latitude in researchable areas for College Student Personnel dissertations was needed and that doctoral candidates should be encouraged to write theoretical and philosophical theses instead of statistical studies.

### Students

Several faculty members thought that more experienced and mature students should be selected for admission as doctoral students in College Student Personnel. The justification was that well-qualified students would have better opportunities in the "tight job market." Another respondent felt that students should participate to a much greater extent in developing their own programs. He commented, "Students learning to be administrators should be involved in the administration of their own education."

### Course Changes

Nearly one-third (nineteen of sixty-three) of the faculty members involved with the College Student Personnel



preparation programs recommended course changes. Several urged that all course offering and course content be reviewed. The need was felt for more seminars and for additional group work. More courses in administration, business, management, law, psychology and counseling, communications and higher education were recommended for College Student Personnel doctoral students. A racism-sexism course or its equivalent was suggested as a requirement, as well as an organizational development and a critique course. Recommendations for preparation in budgeting, computer programming, evaluation and writing grant proposals were made. It was thought that research tools and techniques should be emphasized.

Other changes discussed were eliminating the general education theory courses, requiring more course work outside the Colleges of Education and separating the counseling and student personnel courses.

#### Overall Changes

Half of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty (thirty-three of sixty-three) recommended overall changes needed in the program with which they were associated.

A reevaluation of the profession of student personnel was proposed, along with a name change and shift in thinking about the profession. The reflection was made that the field of College Student Personnel was too narrow and perhaps should merge with higher education or become a community oriented field. Several faculty members made the observation that specific objectives had not been established for the College Student Personnel preparation program in which they were working and that there was a real need for objectives to be agreed upon. Others wanted a clearer definition of the differences among College Student Personnel, Higher Education and Administration programs and degrees.

More emphasis on administration, student development, research and higher education was recommended. Numerous comments were made about decreasing the emphasis on counseling in College Student Personnel and about separating counseling and College Student Personnel Administration. On the other hand, several wanted to increase the emphasis on counseling.

According to several respondents, a need exists for specialization in certain College Student Personnel areas and programs should be planned to meet these needs. Criticisms were advanced that preparation programs were

too broad and too general to be helpful in certain College Student Personnel speciality fields.

Differences in thinking existed about theoretical and pragmatic emphases in the programs. More emphasis upon philosophy, theory and research was recommended by several. However, more practical and less theoretical emphases were also urged. More emphasis on the practical application of theory was the goal of some faculty members.

A plea was made for more flexibility in College Student Personnel preparation. It was felt that there was too much "lockstep" course work. Individualized instruction as well as new teaching methods was urged. Several respondents thought that a total restructuring was needed and that a student's program should be based on competencies and not courses.

#### Other Comments

One respondent wrote that the question required more thought than he was inclined to give at the time. Another felt he did not know the program well enough to make recommendations. According to one, "I am unable to comment really, but intuition says more intellectual rigor is needed." Other recommendations were, "Further development of (preparation programs)." "Not exactly sure of what

changes should be made now, but we should be taking a hard look at our programs. . . ."

#### Changes Unnecessary

Several faculty members had no desires to change the programs in which they were teaching. One stated, "All the changes that are needed now are being acted on by staff and students. These include revision of all courses, adding new courses, adding student representatives to the department, improving and increasing practicum, field work and internships as well as adding resources to the library holdings. We are interested in the quality of graduates, not quantity of graduates--numbers that finish. However, those that are in the program are encouraged to complete but they are carefully selected before they enter the doctoral stage."

#### Summary

One of the purposes of the study was to present a profile of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty member. The characteristics of the preparation program faculty members were presented in the areas of academic rank or title, educational background, professional experience, age, sex, percentage of time spent in College Student Personnel activities, numbers and emphasis of

courses taught, participation in professional organization activities and publications. Faculty perceptions of the preparation program emphasis, of recommended changes for the program and of the leading doctoral programs were also examined. Comparisons were made between full-time and part-time faculty on selected data.

Examination of the data showed eighty-four per cent of the preparation program faculty to be male and sixteen per cent to be female. The mean age was 40.8 years with a range from twenty-five years to sixty-three years. Twenty-two per cent of the preparation program faculty were full-time faculty members. Seventy-eight per cent of the faculty spent three-quarter time or less in preparation program responsibilities and sixty-five per cent of the faculty spent one-quarter time or less teaching in the preparation programs.

The titles of those working in the preparation programs revealed that forty per cent of the faculty were College Student Personnel administrators. Thirty-nine per cent were faculty and nineteen per cent were counselors.

Doctoral degrees were held by eighty-nine per cent of those associated with the preparation programs. Half of the faculty had earned their doctoral degrees since 1966. More

than one-third of the faculty majored in College Student Personnel on the doctoral level and fifty-four per cent majored in Higher Education, Counseling Psychology, Psychology, Guidance and Counseling, Educational Psychology and Counseling. More than one-third of the doctoral degrees were granted by the universities judged by the preparation program coordinators to have the five leading doctoral programs in College Student Personnel.

Ninety-three per cent of the preparation program faculty had a master's degree. Half of the master's degrees were earned between 1956 and 1965. More than one-third of the faculty majored in Guidance and Counseling on the master's level. Less than ten per cent earned a master's degree in College Student Personnel and more than twenty-seven per cent majored in Higher Education, Counseling Psychology, Psychology, Educational Psychology and Counseling. Other majors accounted for more than thirty per cent of the master's degrees. Approximately twenty per cent of the master's degrees were awarded by the universities judged by the preparation program coordinators to have the five leading doctoral programs in College Student Personnel.

The professional experience data showed that ninety-three per cent of the preparation program faculty have had experience in College Student Personnel, with forty per cent having had more than ten years experience. Nearly twenty per cent have worked in other college and university administrative positions and slightly more than twenty-five per cent have been involved in teaching College Student Personnel courses as their major responsibility from one to over fifteen years. Nearly twenty-six per cent have had other college teaching experience. Twenty-six per cent have had public school teaching experience and nineteen per cent have been employed in other than education positions.

It was found that sixty-seven per cent of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty spent no time or less than a quarter time teaching. The remaining thirty-two per cent spent from one-quarter to three-quarters of their time teaching.

Forty-four per cent of the faculty expended no time or less than one-tenth of their time in administrative functions. Thirty per cent spent from one-quarter to three-quarters of their time in administration and twenty-five per cent served as administrators from seventy-five to one-hundred per cent of the time.

Advisement activities were not performed by nineteen per cent of the preparation program faculty and seventy-one per cent advised less than one-quarter time.

Seventy-two per cent of the preparation program faculty were involved in other activities, which included committee meetings, consulting, research, professional organizations and counseling. Thirty-six per cent spent less than ten per cent of their time in other activities. Twenty-eight per cent spent from eleven to twenty-five per cent of their time in other activities. Eighteen per cent estimated that they spent from twenty-five to one-hundred per cent of their time in other activities.

The percentage of time that faculty spent teaching and advising doctoral candidates ranged from no time to seventy-five per cent of their teaching and advising time. Fourteen per cent were not involved with doctoral students. Seventy per cent spent less than one-fourth of their advising and teaching time with doctoral students and sixteen per cent spent from one-fourth to three-fourths of their advising and teaching time with doctoral students.

The number of courses taught on the average each term by the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty ranged from none to four with a mean of 1.56. Each faculty



member taught from zero to seven different courses with 2.6 as the mean.

More than three-fourths of the courses taught by the preparation program faculty were graduate courses with a College Student Personnel emphasis. The faculty also taught other graduate courses which accounted for slightly less than twenty per cent of their teaching load.

The professional organization data showed that sixty-four per cent of the preparation program faculty have served as officers or as committee participants in a College Student Personnel professional organization. On the average, each preparation program faculty member had attended 4.9 national meetings, 2.5 regional meetings, 3.2 state meetings and 1.9 local meetings during the last five years.

Examination of the publication lists of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty indicated that sixty-two per cent of the faculty had published. Approximately twenty-four per cent of those who had published had written or contributed to books, twenty-six per cent had authored or contributed to monographs and fifty-six per cent had published journal articles.

The coordinators and the faculty members had quite different perceptions of the emphasis of the preparation program with which they were involved. Thirty-five per cent of the coordinators and twenty-six per cent of the faculty thought that their program emphasis was administration. Eighteen per cent of the faculty and fifteen per cent of the coordinators thought their program had a counseling emphasis. No coordinators described their program emphasis as educational psychology, but 4.2 per cent of the faculty described educational psychology as the program emphasis. Five per cent of the coordinators and 16.7 per cent of the faculty thought their program emphasis was student development. No coordinators selected "Other" as the emphasis, but 5.6 per cent of the faculty chose "Other." Forty-five per cent of the coordinators and twenty-nine per cent of the faculty selected more than one category to describe the emphasis in their program.

In the opinion of the preparation program faculty members and coordinators, the leading College Student Personnel preparation programs at the present time in rank order are Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota.

The Chi-Square Test for Independence was used to compare the differences between the full-time and the part-time faculty on three characteristics. The results of this analysis revealed that there was a significant association between an individual's status as a full-time or part-time faculty member and whether he participated in a professional organization, whether he published and whether he spent more time in teaching, administration, advisement and other activities than was expected. Full-time faculty tended to participate more and part-time faculty tended to participate less than was expected in professional organizations. Full-time faculty tended to publish more and part-time faculty tended to publish less than was expected. Part-time faculty tended to spend more time in administration and more time in other activities than was expected.

Preparation program faculty listed a number of changes they would recommend for their programs. Half of the group suggested overall changes for the program, including a reevaluation of the profession of student personnel, a merger with higher education, a need for defining program objectives, and a greater emphasis upon administration, student development, research and higher education.

Course changes were recommended by nearly one-third of the respondents. Other recommendations dealt with admissions and recruitment, enrollments, departmental procedures, faculty, financial support, practical work experiences, students and research.

Presented in Chapter VI are the summary, findings, conclusions, discussion, and implications for further research based upon the study.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS

#### Summary

Leaders in the field of College Student Personnel continue to be concerned about the preparation of College Student Personnel workers. These concerns center around the desirability of professional preparation, the recommended preparation program emphases in College Student Personnel and the qualifications of those teaching in the preparation programs.

The study was prompted by the absence of previous research on doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel. A review of the literature revealed no previous comprehensive studies of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel or of their faculty.

The purposes of this study were two-fold. The first purpose was to investigate a selected number of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel. The second purpose was to develop a profile of College Student Personnel preparation program faculty.

A select group of College Student Personnel educators assisted in the choice of twenty doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs for the in-depth study. These twenty programs were thought to be representative of those throughout the United States and included sixteen public universities in fourteen states and four private universities in two states and the District of Columbia.

All of the faculty (N=113) involved in the College Student Personnel preparation programs at the twenty universities were included in the study.

Two research methods were used to gather the data. In investigating the twenty doctoral preparation programs, the structured interview technique was utilized to elicit information from the preparation program coordinators. In developing a profile of the faculty members, a survey questionnaire was employed. To this end, the researcher designed a structured interview for studying the preparation programs and a questionnaire for faculty members teaching in the preparation programs.

For the structured interviews, questions were formulated about thirty aspects of the College Student Personnel preparation programs. The researcher interviewed ten of the coordinators at national conventions and ten were

interviewed in their offices on their respective campuses. All interview information was tape recorded.

The questionnaire was developed to gather general information data from the preparation program faculty. The questionnaire was either mailed directly or personally delivered to the faculty members. 104 or 92.0 per cent of the questionnaires were returned, with a total usable response rate of 89.4 per cent (N=101).

Interview data were transcribed from the tapes and were grouped as they related to the questions. Some numerical tabulations were prepared from the interview information, but most of the interview data was presented in a descriptive manner.

Questionnaire data were coded and punched cards were used in the computer analysis. Frequency counts, percentages, means and standard deviations, where appropriate, were computed for certain variables. The Chi-Square Test for Independence was used in analyzing selected questionnaire responses.

### Findings and Conclusions

The findings of the study are reported in two sections, with one section dealing with the preparation programs and the other with the preparation program faculty.

The findings based on the interviews with the preparation program coordinators resulted in the following conclusions.

1. Many of the College Student Personnel preparation programs were recently established. Nearly two-thirds of the twenty preparation programs have been in existence less than ten years.
2. The emphases in the preparation programs have shifted over the years. The original emphasis in seventeen of the twenty programs was counseling or educational psychology. According to the coordinators, ten of the programs currently have an administration emphasis; eight have a counseling focus; one stresses research; and one has a student development emphasis.
3. The programs were identified by fourteen different titles. The most common titles were College Personnel Work and College Student Personnel Administration.
4. Six degrees were awarded in College Student Personnel, including the Ph.D., Ed.D., Ed.S., M.A., M.S., and M.Ed. Both the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. were offered at seven universities. Only



1

the Ph.D. was awarded at seven universities and only the Ed.D. was awarded at six universities.

5. The main objective of the College Student Personnel programs was to offer preparation for persons who plan to serve as College Student Personnel workers in universities, colleges and community colleges.
6. More of the programs had a pragmatic emphasis than a theoretical orientation. Six programs were classified as pragmatic or more pragmatic than theoretical. Three were classified as theoretical. Three were neither pragmatic or theoretical. Eight were categorized as balanced between pragmatic and theoretical.
7. Program strengths were identified by the coordinators as flexibility, individuality, campus resources, opportunities for meaningful work experiences and preparation program faculty members.
8. The average number of doctoral students enrolled in each of the twenty preparation programs during the 1971-1972 academic year was approximately twenty-three and the average number of master's students was forty-six.

1

9. The average number of graduates from each of the twenty programs during 1970-1971 was 5.6 students.
10. The average number of full-time faculty involved in the programs was 1.4 and the average number of part-time faculty was 3.2 .
11. Many facets of the admissions procedure were similar among the preparation programs. "B" averages on the master's level were recommended at most universities, but slightly more than one-fourth recommended a 3.5 grade point average on a 4.0 scale. Recommended grade point averages and levels of achievement on examinations were waived when a student had other attributes, such as extensive experience or minority group status. Personal interviews as part of the admissions procedure were either required or recommended in eighty per cent of the programs. Work experience after the master's degree was required in nearly three-quarters of the programs. Desirable personal characteristics for the doctoral preparation program applicant included human relations skills, the ability to communicate, leadership, maturity and commitment. On the average approximately

forty-four per cent of the applicants were admitted into the doctoral preparation programs.

12. Formal and informal methods of recruitment were used by eighty per cent of the preparation programs. Informal recruitment was employed by sixteen of the twenty universities. Formal recruitment was practiced by seven universities.
13. Practical work experiences were available in all of the programs.
14. Most College Student Personnel doctoral programs required an average of twenty courses past the master's degree. The typical doctoral program in College Student Personnel consisted of courses in College Student Personnel, Higher Education, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Administrative Theory, Applied Administration, Historical and Philosophical Foundations and Research.
15. Written examinations near the end of a student's program lasting from four to twenty-four hours were required at all twenty universities.
16. All programs required a dissertation and an oral defense of the dissertation.

17. On the average, nearly ninety per cent of the students enrolled in the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs graduated. The average completion time was slightly over three years.
18. A large percentage of doctoral students in the College Student Personnel preparation programs had financial assistance. Assistantships and part-time employment were available on all campuses. Fellowships were available for College Student Personnel candidates on a competitive basis in slightly more than one-half of the universities. On the average, slightly more than three quarters of the College Student Personnel candidates had financial assistance in the form of assistantships, fellowships, scholarships and part-time employment. Travel grants for doctoral students to attend professional meetings were regularly available at only one university.
19. Graduate follow-up was an informal activity in nearly all of the programs. Formal follow-up of graduates had been conducted in less than one-fourth of the programs.

20. Evaluation procedures existed in all twenty programs. Course evaluations were common. Ten universities had used questionnaires to determine alumni evaluations of the programs. One-fourth of the programs had student-faculty committees which recommended program modifications.
21. The components of a quality College Student Personnel preparation program were identified by the coordinators as quality faculty, quality students, sufficient elaboration of the program, strong supporting departments, institutional resources, a well-conceived curriculum, and opportunities for practical work experiences.
22. The coordinators identified the leading doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel in rank order as Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota. The coordinators based their selections of the leading programs on quality of the faculty, quality of the graduates, visible leadership in the field by the faculty and graduates and on the literature and research published and

reported by the leading programs. More than half of the coordinators felt their programs could not compare with the five leading programs.

23. All coordinators desired changes in their programs. Forty per cent wanted additional staff. Financial support was needed for fellowships, assistantships, workshops, institutes and short courses. New modes of instruction, expanded field experiences, greater flexibility, more selective admissions policies and philosophical modifications were desired. More emphasis on the recruitment of minorities and women were recommended. Expanded research efforts for faculty and students were desired.
24. Coordinators forecast a number of changes anticipated in their programs in the next five years. One-half of the coordinators predicted a leveling off or a drop in the numbers of students being admitted to the preparation programs. The cut-back was cited because of the reduced demand for College Student Personnel workers. Most foresaw the composition of the programs changing to include more women and minority students. Several coordinators previewed new administrative structures with



College Student Personnel joining with other education specialties. A review of curriculum, content and quality of the College Student Personnel preparation programs was recommended to make them relevant to changes that occur in higher education in general. The need for administrative theory and a broader curriculum were thought to be important requirements for the programs. Future-oriented classes and open kinds of programs without courses and grades were forecast. A "new" kind of faculty member with expertise in research, analysis and interpretation of personality theory literature was anticipated. New roles for College Student Personnel administrators were previewed including consultative and student development roles and a combination student development and political administration role.

The findings based on the questionnaires completed by the preparation program faculty yielded the following conclusions.

1. The preparation program faculty members are predominantly male (eighty-four percent) and average forty-one years of age.

2. Over forty cent of the preparation program faculty members are College Student Personnel administrators. Nearly forty per cent have faculty titles and nineteen per cent are classified as counselors.
3. Less than one-quarter of the preparation program faculty are full-time. More than sixty per cent of the faculty spent one-quarter time or less in College Student Personnel preparation program responsibilities.
4. Nearly ninety per cent of the preparation program faculty have doctoral degrees. Slightly more than one-third of the faculty in the College Student Personnel preparation programs received their doctoral degrees in College Student Personnel. Half of the preparation program faculty received their doctoral degrees after 1966.
5. Most preparation program faculty members have had experience in the field of College Student Personnel. Over ninety per cent of the preparation program faculty had from one to over fifteen years experience in the field. Nearly forty per cent had more than ten years experience.

6. Two-thirds of the preparation program faculty spent less than one-fourth of their time teaching. Forty per cent spent from one-half to full-time in administrative responsibilities. Nearly forty per cent spent less than one-tenth of their time advising students and twenty per cent did not advise students at all. Of the time involved in teaching and advising activities, over forty per cent of the preparation program faculty spent less than one-tenth of that time with doctoral students. Fourteen per cent of the faculty spent no time teaching or advising doctoral students.
7. On the average, each faculty member taught 2.6 different courses. Slightly more than three-quarters of the classes had a College Student Personnel emphasis. The average number of courses taught by College Student Personnel faculty members per term was 1.56.
8. Nearly two-thirds of the College Student Personnel preparation faculty are active in the College Student Personnel professional organizations as either an officer or as a committee chairman or participant.

9. During the last five years, the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty attended on the average 4.9 national meetings, 2.5 regional meetings, 3.2 state meetings and 1.9 local meetings.
10. Nearly two-thirds of the College Student Personnel preparation program faculty have published books, monographs or journal articles.
11. The emphasis in the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs was described as multiple by nearly one-third of the faculty; administration by twenty-eight per cent; counseling by seventeen per cent and student development by fourteen per cent.
12. In the opinion of all the faculty members teaching in the College Student Personnel preparation programs, the five leading doctoral preparation programs in rank order are Michigan State University, Indiana University, Florida State University, Columbia Teachers College and the University of Minnesota. In examining three of the preparation programs judged to be among the leading five programs for common characteristics, a number of commonalities were found. All of the programs had

been in existence for more than twenty years and had an emphasis on administration at the doctoral level. All graduated at least eight doctoral students in 1971 and had a master's program with at least sixty-five students enrolled and a doctoral program with at least thirty students enrolled during the 1971-1972 school year. Other common characteristics included at least two full-time faculty in College Student Personnel and the availability of ten or more College Student Personnel courses.

13. The Chi-Square Test for Independence indicated that there were significant differences between full-time and part-time faculty. Full-time faculty tended to participate more and part-time faculty tended to participate less than was expected as officers or committee members in professional College Student Personnel organizations. Full-time faculty tended to publish more and part-time faculty tended to publish less than was expected. Part-time faculty tended to spend more time in administration and more time in other activities than was expected.

14. Preparation program faculty recommended a number of changes desired in the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs. One-half suggested major changes for their programs and one-third recommended course changes.

### Discussion

Since there have been no similar in-depth studies about College Student Personnel preparation programs or their faculties, no comparisons between the findings of this study and others can be made. However, several findings of this investigation are related to the literature reviewed in Chapter II.

Barry and Wolf (1963) asserted that College Student Personnel preparation programs consisted of a mixture of courses from various disciplines. This study revealed that the typical doctoral program included courses in College Student Personnel, Higher Education, Counseling and Educational Psychology, Administrative Theory, Applied Administration, Historical and Philosophical Foundations and Research. It would appear that this investigation corroborated the statement by Barry and Wolf.

Penney (1969) pointed out three emphases in College Student Personnel preparation programs, including guidance-

based, human relations, and counseling. The findings of this study would seem to refute Penney's categorization. This investigation revealed that the current preparation program emphases are administration, counseling, research and student development.

Dewey (1972) called the preparation programs limited in design, repetitive, unimaginative and reluctant to question themselves. The findings of this study indicated that the preparation programs were similar in design, but many appeared to be staffed by innovative faculty and coordinators who were seriously questioning their programs.

The finding that internship-practicum-field work experiences were inconsistent in terms of definitions and understandings among the programs was similar to that found by Wallenfeldt and Bigelow (1971).

The model preparation programs described by Cosby (1965), Trueblood (1966), Miller (1967), O'Banion (1969), and by APGA (1968) were similar to the programs examined in this study. Slight variations were observable, but basically the programs patterned the models suggested.

Other findings of this investigation cause the researcher to make observations and pose questions about several phases of the doctoral College Student Personnel

preparation programs. It is possible that the findings of this study could have significant implications for the doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel.

Considerable interest was indicated in the investigation by both the preparation program coordinators and by the faculty. The coordinators expressed their concern by their willing and open participation in the interview. The faculty interest was evidenced in the high rate of questionnaire return.

One of the most striking observations about the preparation programs was the inadequate student-faculty ratio. With only 1.4 full-time faculty and twenty-three doctoral and forty-six master's students on the average in each of the programs, the faculty appeared to be extremely overextended. Even with the addition of 3.2 part-time faculty on the average in each of the programs, students probably were not receiving sufficient faculty time. It would appear that preparation program faculty are attempting to train far more students than their time should allow. Obviously, either more faculty should be hired or fewer students should be admitted into the programs.

Another observation was the high percentage of part-time faculty members in the preparation programs. Do these



part-time faculty have the time to be involved so heavily in the preparation programs? Do these full-time administrators and part-time faculty tend to be pragmatic in their outlook? Do they provide the creative leadership necessary for the preparation programs? It appears that there is a real need for additional full-time faculty members to be employed by the preparation programs.

Few of the preparation program faculty are women. In fact, many of the programs had all male faculties. In view of this situation, should not the preparation programs be encouraged to hire more women faculty?

On the surface it would appear that the preparation program faculty were well-educated with nearly ninety percent holding the doctorate. However, the data indicated that only one-third were trained in College Student Personnel on the doctoral level. One-half were educated in closely related areas, but they were not primarily prepared for College Student Personnel. One questions whether those teaching in College Student Personnel should not be prepared in College Student Personnel?

Another surprising discovery was that in many instances the preparation program objectives were vague and obscure. Preparing College Student Personnel workers without

definitive program objectives seems like a purposeless exercise. More carefully understood program purposes appear to be an obvious need.

In addition program emphases were poorly defined. In many programs, little or no agreement existed among faculty members as to the focus of their program. As a minimum requirement for a doctoral preparation program in College Student Personnel, it seems logical and reasonable for the faculty to agree on the emphasis of the program.

The curricula in the doctoral programs tended to be multidisciplinary. Some programs offered only one or two courses in College Student Personnel on the doctoral level and the remainder of the student's courses were in four or more other areas. Is this kind of preparation relevant to the new roles predicted for the College Student Personnel worker in an employment setting? If, as a number of coordinators predicted, the College Student Personnel worker becomes a student development specialist and a political administrator, how is he being prepared for the new roles?

Practical work experiences in the preparation programs were inclined to be poorly defined, loosely organized and haphazardly supervised. Are not poor administrative

practices perpetuated in this manner? Furthermore, what could be said about the quality of such practica and internships?

While the evidence was not conclusive, it appeared that additional shifts in program emphases were developing. Over the years many programs changed from a counseling emphasis to an administrative emphasis. Currently there seems to be a trend of College Student Personnel preparation programs moving toward higher education or student development emphases.

On the basis of this investigation, the observation is offered that there are probably a sufficient number of doctoral preparation programs in College Student Personnel in existence at the present time. Universities considering the addition of doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs might well reconsider their proposals and small, ill-defined programs might consider dropping their College Student Personnel major. Other smaller programs might be more effective in developing specialties rather than attempting to "cover the field."

#### Implications for Further Research

This study suggests several areas for additional investigation.

1. Because of the lack of basic information about preparation programs in College Student Personnel, a similar investigation of the Master's and Education Specialist programs could be useful to prospective students and to educators in the field.
2. A follow-up study of the graduates of the twenty doctoral preparation programs included in this study would be desirable in judging their perception of the appropriateness of their professional preparation.
3. Statewide and regional studies of College Student Personnel preparation programs would be valuable in determining program duplications. Universities located in close proximity might decide to restructure their programs rather than continue to operate duplicate programs. This kind of investigation might encourage more cooperation among programs and preparation program faculty, and as a result could strengthen the entire profession.
4. Several authors have suggested quality control for the preparation programs in College Student Personnel. Additional and more sophisticated

investigation of the quality in preparation programs would appear to be appropriate for consideration by the national professional organization committees on standards and accreditation.

5. Specialty areas in College Student Personnel preparation might be investigated. For instance, are universities offering specialized preparation for College Student Personnel workers who plan to work in community colleges or in urban universities? Is so, what are the differences in job responsibilities in various kinds of institutions of higher education and what constitutes appropriate preparation for various kinds of settings?
6. Research on the selection of students for the doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs might be of value in improving the quality of College Student Personnel graduates. What qualities does the doctoral student in College Student Personnel need in order to persist in the program, to graduate, and to succeed in his profession?

7. A more detailed study of the five leading preparation programs might result in several models of outstanding programs. If the characteristics of the leading programs could be described in detail, other programs would have criteria for comparison and evaluation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A.C.P.A., Directory of Preparation Programs in College Student Personnel 1970-1971. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Assn., 1971.
- A.P.G.A., Financial Aid for Personnel and Guidance Graduate Study 1970-71. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Assn., 1971.
- A.P.G.A., "Guidelines for Graduate Programs in the Preparation of Student Personnel Workers in Higher Education." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47, No. 5 (January, 1969), pp. 493-498.
- Barry, Ruth and Beverly Wolf. Modern Issues in Guidance-Personnel Work. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.
- Bolmon, Frederick de W. "Can We Prepare Better College and University Administrators?" Educational Record, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Summer, 1964), pp. 272-284.
- Borg, Walter R. Educational Research. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.
- Chickering, Arthur W. "The Young Adult: A New and Needed Course for College Personnel Administrators." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Spring, 1967), pp. 98-107.
- Cosby, Betty. "Professional Preparation for Student Personnel Work in Higher Education." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Fall, 1965), pp. 14-18.
- Crane, Robert M. "The Raison d' Etre of a Student Personnel Administrator." Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Winter, 1965), pp. 19-20.
- Cross, K. Patricia. "New Students and New Contours in Student Personnel Administration." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Winter, 1972), pp. 49-58.



- Dewey, Mary Evelyn. "The Student Personnel Worker of 1980." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Winter, 1972), pp. 59-64.
- Dressel, P. L. "Editorial Comment." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 4 (1957), p. 182.
- Dunn, Charleta J. "Recommended Preparation for Prospective Deans of Women." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall, 1967), pp. 73-74.
- Fitzgerald, Laurine E.; Walter F. Johnson and Willa Norris (eds.). College Student Personnel: Readings and Bibliographies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Foy, James E., "Career Patterns of Student Personnel Administrators." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Gladstein, Gerald A. "Doctoral Research in College Student Personnel Work." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 9, No. 1 (January, 1968), pp. 24-31.
- Grant, W. Harold. "Higher Education and Student Personnel Work in the Year 2000." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 31, No. 3 (Spring, 1968), pp. 140-141.
- Greenleaf, Elizabeth. "Who Should Educate the College Student Personnel Worker and to What End?" The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 6, No. 1 (July, 1968) pp. 29-32.
- Haller, Lola Marie. "The Future Role of the Highest Ranking Woman Student Personnel Administrator in the College or University and a Suggested Training Program." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Hester, Linda A. "Differential Perceptions of Factors Important in the Selection of Student Personnel Administrators in Midwestern Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

- Hillway, Tyrus. Handbook of Educational Research. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1969.
- Houtz, Patricia. "Internships in Student Personnel Programs." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 8, No. 5 (September, 1967), pp. 322-326.
- Hulet, Richard E. "Perils of a Placement Office." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 3, No. 4 (April, 1966), pp. 13-14.
- Johnson, Walter F. "Student Personnel Work in Higher Education: Philosophy and Framework." Chapter I. College Student Personnel: Readings and Bibliographies. Edited by Laurine E. Fitzgerald, Walter F. Johnson and Willa Norris. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.
- Kauffman, Joseph F. "Student Personnel Administration." Educational Record, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Summer, 1964), pp. 291-298.
- Keller, Leonard I. "Evaluation of a Student Personnel Training Program Through the Opinions of Its Trainees." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1962.
- Lloyd-Jones, Esther. "How to Prepare for the Unknown." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 6, No. 1 (July, 1968), pp. 24-28.
- Macoby, Eleanor F. and Nathan Macoby. "The Interview: A Tool of Social Science," Part III. Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 1. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954, pp. 449-484.
- Matson, J. E. "Implications of the Project for Professional Preparation of Junior College Student Personnel Workers." In Selected Papers from the 46th Annual Convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.

- McConnell, T. R. "Student Personnel Services--Central or Peripheral?" The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 8, No. 1 (July, 1970), pp. 55-63.
- Miller, T. K. "College Student Personnel Preparation--Present Perspective and Future Directions." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 4, No. 4 (April, 1967) pp. 171-176.
- Montgomery, Phyllis. "An Evaluation of the Indiana University Master's Degree Program in College Student Personnel Administration from 1959 to 1969." Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, (Spring, 1972), pp. 12-18.
- Mueller, Kate Hevner. "Educational Issues and the Training of Student Personnel Workers." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 4, No. 4 (April, 1967), pp. 167-170.
- Nygreen, Glen T. "Professional Status for Student Personnel Administrators?" The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 5, No. 3 (January, 1968), pp. 283-291.
- O'Banion, Terry. "Program Proposal for Preparing College Student Personnel Workers." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10, No. 4 (July, 1969), pp. 249-253.
- Parker, Clyde A. "The Place of Counseling in the Preparation of Student Personnel Workers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 45, No. 3 (November, 1966), pp. 254-261.
- Penney, J. F. "Student Personnel Work: A Profession Stillborn." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 47, No. 10 (June, 1969), pp. 958-962.
- Penney, J. F. "Student Personnel Work: Role Conflict and Campus Power." Journal of Education, Vol. 151 (February, 1969), pp. 42-52.

- Pierson, George A. "The Art and Science of Counseling and Student Personnel Work." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 3 SP (Spring, 1967), pp. 248-254.
- Robinson, D. W. "Analysis of Three Statements Relative to the Preparation of College Student Personnel Workers." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 7 (July, 1966), 1966), pp. 254-256.
- Rhatigan, James J. and Donald P. Hoyt. "Student Personnel Administration: Faculty-Trainer Perceptions and the Reality of Practice." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 7, No. 3 (January, 1970), pp. 156-163.
- Schreck, Thomas C. and Robert H. Shaffer. "Implications of the Campus Organization Power Structure for Student Personnel Administrators." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 5, No. 4 (April, 1968), pp. 331-335.
- Schultz, Raymond E. "The Preparation of College and University Administrators." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 49, No. 7 (March, 1968), pp. 390-394.
- Scott, C. Winfield, Ralph F. Berdie, Hubert W. Houghton, and Roger A. Myers. "Qualifications of Educators of Counselors and Student Personnel Workers: A Symposium." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 10, No. 1 (January, 1969), pp. 27-31.
- Shoben, Edward J., Jr. "Psychology and Student Personnel Work." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 8, No. 4 (July, 1967), pp. 239-245.
- Stripling, Robert O. and James L. Lister. "Selection, Preparation, and Professionalization of Specialists." Review of Educational Research, Vol. 33, No. 2 (April, 1963), pp. 171-178.
- Stroup, Herbert. "Sociology: Contributions to Student Personnel Worker." Counselor Education and Supervision, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Spring, 1967), pp. 157-165.

- Super, Donald E. "Comment." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Fall, 1962), p. 236.
- Thiel, Larry, and Linda Patrick. Percount. Technical Report No. 18. East Lansing: Michigan State University Computer Institute for Social Science Research (CISSR), 1968.
- Tracy, Joseph L. "The Current Status of Master's Programs in College Student Personnel." The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 9, No. 2 (October, 1971), pp. 106-110.
- Trueblood, Dennis L. "The Educational Preparation of the College Student Personnel Leader of the Future." In College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead. Edited by Gordon Klopff. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1966. pp. 77-84.
- Upcraft, M. Lee. "Does Training Make a Difference?" The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Vol. 9, No. 2 (October, 1971), pp. 134-137.
- Upcraft, M. Lee. "Role Expectations for Chief Personnel Administrators in Large Universities." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Useem, Ruth Hill. "Professionalizing an Academic Occupation: The Case of Student Personnel Work." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Winter, 1964), pp. 94-101.
- Van Dalen, B. B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.
- Wallenfeldt, Evert C. and Gordon S. Bigelow. "Status of the Internship in Student Personnel Studies." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer, 1971), pp. 180-184.
- Williamson, E. G. "Professional Preparation of Student Personnel Workers." School and Society, Vol. 86, No. 2123 (January, 1958), pp. 3-5.

Wright, Willis L. "An Analysis of Doctoral Programs in Guidance and Personnel Work in Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1958.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN THE INITIAL  
SURVEY TO DETERMINE INSTITUTIONS OFFERING DOCTORAL  
PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL



COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN THE INITIAL SURVEY TO  
DETERMINE INSTITUTIONS OFFERING DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN COLLEGE  
STUDENT PERSONNEL

Auburn University  
University of Alabama  
University of Arkansas  
Arizona State University  
University of Arizona  
Claremont Graduate School  
Colorado State University  
University of Colorado  
University of Denver  
University of Northern Colorado  
George Washington University  
Florida State University  
University of Florida  
University of Georgia  
University of Idaho  
Loyola University  
Northwestern University  
Southern Illinois University  
Purdue University  
Indiana State University  
Indiana University  
Iowa State University  
University of Iowa  
Kansas State University  
Northwestern State University (Louisiana)  
University of Maine  
University of Maryland  
Michigan State University  
Wayne State University  
Western Michigan University  
University of Minnesota  
Mississippi State University  
University of Mississippi  
New Mexico State University  
Montclair State College  
University of Nevada  
Rutgers University  
Cornell University  
State University of New York--Albany

State University of New York--Buffalo  
New York University  
Syracuse University  
Columbia Teachers College  
University of Rochester  
North Carolina State University  
University of North Dakota  
Bowling Green State University  
Case Western Reserve  
Kent State University  
Ohio University  
Ohio State University  
University of Toledo  
Oklahoma State University  
University of Oklahoma  
Oregon State University  
University of Oregon  
Pennsylvania State University  
University of Pennsylvania  
University of South Carolina  
Memphis State University  
University of Tennessee  
Baylor University  
East Texas State University  
Texas A. & M. University  
Texas Tech. University  
University of Texas  
University of Utah  
University of Virginia  
University of Washington  
West Virginia University  
University of Wyoming

APPENDIX B

LETTER AND INFORMATION SHEET FOR THE INITIAL SURVEY

---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION  
BRICKSON HALL

Ms. Marybelle Rockey and I have begun a project to evaluate doctoral-level college student personnel programs in several universities.

Before we proceed further in the design of an instrument, we need to know the number of doctoral candidates graduated from your university in the last three years and the exact name of the doctoral program at your institution.

We request that you complete the enclosed form and return it to us in the enclosed, pre-addressed, and stamped envelope.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

James Mansfield  
Instructor

Enclosures

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED  
ENVELOPE BEFORE DECEMBER 15

- (1) Check the title which best describes the Student Personnel Preparation Program at your university:

\_\_\_\_\_ (A) Student Personnel Administration  
\_\_\_\_\_ (B) Student Personnel  
\_\_\_\_\_ (C) College Personnel Administration  
\_\_\_\_\_ (D) College Personnel Work  
\_\_\_\_\_ (E) None of the above. Known here  
as \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) How many doctoral candidates were graduated from the above program during the following years?:

\_\_\_\_\_ 1968-69

\_\_\_\_\_ 1969-70

\_\_\_\_\_ 1970-71

Name of respondent \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Office \_\_\_\_\_

University \_\_\_\_\_

City and State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

RESPONSES TO INITIAL SURVEY WITH NAME OF PROGRAM

## RESPONSES TO INITIAL SURVEY WITH NAME OF PROGRAM

Auburn University	College Student Development
University of Alabama	College Personnel Work
University of Arkansas	Student Personnel Admin., Higher Ed.
Arizona State University	NO RESPONSE
University of Arizona	Student Personnel Work in Higher Ed.
Claremont Graduate School	No Program
Colorado State University	No Program (Master's Only)
University of Colorado	College Personnel Work
University of Denver	No Program in C.S.P., Higher Ed. only
University of Northern Colorado	College Student Personnel Work
George Washington University	Higher Education
Florida State University	Student Personnel Admin. in Higher Ed.
University of Florida	Counselor Ed. with emphasis in St. Pers. Work
University of Georgia	Student Personnel in Higher Education
University of Idaho	No Program
Loyola University	Student Personnel Work in Higher Ed.
Northwestern University	Student Personnel Administration
Southern Illinois University	Higher Education
Purdue University	Counseling & Personnel Services
Indiana State University	Guidance & Psychological Services
Indiana University	Higher Education Administration
Iowa State University	Higher Education
University of Iowa	College Student Personnel Administration
Kansas State University	Educational Psychology
Northwestern State University (Louisiana)	No Program
University of Maine	Name Not Listed
University of Maryland	Counseling and Personnel Services
Michigan State University	College Student Personnel in Higher Education
Wayne State University	NO RESPONSE
Western Michigan University	Educational Leadership/Student Pers. Admin.

University of Minnesota	Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology
Mississippi State University	Guidance Ed. with emphasis in St. Pers. Services
University of Mississippi	Higher Education & Student Pers. Services
New Mexico State University	Student Personnel in Ed. Psychology
Montclair State College	No Program
University of Nevada	No Program
Rutgers University	College Student Personnel Services
Cornell University	Student Personnel
State U. of New York-Albany	Student Personnel Work in Higher Ed.
State U. of New York-Buffalo	Counselor Education
New York University	Student Personnel Admin. in Colleges & Univ.
Syracuse University	Student Personnel Admin. in Higher Education
Columbia Teachers College	Student Personnel Administration
University of Rochester	Student Personnel Work
North Carolina State University	Guidance & Personnel Services
University of North Dakota	Counseling & Guidance
Bowling Green State University	College Student Personnel
Case Western Reserve	Student Personnel Administration
Kent State University	Student Personnel Services in Higher Education
Ohio University	Student Personnel
Ohio State University	College Student Personnel Work
University of Toledo	NO RESPONSE
Oklahoma State University	Student Personnel & Guidance
University of Oklahoma	Higher Education-Student Personnel Services
Oregon State University	College Student Personnel Administration
University of Oregon	College Student Personnel Administration
Pennsylvania State University	Student Personnel Services
University of Pennsylvania	Counseling Psychology
University of South Carolina	Student Personnel Services in Higher Education



Memphis State University	Student Personnel Administration
University of Tennessee	College Personnel Work
Baylor University	NO RESPONSE
East Texas State University	College Personnel Work
Texas A. & M. University	No Program
Texas Tech. University	Higher Education-Student Personnel
University of Texas	Counseling Psychology
University of Utah	No Program
University of Virginia	Counselor Education
University of Washington	Student Personnel Administration
West Virginia University	No Program
University of Wyoming	College Personnel Work in Guidance and Counselor Educ.

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

## UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

University of Alabama  
University of Northern Colorado  
George Washington University  
University of Georgia  
Loyola University  
Southern Illinois University  
Indiana University  
Iowa State University  
University of Iowa  
University of Maryland  
Michigan State University  
Rutgers University  
State University of New York--Albany  
Syracuse University  
Columbia Teachers College  
Bowling Green State University  
Oregon State University  
University of Oregon  
University of Tennessee  
University of Wyoming

APPENDIX E

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW OUTLINE

INTERVIEW ITEMS FOR COORDINATOR OF COLLEGE STUDENT  
PERSONNEL PREPARATION PROGRAM

1. Name of the University \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of Respondent \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_
3. Enrollment September, 1971: Graduate \_\_\_\_\_  
Undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_
4. Enrolled College Student Personnel Students (1971-72):  
Total Masters \_\_\_\_\_ Men \_\_\_\_\_ Women \_\_\_\_\_  
Total Ed. Spec. \_\_\_\_\_ Men \_\_\_\_\_ Women \_\_\_\_\_  
Total Doctoral \_\_\_\_\_ Men \_\_\_\_\_ Women \_\_\_\_\_
5. Credit system at your university: quarter, semester
6. Degree(s) offered in C.S.P.
7. The history and stages of development in the doctoral  
C.S.P. preparation program at your university.  
Year begun  
Original emphasis  
Current emphasis
8. The objectives of the doctoral C.S.P. preparation  
program at your university.
9. Is your doctoral program emphasis theoretical or  
pragmatic? Why?
10. The number of C.S.P. courses offered in your  
program. \_\_\_\_\_
11. How many courses are offered in a term? \_\_\_\_\_  
In a year? \_\_\_\_\_

12. The number of faculty members in your C.S.P. preparation program.

Full time \_\_\_\_\_ Part time \_\_\_\_\_ F.T.E. \_\_\_\_\_

13. Admission requirements to doctoral program in C.S.P.

Undergraduate major  
 Graduate major  
 G.P.A. cutoff  
 Tests-what and scores  
 Interviews  
 Recommendations  
 Work experience--nature and number of years  
 past M.A.  
 Personal characteristics  
 Degree commitment  
 Percentage accepted

14. In what ways does your university and your immediate department recruit candidates both formally and informally for the C.S.P. program?

15. The course requirements in a typical doctoral program.

	No. of Courses	No. of Hours
C.S.P.		
Counseling & Testing		
Admin. Theory		
Applied Admin.		
Human Learning & Dev.		
Historical and Phil. Foundations		
Research Competency		
Language		
Cognate		
Internships		

16. What are the practicum-internship arrangements? Who supervises them?

Requirements  
 Areas available  
 Where? On Campus? Off Campus?

17. What written and oral examinations are required for the C.S.P. candidate? At what stages are they given?
18. How many credits are awarded for the dissertation? \_\_\_\_
19. What percentage of C.S.P. doctoral students graduate? \_\_\_\_
20. Of those who graduate, what is the average time taken for completion? \_\_\_\_\_
21. What financial assistance administered through the institution is available for C.S.P. candidates?
  - Fellowships
  - Scholarships
  - Assistantships
  - Part-time employment
22. What percentage of students have financial assistance administered through the institution?
23. Do you provide travel grants for candidates to attend professional meetings? In state or out-of-state?  
How much?
24. Do you follow up graduates? How and when?
25. How and when do you evaluate your program? Who evaluates? Include students? Former grads?
26. In your opinion, what makes a quality C.S.P. preparation program?
27. If you were asked to put into rank order the five leading doctoral C.S.P. preparation programs in the U.S. at the present time, what would they be?

28. Why do you consider these to be the leading programs?
29. How does your program compare with these programs?
30. What changes would you like to see in your program, if any?
31. What changes do you foresee in your program in the next five years? Why?



APPENDIX F  
FACULTY COVER LETTER

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION  
BRICKSON HALL

For my dissertation, I am conducting a study of doctoral College Student Personnel preparation programs in selected universities in the United States. Your university has been chosen for inclusion in this project.

With the encouragement of C.S.P. educators as well as Commission XII of ACPA, the attached questionnaire was devised to elicit information from faculty members involved in C.S.P. preparation programs.

I sincerely seek your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. Without your participation, the study will be seriously lacking in input. Your responses will be treated professionally and confidentially.

I am planning to share the results of this study and will prepare a perspective of each university's program for its use.

Your cooperation in the study by completing and returning the questionnaire by \_\_\_\_\_ will be greatly appreciated. An addressed, stamped envelope is included for your convenience, and I thank you in advance for your assistance.

Most sincerely,

Marybelle C. Rockey  
C.S.P. Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX G  
FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL PREPARATION  
PROGRAM FACULTY

1. Name of the University \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of Respondent (optional) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Present Academic Rank or Title \_\_\_\_\_
4. Academic Background

Degree	Year	Major	Institution

5. Professional Experience

Title	Institution	No. Years

6. Age \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Sex \_\_\_\_\_
8. Percentage of time spent in each activity in typical work week:
  - \_\_\_\_\_ % Teaching
  - \_\_\_\_\_ % Administration
  - \_\_\_\_\_ % Advisement
  - \_\_\_\_\_ % Other (Committee meetings, research, consulting, professional organizations, etc.)
9. Percentage of time spent teaching and advising College Student Personnel doctoral candidates. \_\_\_\_\_

10. C.S.P. faculty responsibilities: (Circle appropriate response)

full time,    3/4 time,    1/2 time,    1/4 time,

occasional

11. Number of courses you teach on the average each term. \_\_\_\_\_

12. Courses you teach regularly.

Course Name	Level			Credits	No. Terms Offered Per Yr.	Average Enroll- ment	Check if C.S.P. Emphasis
	BA	MA	PhD				

13. Offices and committee assignments you have held in C.S.P. professional organizations.

Organization	Office Held	Major
		Committee Membership

14. The number of C.S.P. professional meetings you have attended in the last five years.

National \_\_\_\_\_ Regional \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Local \_\_\_\_\_

15. Professional publications in C.S.P. or closely related areas. (Do not include internal institutional publications.) If available, please attach a publication list.

	Number	Year Published
Books-authored or co-authored		
Books-contributed to		
Books-editor of		
Monographs-authored or co-authored		
Monographs-contributed to		
Journals-National		
Journals-State		

16. Emphasis in the C.S.P. preparation program at your university. Put a 1 in the category describing the emphasis in your doctoral program and a 2 in the category describing the emphasis in your master's program.

_____ Administration	_____ Psychology
_____ Counseling	_____ Student Development
_____ Educational Psychology	_____ Other. Explain _____

17. The five leading doctoral C.S.P. preparation programs listed in rank order.

1.	4.
2.	5.
3.	

18. Changes you would recommend in the doctoral College Student Personnel Preparation Program at your University.

Thank you for your participation in this study. Please return the questionnaire in the addressed, stamped envelope to:

Marybelle C. Rockey  
 W510 Owen Hall, Michigan State University  
 East Lansing, Michigan 48823

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293106670692