INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

AN INVESTIGATION OF UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Mary Ellen Quinn

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1972

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION OF
UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES
AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Mary Ellen Quinn

Problem

Although field study is not new, a recent upsurge of interest in off-campus learning has prompted many colleges and universities to initiate or expand their programs. The purpose of this work was to examine undergraduate field studies at Michigan State University in an attempt to provide guidelines for the further development and implementation of such experiences in other universities or liberal arts colleges. Specifically this study attempts to investigate:

1. the extent to which field study is part of the curricula in a large university;
2. the extent to which such experiences are designed and evaluated according to stated goals and objectives;
3. those factors both within and outside of the institution which prove inhibiting to the development of field studies;

4. those situations students encounter which encourage or discourage them in their participation.

Design

Questionnaires were sent to all departments offering undergraduate instruction to determine the extent to which field study is offered for credit. Second questionnaires were sent to the forty-one departments reporting such field studies, and follow-up interviews with faculty and students were arranged for thirty-five of these departments--all except those whose field experiences prepare students for traditional teaching or nursing careers. These questionnaires and interviews identified both the problems and the promises of field study and showed the extent to which these experiences were designed and evaluated according to stated goals and objectives.

Findings

Questionnaires and interviews confirmed that problems found in earlier studies persist today. Opportunities for field study, while increasing for students of average ability, are still confined mostly to the junior and senior years. Faculty time, institutional costs, limited field opportunities, and costs to students inhibit departments from offering field study and students from participating. However, innovative approaches, student interest, and breadth

of experiences encourage faculty to provide such opportunities.

Although most departments had definite objectives, the admitted weaknesses in evaluation indicated their failure to express these objectives as attainable goals.

Field studies seemed to operate in departmental environments which were sometimes supportive, sometimes tolerant, but seldom openly encouraging. Faculty involved found overload demanding, costs discouraging, time demands excessive, interdepartmental cooperation limited, and campus-wide communication lacking.

Students were highly enthusiastic about their experiences, wanted opportunities extended to all students and available earlier in their programs. They seemed to seek out the programs which most nearly complied with their interests and purposes: to be freed from traditional regulations, to get vocational experience, to experience learning by doing, or simply to escape from campus. However, despite their praise, students found communication faulty, faculty not always supportive, and costs and transportation burdensome and inequitable.

Guidelines

From these findings the following guidelines seem justified.

1. Field study objectives must be in harmony with institutional objectives and must state desired outcomes in terms of achievable goals.
2. Costs must be realistically appraised before commitments to field study are made and then on-going evaluation of the program and student performance must follow up such commitments.
3. Faculty must have sufficient time for planning, advising, supervision, and evaluation in order to give field studies adequate structure and students adequate guidance.
4. A supportive climate which encourages both faculty and students and allows students to share in the planning and design of field studies is essential to a good program.
5. Communication, cooperation, and coordination among departments must be established and guidelines provided to ensure consistent policies.
6. Contact agencies and outside organizations should be involved in planning.

Further research is needed on: the relationship between credit granted and student time expended, appropriate evaluation methods, new grading procedures, simulated learning experiences, and mechanisms for involving more off-campus personnel and organizations in this type of educational venture.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my sincere gratitude to Dr. Margaret F. Lorimer for her constant support, valuable direction and scholarly criticism during my work with her prior to and during my research. I am also very grateful to Dr. Walter F. Johnson for his friendly guidance and helpful advice during this research and throughout my graduate studies.

My sincere appreciation to:

- Dr. Dorothy A. Arata for her interest in and support of my study;
- The department chairmen, faculty, and students in departments which I visited, for their gracious cooperation;
- The members of the Field Study Committee for their openness and sharing;
- The Sisters of Mercy, my religious community, for their encouragement in this profitable endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Field study experiences in colleges and universities in the United States are not new. In 1945 Lynd wrote, "A growing number of colleges and universities have made use of field work during the last few decades."[1] Twenty years later McGrath and Meeth claimed:

> An increasing number of colleges are requiring work experience of their students as a regular part of the student's college program. The trend here is . . . toward the development of . . . plans that require or encourage the student to spend . . . time in some kind of work activity or field or other off-campus project.[2]

And yet in the book, Innovation in Liberal Arts Colleges, published by Brick and McGrath in 1969, field study experiences are included as one of the "innovations"--still growing in use and availability to a greater number of students.[3]

---

[1]Helen Merrell Lynd, Field Work in College Education (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), p. 11.

[2]Earl J. McGrath and L. Richard Meeth, "Organizing for Teaching and Learning: The Curriculum," in Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, edited by Samuel Baskin (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), p. 42.

[3]Michael Brick and Earl J. McGrath, Innovation in liberal Arts Colleges (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969).

This apparent contradiction--a long-established curricular practice and at the same time an innovation--reflects something about the vagueness that surrounds the current status of college field study experiences. In writing about independent study under which she includes field study, Thompson points out that few aspects of the curriculum have been so little researched,[4] yet Brick and McGrath claim that institutions which have adopted field study experiences "are convinced that they have great educational merit . . . that off-campus study stimulates the entire campus."[5]

Students across the country are demanding broad changes in what they learn and how they learn it. Some of their criticisms seem to echo Brownell's censures--that higher education is still treated not as life but only as a preparation for life; that the student is placed in a social vacuum, a "recess from life;" and that higher education is almost completely divorced in the student's experience from significant practice.[6] Students today are clamoring for relevance and meaningfulness. Among others, Heist and Wilson report that they complain about "the rigidity of curricula

---

[4]Mary Magdala Thompson, "A Study of Problems Impeding the Growth of Independent Study in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1971).

[5]Brick and McGrath, op. cit., p. 47.

[6]Baker Brownell, The College and the Community (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), pp. 35-37.

and academic experiences" and the lack of "opportunity to pursue their interests or to learn in ways most advantageous to them."[7] The pressures building up within and pushing beyond campus walls can be felt strongly. Nesmith claims that

> They are signs of the times: part of the whole spectacle of student unrest. Students are uneasy, unhappy, rebellious against conventional patterns of learning and conventional institutions of learning because they feel these are divorced from reality, too far removed from the action. For whatever else the student rebellions mean, they mean at least that students are fighting their way out to what they consider vital, dynamic, important to the world.[8]

Many colleges and universities are attempting to respond to the demands and needs of students, and as a result some are exploring or developing or expanding field study experiences--experiences which Mayhew contends are the right of every student.[9] In writing about such experiences Dressel admits "the willingness of colleges and students to do this implies that there is something lacking in the campus

---

[7]Paul Heist and Robert Wilson, "Curricular Experiences for the Creative," in The Creative College Student: An Unmet Challenge, edited by Paul Heist (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968), p. 192.

[8]James N. Nesmith, "Report of Inquiry into the Structuring and Evaluating of Field Study as a Method of Improving Teaching and Learning," (unpublished report to the Danforth Foundation, Stephens College, Missouri, Fall, 1969).

[9]Lewis B. Mayhew and Patrick J. Ford, Changing the Curriculum (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971), p. 162.

community experience."[10] However, in our highly complex society this "something lacking" is not necessarily a fault, for were colleges and universities to attempt to incorporate all of the potential learning situations or opportunities, they would be undertaking an impossible task. Businesses, hospitals, different cultural settings--these are but a few of the sites to which students go for different kinds of learning experiences. Lynd defends off-campus learning:

> For certain subjects field work is as essential as the laboratory for natural science, the studio for painting, the nursery school for child psychology. Field work may also be of the utmost importance in developing relations among different areas of knowledge and between college and community life. To many students field work gives a method of learning and a sense of significance and coherence which is irreplaceable at certain points in their education and which enriches subsequent study.[11]

Theory

In Lynd's statement are some basic assumptions about learning which give support to the concept of field study. First, learning need not be confined to the traditional campus. Dearing,[12] Mayhew,[13] and more recently Gould and

---

[10]Paul L. Dressel, College and University Curriculum (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1968), p. 83.

[11]Lynd, op. cit., p. vii.

[12]Bruce Dearing, "The Student on His Own: Independent Study," in Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, edited by Samuel Baskin (New York: McGraw-Hill Book, Co., 1965).

[13]Mayhew and Ford, op. cit.

Cross[14] contend that the ivory towers must extend into the community where others than professors contribute to the educational process. The student is then involved in what he terms a "real world" situation.

A second belief in relation to field study is that the testing of theory in practical situations adds a most valuable contribution to the learning process. Henderson is only one who claims that "the interweaving of the theoretical and the practical should accelerate learning and make it more lasting. It should result in a higher degree of competence in the individual."[15] The student develops a most important aspect of learning--the ability to place objects and events in new relationships.

When this application of theory directs itself outwardly--to the community, to the service of others, to societal issues--another dimension is approached. Dunivant claims that the cue words of today's students are relevance, meaningfulness, and action.[16] Measured against these criteria many college courses prove woefully lacking. However,

---

[14]Samuel B. Gould and K. Patricia Cross, (eds.) Explorations in Non-Traditional Study (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972).

[15]Algo D. Henderson, The Innovative Spirit (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970), p. 18.

[16]Noel Dunivant, Jr., Bridging the Gap, the Winston-Salem Service-Learning Project in Community Resource Development (Summer, 1969), p. 3.

the involvement demanded by some field study experiences fulfills some of the needs implied by these terms.

> [The student's] interaction with his environment can be so structured as to enable him to gain awareness and understanding of the world in a conscious, systematic fashion, i.e., to learn; and simultaneously, to render service to his community by helping to meet its needs and solve its problems, i.e., to serve.[17]

Sanford, too, notes that if students are fully immersed in the realities of a problem situation--are engaged with it and concerned with bringing about some desirable changes--that situation can be very meaningful.[18]

Another assumption, one so basic and yet at the same time frequently disregarded, is that each individual is unique and has different needs. Aydelotte maintains that "the best education for any individual is that which will develop his powers to the utmost and best fit him to realize his own ideal of the good life . . . ."[19] He wrote this after pointing out that the greatest defect of education is the regimentation of individuals. Educational programs should reflect the interests and capabilities of different students and should provide opportunities for the students to respond at the time, in the manner, and at the pace best suited to the individual. Many types of field studies are

---

[17] Ibid., p. 2.

[18] Nevitt Sanford, Where Colleges Fail (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1967), p. 209.

[19] Frank Aydelotte, Breaking the Academic Lockstep (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944), p. 128.

structured in such a way that these goals may be achieved. However, basic to an environment that allows this type of growth is, according to Heist, a teacher-student relationship that is supportive of the student.[20]

Finally, there is evidence that individual development, whether it be a greater sense of responsibility, self-reliance, self-direction, or independence, is fostered by field study experiences. That these are valid goals of higher education is strongly stated in the Hazen Foundation report.

> The chief goal of the college and university is to train and develop the human intellect, extending the power of independent and balanced thought and deepening the powers of discrimination and critical expression. But it is no longer possible to take a narrow view of intelligence as "academic knowledge," isolating cognitive growth from moral growth and the general maturation of the person. This view appears untenable not so much for reasons of philosophy, but rather because our knowledge of the nature of the human personality forces us to conclude that cognitive growth which is separated from the development of other aspects of the human personality is illusory or distorted.[21]

Perhaps such personal growth is not realized through all types of field studies, but it can be through those that take the form of an independent study project. Both Mayhew[22]

---

[20]Heist and Wilson, op. cit., p. 197.

[21]The Student in Higher Education, Report of the Commission on the Student in Higher Education, New Haven, Connecticut: The Hazen Foundation (January, 1968), p. 8.

[22]Mayhew and Ford, op. cit.

and Dressel[23] include these goals in their discussion of independent study.

These beliefs should challenge colleges and universities to consider more carefully the advantages of field study experiences for their students. Nevertheless, Dressel points out that there are some disadvantages and problems: planning, coordinating, and staffing.[24] Despite such warnings many colleges and universities are embarking on field study programs without sufficient preparation. Literature on the topic is limited and, as will be pointed out in the review of literature, the little we have is more descriptive than critical. Promotion of field studies does not seem to be based on solid research findings nor on evaluation.

Purpose of Study

All indications are that off-campus learning experiences should remain the subject of continued study. The purpose of this investigation, therefore, is to examine some undergraduate field study experiences at Michigan State University in an attempt to provide guidelines and directions for the further development and implementation of such experiences in other universities and liberal arts colleges.

---

[23] Dressel, op. cit.

[24] Ibid., pp. 78-83.

Specifically in this study there is an attempt to investigate:

1. the extent to which field study experiences are a part of the curriculum,
2. the extent to which field study experiences are designed and evaluated according to stated goals and objectives,
3. those factors on the part of the institution and faculty which prove inhibiting to the development of field study experiences,
4. those factors outside of the institution which prove inhibiting to the development of field study experiences,
5. those problems students encounter which discourage them in their participation in field study experiences,
6. those aspects of field study experiences which students find stimulating and valuable.

The plan of the study was, first, to identify field study experiences at Michigan State University by means of brief questionnaires sent to each department chairman. Following this investigation, more extensive questionnaires were sent to faculty members involved in field study experiences in order to gain insight into the current status and practices in the various departments. To clarify and to expand the information contributed through the questionnaires,

interviews were requested of a sample of faculty and participating students.

This survey and analysis was undertaken to reveal both strengths and weaknesses of college field study experiences. The extent to which unclear objectives, lack of coordination, and various environmental factors pose problems which work against the successful implementation of these programs; the relationship between budgetary allocations and planning for field experiences, between finances and the actualization of such programs; and factors which encourage the development or expansion of opportunities for students to participate in valid field study experiences are examined and analyzed. Guidelines for the establishment or expansion of field study experiences in liberal arts colleges and universities are formulated from the analysis.

Dressel cautions that field experiences must fit into a program with continuity and sequence. "Structure," he says, "need not be provided by traditional methods, but it must be provided."[25] If the boundaries of campuses are expanding through field experiences, and Mayhew says it can be assumed that the forces or conditions demanding innovation will not diminish in pressure,[26] then it seems imperative that continuous research be undertaken in this area.

---

[25]Dressel, op. cit., p. 24.

[26]Lewis B. Mayhew, Colleges Today and Tomorrow (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1969), p. 160.

This study begins with a review of past and present practices in field study. Then, following the plan or methodology used, the findings from the questionnaires and the information gained through the faculty and student interviews are presented. The study concludes with some guidelines and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In Explorations in Non-Traditional Study[27] Gould refers to non-traditional study as a group of changing educational patterns caused by the changing needs and opportunities of society. Much of it, he points out, is not new, but it is being catapulted to the forefront of public attention. Although the particular emphasis in his book is on non-traditional, external degree programs, the definition also extends to other off-campus learning experiences. Those field experiences or activities that occur outside of the conventional classroom setting but under the auspices of a college or university--experiences such as work experiences, service experiences, and cultural experiences--are among the vast array of educational programs or study termed non-traditional. These off-campus field experiences are the subject of this study.

In the above-mentioned work, which has been acclaimed the first careful, scholarly examination of non-traditional study, the authors argue that learning can and does take place in different ways for different people, but they also

---

[27]Gould and Cross, op. cit.

point out the confusion that surrounds all aspects of non-traditional study today--confusion, among other things, about what it is and what it is expected to do. When the history and development of field study experiences on campuses are reviewed, it seems somewhat surprising to note that such confusion exists, for one would think that the continued expansion and increasing popularity of these experiences would attest to the fact that field study has been well researched. With the exception of student teaching and nursing experiences, areas not included in this study, such is not the case.

Extent and Development of Field Study

Field study appears on campuses in many different forms. It includes field trips as well as extensive programs of foreign study, observations with minimal participation as well as intern programs, service projects, or even work experiences. Sometimes it is considered under the broad umbrella of independent study and as such refers to any number of types of programs. And underlying all of these is the belief that there is value in the interweaving of theory and practice and/or that some experiences and learning can best be achieved outside of the traditional classroom.

It was in 1906 at the University of Cincinnati that Herman Schneider inaugurated one form of field study, a

cooperative work-and-study program.[28] The plan called for students to spend alternate periods at study in the College of Engineering and at work on jobs. They were to learn through apprenticeships with industry as an extension of the laboratories at the school. In the 1920's Antioch[29] and then later Northeastern University[30] allowed students to intersperse formal academic studies with work experience. Lynd regarded Antioch College a pioneer in the movement of making field work an essential part of the college program and claimed, "For the majority of Antioch students, the work has been at least as important a part of their college experience as academic study."[31] In the 1930's Bennington College, which from the outset sought to provide experiences outside the classroom, allowed students to spend as much as a year away from campus on research, study, or work.[32] Gradually the list grew and the experiences broadened. By 1958 Wilson and Lyons[33] found more than 60 colleges and universities with such cooperative programs. And in 1969 two other

---

[28]Henderson, op. cit., p. 19.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Mayhew and Ford, op. cit., p. 98.

[31]Lynd, op. cit., p. 12.

[32]Mayhew and Ford, op. cit., p. 153.

[33]James W. Wilson and Edward H. Lyons, Work-Study College Programs (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961).

reports indicate the continued growth of such field experiences. Dressel and DeLisle compiled results from a randomly selected catalog survey of one-third of all four-year liberal arts colleges and universities listed in the 1964 edition of the American Council on Education American Universities and Colleges and found 5.6 percent with work-study or cooperative programs.[34] Brick and McGrath, however, polled by questionnaire all four-year institutions in the Unided States offering a program of liberal arts. They used the Education Directory, Part 3, Higher Education, published by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965-66. Their findings indicate that 54.3 percent of the colleges and universities reported actually having or planning to introduce work-study programs as a part of the curriculum or instruction.[35] Perhaps the great discrepancy appears because of the inadequacy of catalog descriptions.

Field trips are another form of field study that has undergone remarkable change. Some faculties have long made use of the field trip as a way of implementing and enriching the curriculum. At Stephens College the field trip has a certain notoriety as far back as the 1920's and especially during the 1930's, when whole trains were reserved for the

---

[34]Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, Undergraduate Curriculum Trends (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969), Table 15, p. 39.

[35]Brick and McGrath, op. cit., Table 2, p. 20.

entire student body and its faculty for travel to New York.[36] Now field trips range from excursions to museums or geological sites to visits to different cities and even different countries. These latter have developed, in some instances, to undergraduate study abroad. Today the Junior Year Abroad program is known by every faculty member in foreign languages. Dressel and DeLisle found 46.9 percent of the colleges and universities offering study abroad;[37] Brick and McGrath found 63.3 percent.[38] The rapid growth of this opportunity is quite evident when it is noted that prior to 1950 only six programs existed whereby undergraduates could earn credit abroad during the academic year.[39]

Somewhat related to the work experiences already described are service-learning experiences or programs. A quarter of a century ago Earlham College in Indiana had a program of Community Dynamics whereby students helped in community efforts, and Brooklyn College in New York City has had a community service program for a long time.[40] Goshen College, Indiana, has a trimester plan with study and service; the objective is to examine and experience the culture of

---

[36]Nesmith, op. cit., p. 41.

[37]Dressel and DeLisle, op. cit.

[38]Brick and McGrath, op. cit.

[39]Ibid., p. 41.

[40]Brick and McGrath, op. cit., p. 45.

another country and to give service to people in need.[41] At the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay the faculty members are expected to be involved in community outreach activities, preferably in conjunction with their students.[42] The list could be extended, for other colleges and universities, too, have established such programs. Dressel and DeLisle report 4 percent;[43] Brick and McGrath report 70.3 percent;[44] but a postcard survey conducted in 1968 by the Commission on Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education and the National Service Secretariat, found that only 13 percent of the 2106 colleges and universities polled offer credit for off-campus service activities.[45] Such differences in findings, particularly those of Dressel and DeLisle as contrasted with those of Brick and McGrath, may be attributed to methods of research, different populations, and restrictions of definition.

Some of the most interesting developments in service-learning have taken place in the South. In 1967 the Southern

---

[41] Ibid., p. 36.

[42] Harry V. Scott, "American Higher Education: Some Features of the Current Scene," The North Central Association Quarterly, XLVI, No. 3 (Winter, 1972), 343.

[43] Dressel and DeLisle, op. cit., p. 39.

[44] Brick and McGrath, op. cit., p. 20.

[45] Donald J. Eberly, "Service Experience and Educational Growth," Educational Record, XLIX, No. 2 (Spring, 1968) 201.

Regional Education Board established a program to provide students with internships off campus.[46] These internships required students to accomplish a clearly defined independent project for a social or economic agency with assistance from an agency supervisor and a faculty counselor. Another Southern project, the Winston-Salem Service-Learning Project in Community Resource Development, was organized to "bridge the gap" between academic institutions and the surrounding community, between learning about the world vicariously and consciously experiencing it firsthand.[47] What is different about these two programs is that the push for their development and expansion is coming from outside the institutions of higher education. In the first instance it is from the federal Economic Development Administration; in the latter case, from the State Department.

Perhaps the widest variety of field study experiences falls under independent study. Many of the early off-campus experiences were direct outgrowths of the independent honors programs such as the tutorials at Swarthmore or the independent programs at Sarah Lawrence. Both of these institutions adhered to the philosophy that students can assume a greater

---

[46]William R. O'Connell, Jr., "Innovations in Undergraduate Instruction: Service-Learning as a Southern Strategy," (address given at the American Association for Higher Education Meeting, Chicago, March 7, 1972).

[47]Dunivant, op. cit.

share of the responsibility for their own learning. Bennington, Bard, Goddard, Sarah Lawrence, Swarthmore, Reed, and Stephens are all some of the early pioneers who regarded as valid the philosophy which fused academic and off-campus or work experiences.[48]

A relatively recent trend is revision of the academic calendar in order to provide special opportunities for field study. Bard College in New York began a distinctive Winter Field Period whereby for seven weeks students could explore vocational, creative, or intellectual interests away from campus and classroom.[49] Florida Presbyterian in 1960 and Beloit College in 1964 were among the first to rearrange their calendars so that each student could have an off-campus experience of several months between fall and spring terms.[50] St. Olaf College and Macalester College in Minnesota and Colby College in Maine were leaders in developing winter term programs,[51] but today there are too many such programs to list.

From the above-mentioned reports it is evident that field studies are indeed a part of higher education in the United States today. Difficulty in determining the extent

---

[48]Mayhew and Ford, op. cit., p. 136.

[49]Brick and McGrath, op. cit., p. 35.

[50]Mayhew and Ford, op. cit., p. 99.

[51]Brick and McGrath, op. cit., p. 35.

results from the variety of experiences described as field study. Some of the newer programs, like the one at New College at Sarasota, Florida, emphasize the notion of self-pacing and self-determination,[52] but whatever the emphasis, whether the programs are to prepare students vocationally or professionally, to give them broader cultural experiences, or to provide them with the opportunity of giving service and perhaps responding to some of the ills of society, the fact is that they are here.

Previous Research

Such enumerations and descriptions as have just been pointed out do relatively little to enlighten one about the goals, restrictions, problems, and values of field study. Two surveys of honors courses, which category at that time included such few independent field studies as were available to students, were undertaken by Aydelotte in 1924[53] and in 1925.[54] In these he noted that the trend was to restrict these experiences to "better students." These surveys were conducted by the Division of Educational Relations of the

---

[52]Scott, op. cit., p. 346.

[53]Frank Aydelotte, "Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities," Bulletin of the National Research Council, VII, Part 4, No. 40 (January, 1924).

[54]Ibid., X (April, 1925).

National Research Council, but it was not clear how the colleges were selected.

In 1934 Taylor and Sinclair,[55] again not singling out field studies but rather including some forms of it under independent study, reported such experiences still being limited to honors students. The questionnaires, sent to colleges and universities accredited by the Association of American Universities, revealed that one-third of those colleges offered independent study but that relatively few students enrolled. The direction or supervision of such work was generally an extra load for faculty.

Still focusing on independent study, Umstattd in 1935 published further findings.[56] Greater freedom and latitude and the pursuit of any subject by independent study were reported by over one-half of the colleges and universities with independent study programs, but most offerings were still restricted to above-average students. It is not known how the colleges--more than 300--were selected for this catalog survey.

Aydelotte continued his interest in honors work and independent study and in 1944 published Breaking the Academic

---

[55]Mary Barbara Taylor and J. H. Sinclair, "Honors Work in Institutions Accredited by the American Association of Universities," School and Society, XXXIII (February 14, 1931).

[56]J. G. Umstattd, "The Prevalence and Practice of Independent Study," The Journal of Higher Education, VI (October, 1935).

Lockstep,[57] a book which reported the results of his and other Swarthmore faculty members' visits to a sampling of colleges and universities on the approved list of the Association of American Universities. He reemphasized the trend to limit such experiences to the superior student and like Taylor and Sinclair he noted the added burden of independent study on faculty.

In 1945 a report emerged that pertained specifically to field study, Lynd's Field Work in College Education.[58] Whereas the previously mentioned research endeavors included field study under independent study, this work focused on field study, but only one aspect or form of it--that termed field work.

A grant from the General Education Board to Sarah Lawrence College from 1935-1940 initiated this widely publicized study on field work. The College, founded in 1928 for the purpose of seeing what could be done by giving individual attention, had initiated field work for the same reason, to provide for the uniqueness of each person. The study was undertaken in order to ascertain how the College was proceeding in this area and to make its findings known. Although Lynd called the study only an exploration and a

---

[57]Frank Aydelotte, Breaking the Academic Lockstep (New York: Harper & Bros., 1944).

[58]Lynd, op. cit.

beginning and matintained there were no final results in any single area, it was a contribution to the minimal body of research on the development of field work.

After studying field work at Sarah Lawrence, Lynd identified problem areas as transportation, evaluation, and arrangements such as scheduling interviews, keeping appointments, and attending meetings. Other concerns, too, were pointed out: providing for supervision, overtaxing the community, and most important of all, proper planning for the studies. Sarah Lawrence College also learned, as a result of the study, to strive for a balance between structure and casualness, not to limit experiences to the vocational, not to limit them to the above-average student, and not to restrict them to the junior and senior years. Individual differences must be considered.

Although the limitations of human time and energy posed a conflict for the faculty, the general feeling at Sarah Lawrence College about field work was expressed by Lynd:

> It remains true, however, that for many students field work gives a kind of educational experience which they can not acquire adequately in any other way. The kinds of skills acquired in the process of getting ready for an interview, of observing unlabeled material, of deciding how to organize data, of developing appropriate methods of statistical and of qualitative analysis can scarcely be glimpsed in any brief summary. Furthermore, some of the most important results of field work appear, not in its direct bearing on the course in which it is done, but in the heightened perceptions it carries over

> to other courses and in providing a natural method of relating and deepening various areas of work within and without the college.[59]

In 1957 Bonthius et al., with a grant from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, published results of probably the most comprehensive survey and evaluation of independent study yet made.[60] Again we must limit our view of field study to those projects which fall in the independent study category. Field study, however, was specifically named as one of the forms of independent study investigated. This work focused on the programs at Wooster College and twenty other institutions with different types of independent study plans.

Prior to this study Bonthius had conducted a catalog survey of all four-year colleges and universities in the United States which granted the bachelor's degree and had found a general increase in the number of independent study programs and a trend toward opening up such opportunities to all undergraduate students. However, he still found the junior and senior years the preferred times for admission to such projects.

In the Wooster study, general weaknesses were identified as inadequate advising and insufficient preparation for

---

[59] Lynd, op. cit., p. 113.

[60] Robert H. Bonthius, F. James Davis and J. Gerber Drushel, The Independent Study Program in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).

the students. The most frequently mentioned value was the development of the ability to work resourcefully or creatively on one's own. Also mentioned as values were "the opportunity to probe intensively into an area of special interest, the opportunity to learn research techniques, [and] the development of the ability to organize and present material."[61]

Drawbacks for students were listed as lack of sufficient guidance, the possibilities of procrastination, the feeling that the program was not so demanding or rewarding as course work, and the insufficient amount of time or credit. Teachers' drawbacks were almost all centered around the heavy burden placed on their time and energy, and a drawback from the administration viewpoint was the instructional expense.

Bonthius felt his study raised more questions than it suggested answers.

> More adequate criteria are needed before final pronouncements upon the claims and weaknesses of independent study plans can be made. . . . It is the hope of the authors that this study will stimulate further investigation of an undergraduate method which has gained the approval of so many of the students, faculty, and administrators who have adopted it.[62]

Another study on field work or cooperative education was undertaken and published by Wilson and Lyons in 1961.[63]

---

[61]Bonthius, Davis, and Drushel, op. cit., p. 214.

[62]Ibid., p. 220.

[63]Wilson and Lyons, op. cit.

It was promoted by the Fund for the Advancement of Education because of a strong feeling on the part of some educators that

> There has been a glaring lack of basic research properly documenting the philosophic advantages and disadvantages of this approach as part of an educational process. In addition, there is a remarkable paucity of information regarding specific values, variety in curricula, [and] contributions of industry to this type of education.[64]

Through studying a sampling of the 61 colleges whose programs fit the definition of cooperative education, it was sought to illuminate a number of positive and negative claims about work study. After extensive research, the conclusion was that the educational values of cooperative education are very significant. By theory and practice being more closely related, students find greater meaning in their studies, motivation is increased, and students develop a greater sense of independence and of responsibility.

Planning and costs, as in other studies, were mentioned as problems and a new obstacle was identified.

> Students are not always used in ways that best capitalize upon their abilities and that provide them with the most suitable educational experiences. The institutional coordinators feel that some employers frequently use cooperative students for menial and repetitive jobs which do not offer them either the challenge or opportunity to use effectively the knowledge and skills that they have acquired on campus.[65]

---

[64] Ibid., p. 4.

[65] Wilson and Lyons, op. cit., p. 149.

Nevertheless, Wilson concludes that cooperative education programs have sufficient merit to warrant their development and expansion.

Once again, in 1964, results of an institutional survey on independent study were published by Felder.[66] In his contact of 520 four-year colleges and universities, he found that 68 percent of the respondents offered independent study and that almost two-thirds of these singled out field study as one of the forms of independent study. Although Felder found that a greater percentage of the student's work might now be in independent study projects, still fewer than half of the colleges contacted allowed freshmen and sophomores to enroll for such credit.

Several studies have been reviewed but none so far have described or considered the broad, general area of field study. Finally, in 1969, such a study was released.[67] Just four years ago Stephens College at Columbia, Missouri, a college long known for its devotion to the ideal of innovation and experimentation, felt a sense of urgency about field study and undertook the task of looking at it systematically. Two questions about field education--how can it be structured and how can it be evaluated--were of paramount importance in their quest and so with funds from the Danforth Foundation,

---

[66] Dell Felder, "Independent-Study Practices in Colleges and Universities," The Journal of Higher Education, XXV, No. 6 (June, 1964).

[67] Nesmith, op. cit.

a Field Study Team accepted the charge of looking into field studies at Stephens College.

The process of inquiry itself contributed to a heightened interest in and enthusiasm for field study throughout the college. New courses were developed, new ways of scheduling were implemented, faculty seminars were arranged, operating procedures were reviewed, and new forms and guidelines were collected from other colleges. These show results, but what was learned is of more importance.

The study at Stephens College indicated that the key to successful field study is the instructor and his willingness to give the time needed for supervision. A conclusion drawn from this is that "no student should be sent into a field setting unless there is a reliable, substantial, and willing person who . . . is more than happy, even enthusiastic, about the project and the student.[68]

The importance of structure was the second most useful finding. The team decided that in delineating a project both the instructor and the student must have clear-cut objectives, know how the student will reach these goals, and know how the study will be evaluated. If the student has sufficient preparation and if these other criteria are realized, the faculty thought it would be difficult for a

---

[68]Nesmith, op. cit., p. 57.

student to go through an experience with supervision and not realize substantial educational benefits.[69]

Another opinion of the Stephens College Team was that there should be some regular contact with the home campus, even if only through a log. Personal contact, too, was emphasized in order to reassure the student and give her a chance to sound off about problems or concerns. This latter should be done, they thought, even if only by phone.[70]

At the conclusion of the study the Field Study Team admitted that their work, or the work of anyone examining field study in undergraduate colleges and universities, was not complete. In a report to the Danforth Foundation they stated, "There is need for wider understanding of both the promise and the problems of Field Study."[71]

The Danforth Foundation has continued its interest in field study. During the summers of 1969 and 1970 it sponsored institutes at Stephens College for a number of developing colleges, and the message was loud and clear--the colleges must respond more to the community and its needs. And field study is an important way of responding. This present study at Michigan State University was prompted by the interest aroused at those summer institutes.

---

[69] Nesmith, op. cit., p. 58.

[70] Ibid., p. 59.

[71] Ibid., p. 61.

Summary

To describe field study and to trace its growth in colleges and universities is a somewhat discouraging task because of the many different meanings and definitions of field study. Nevertheless, by looking at the growth and development of field trips, foreign study, service-learning projects, work-study programs, and the many field studies falling under the independent study category, it is evident from surveys and reports that field study is subscribed to--at least in theory--by many colleges and universities and that such programs are expanding and growing in popularity.

To find evaluations of such programs and to make comparisons is an even more discouraging task not only because of the limited number of such research studies but also because of the use of some broad categories such as independent study and the narrow focus of others such as work study. Consequently comparisons of data are all but impossible. And even in studies using the same category, there is such diversity in the selection of colleges and universities and such a variety of methodologies used--catalog surveys, questionnaires, interviews--that findings do not readily lend themselves to such comparisons.

Certain trends, restrictions, problems and values, however, did emerge. The opportunity for field study as one form of independent study has increased for the average student but is still confined mostly to the junior and senior

years of study. It has provided opportunities for learning which cannot be duplicated on campus, and it has promoted independence and responsibility. The key to a successful field study is the faculty member, and yet one of the most frequently-mentioned problems is the extra burden or load such study places on the faculty. Evaluation and supervision are closely related problem areas which were frequently identified.

It is interesting to note that as each study was completed, the researchers stressed that their findings were limited and that there should be continued investigation of both the problems and values of field study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study, an attempt to identify and examine undergraduate field study experiences at Michigan State University, was undertaken in hopes that an investigation of the important aspects of these experiences would help provide direction for the further development and implementation of such experiences in liberal arts colleges and universities. Positive and stimulating aspects of field study experiences as well as inhibiting factors were included in the research.

Population

All of the colleges, departments, schools and other units such as centers or programs which offer undergraduate instruction at Michigan State University were selected for the study. This grouping included seventy-four departments, nine schools, and four other instructional units within twelve of the colleges and three colleges which are not organized along departmental lines. The total selection numbered ninety different divisions. Units which were excluded because of their exclusive concentration on graduate

education were five departments in human medicine and osteopathic medicine.

Selection of Sample

The initial questionnaire (Appendix I) was a survey instrument distributed to all deans, department chairmen, or directors for the purpose of gaining information about the extent of field study offerings. Each was asked to indicate whether or not his department* offered some form of undergraduate field experience for credit, to specify by course number each particular offering providing opportunity for such experiences, and to indicate whether these courses were:

a. a professional requirement,

b. a departmental requirement, or

c. optional courses or experiences.

The questionnaire indicated that field study would include such experiences as observations, intern programs, work-study programs, travel experiences, residence or study abroad, cultural projects or opportunities, and other off-campus experiences. On-campus experiences were to be included provided they were comparable to off-campus field experiences; i.e., they removed the student from the closely supervised

---

*For the rest of the study all of the units contacted will be referred to as departments.

classroom or laboratory situation and provided him with the opportunity to seek and make use of the resources of a field of interest in a manner different from the usual independent research project.

The respondent was then asked to name one or more faculty members with whom further contact concerning field study experiences might be made. And finally, program descriptions, outlines, or brochures describing these offerings were requested.

Ninety percent (81) of the questionnaires were returned promptly and after follow-up telephone calls and one personal visit all ninety departments responded. Although only eighty-eight questionnaires were actually returned, the two remaining responses were telephoned in to make a 100 percent return.

Of these departments forty-seven indicated that they did offer undergraduate field experiences as identified in the questionnaire; forty-three reported that they did not offer such experiences.

A second questionnaire was designed after many of the possible topics relating to the basic research questions were reviewed through the literature, through faculty committee discussions, and through contact with faculty in Institutional Research and in the Provost's Office. After being approved by the co-directors of the study, this more detailed questionnaire on field study experiences

(Appendix II) was sent to the eighty-eight faculty members named in the initial questionnaire as contact persons. Seventy of these responded, a few only after receiving a follow-up telephone call or a personal visit. The remaining eighteen were members of departments where another faculty member answered for the department. The questionnaire had indicated that departments could use the option of returning only one questionnaire for the department or of having each recipient answer and return a questionnaire. In effect, then, the responses were again 100 percent.

Of the forty-seven departments indicating that they offered undergraduate field study experiences, 35 remained in the study. They were determined in the following manner. After the seventy faculty members responded (sixty-four returned the questionnaires, three answered by telephone, and three sent letters or notes) six departments were dropped or withdrew from the study because their program had been discontinued (1), their field experiences were not offered for credit (2), the experiences were provided but credit was received through other departments (1), or they had misunderstood the term <u>field</u> in the original questionnaire (2). This revision left forty-one departments at Michigan State University--almost half of the departments offering undergraduate field study experiences for credit (Appendix III).

Two faculty members returned blank questionnaires and indicated that their courses had been dropped, but both were members of departments where another faculty member responded or reported for the department.

A further limitation, suggested in the initial planning of the study, was then positively determined. Two areas, student nursing and student teaching, were excluded from the present study. Although these two areas are rapidly changing, they have been thoroughly evaluated and are continually being evaluated. Furthermore, each is so extensive that it could and should be the subject of a special study. Therefore, student teaching and student nursing and other off-campus experiences which directly prepare one for a teaching or nursing career (classroom or hospital observations, learning-laboratory experiences, school intern programs, etc.) were excluded from further investigation. This decision left forty-five faculty members representing thirty-five departments in the study.

Selection of Faculty and Students for Interviews

The third step in gathering data for the study involved setting up personal interviews with at least one faculty member from most of the departments in the study. Thirty-six such interviews were scheduled and completed; these included faculty from twenty-nine departments and

three other offices where it was felt persons might contribute valuable information for the study.

Reasons for excluding the few departments which were omitted were:

1. Questionnaires returned did not meet the deadline (4).
2. Experiences were so limited (one very brief observation or interview per term) that the desired information was contained in the questionnaire (2).

An attempt was then made to contact at least three students from each of the thirty-five departments in the study. Eighty-eight students were interviewed. With the exception of two departments where all the participants had been graduate students, two departments where the programs were still in the planning stages, one department which did not send in course numbers on time, and one class where students participated in the field experience during their final term and thus were gone, the goal was almost achieved. In only two departments were the interviews limited to two students; three were contacted in all the rest. The students were selected at random primarily from the class lists of the previous complete term (Winter, 1972). If the course had not been offered that term, the list was used from the last time it was offered. The oldest class lists used were from Summer, 1971; the most recent list was a Spring, 1972, list for a course offered only once a year to seniors.

These students were enrolled in the field study at the time of the interview. Only one student described an on-campus field study, but this isolated experience was not surprising when one notes the few opportunities for such an experience (Appendix VII, #31).

Coordination of this Investigation with an Ad Hoc Faculty Committee

At the same time this investigation was being planned the Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education invited selected departments to send faculty members involved in field study and cognizant of the problems encountered in making them effective to meet for discussion and possible plans for solution of their common problems.

The investigator was invited to attend these meetings, was able to better understand the role of field study as perceived by these people, and in turn to share her understanding of the problems gained from questionnaires and interviews.

Definition of Field Study

In a report to the Danforth Foundation regarding field studies at Stephens College, Nesmith explained why it is not possible to define field study simply.

> It is extremely difficult to talk about field study because the term means so many different things; running the gamut from "learning by doing" to engaging in a carefully planned and phased archeological dig. The meanings

> range from observing birds or animals through a window to making interviews or gathering statistical data about people. One of the consequences of this imprecision and ambiguity is great difficulty in making any discernible progress in talking about field study programs.[72]

Recognizing this problem but at the same time appreciating the value of a broad definition which would encourage faculty to describe some experiences which might otherwise be excluded, the investigator defined field study in the questionnaire as follows:

> Field studies in this survey will refer to undergraduate, off-campus@ field experiences for which credit is given. Field study may include such experiences as:
>
> observations
> intern programs
> work-study programs
> travel experiences
> residence or study abroad#
> cultural projects or opportunities
> other off-campus experiences
>
> Field study should not include:
>
> independent reading or study assignments
> independent study groups
> independent laboratory experiments
> other similar projects
>
> @On-campus experiences may be included provided they are comparable to off-campus field experiences; i.e., they remove the student from the closely supervised classroom or laboratory situation and provide him with the opportunity to seek and make use of the resources of a field of interest in a manner different from the usual independent research project.
>
> #Credit must be more than that earned through formal enrollment in a foreign institution (Appendices I and II).

---

[72] Nesmith, op. cit., p. 56.

As was previously mentioned, student teaching and student nursing and related experiences were excluded from the study after questionnaire returns were in. Experiences for which students received monetary stipends or salaries were not excluded on that account.

Interview Technique

As was indicated earlier, the dean or department chairman named the faculty member(s) with whom there might be further contact. Frequently he named himself. After the faculty member returned his questionnaire, he was called for an interview appointment. Where two or three faculty members from the same department returned completed questionnaires, those faculty members were called who seemed most involved in field study work or who indicated by note they would like further contact. No one refused the request for an interview.

Although interview questions were prepared and available (Appendix IV) these were not strictly adhered to. It was found after the first two or three interviews that faculty members were much more at ease and much more expressive when they were allowed to talk freely about the advantages and problems of their programs. In most instances they covered all or almost all of the questions listed; if any were omitted, those specific questions were pointed out. With the exception of one, all faculty members' interviews

were taped. These conversations were later transcribed or reviewed.

The student interviews were telephone interviews which ranged from ten minutes to forty-five minutes in length. For these, interview questions were followed (Appendix V) but the open-ended questions provided ample opportunity for students to elaborate on their experiences. These interviews, too, were taped and later replayed for review or transcription.

CHAPTER IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FINDINGS

Departments Offering Field Study

Forty-one (45.6 percent) of the ninety departments contacted reported that they offer field study experiences for credit to undergraduate students (Appendix III). The other departments (Appendix VI) responded either that they offer no field study experiences, that they offer field studies but these are at the graduate level, or that they offer and sometimes even require field study but no credit is given. However, one can assume that most of the departments with a sense of commitment to this type of learning experience are among the forty-one contacted for further information.

Of these forty-one departments, six--those whose experiences prepare one directly for traditional teaching or nursing careers--were excluded from the focus of the study. The remaining thirty-five departments represent 85.4 percent of the departments offering such field study as is being reviewed and 38.9 percent of all the departments on campus.

The questionnaire returns submitted by forty-five faculty members from the thirty-five departments under

consideration provided information directly related to five of the basic research questions in the study:

1. the extent to which field study experiences are a part of the curriculum;
2. the extent to which field study experiences are designed and evaluated according to stated goals and objectives;
3. those factors on the part of the institution and faculty which prove inhibiting to the development of field study experiences;
4. those factors outside of the institution which prove inhibiting to the development of field study experiences; and
5. those problems students encounter which discourage them in their participation in field study experiences.

When questionnaires were tabulated, responses showed not only the overall status of field studies at Michigan State University but also the manner in which answers differed according to the types of field study. Tables 1-5 provide some answers to the above questions according to the following categories: optional field studies which focus on professional or technical preparation, optional field studies with a liberal arts or cultural emphasis, departmentally-required field studies with a professional or technical preparation emphasis, departmentally-required field studies

which have a cultural or liberal arts emphasis, and those field studies which are a professional requirement.

Responses to questionnaire items that are not included in Tables 1-5 are tabulated and reported in Appendix VII. These questionnaire items, although not directly related to the basic research questions, give a clearer picture of the field study experiences in this study and provide interesting information and background material about field study at Michigan State University.

Extent of Field Study

Field studies, although offered in thirty-five departments, are required experiences in fewer than half of these. Table 1 indicates that only fifteen departments require a field experience; the other departments offer these experiences on an optional basis. A further observation reveals that only slightly more than one-third (37.1 percent) limit such study to majors enrolled in the department and that none of the required or optional field study experiences with a liberal arts emphasis exclude non-majors. Still, however, twenty-five (71.4 percent) of the departments have 25 percent or fewer non-majors in their field study programs. This enrollment pattern suggests that field studies may be more open in theory than in practice.

In the review of literature it was noted that many field study experiences in the past were limited to honors

Table 1. Availability of field study.

Departments:	a (N = 14)		b (N = 6)		c (N = 3)		d (N = 2)		e (N = 10)		Total (N = 35)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Limited to majors	6	(42.9)	0	--	0	--	0	--	7	(70.0)	13	(37.1)
Limited to superior students	2	(14.3)	0	--	1	(33.3)	0	--	1	(10.0)	4	(11.4)
Available to seniors	12	(85.7)	6	(100.0)	2	(66.7)	2	(100.0)	9	(90.0)	32	(91.4)
Available to juniors	7	(50.0)	6	(100.0)	2	(66.7)	2	(100.0)	8	(80.0)	25	(71.4)
Available to sophomores	2	(14.3)	6	(100.0)	1	(33.3)	1	(50.0)	3	(30.0)	13	(37.1)
Available to freshmen	1	(7.1)	2	(33.3)	0	--	1	(50.0)	2	(20.0)	6	(17.1)
90% or more graduating seniors have participated	0	--	0	--	3	(100.0)	2	(100.0)	8	(80.0)	13	(37.1)
10% or fewer graduating seniors have more than one	6	(42.9)	2	(33.3)	0	--	0	--	1	(10.0)	9	(25.7)
90% or more graduating seniors have more than one	1	(7.1)	1	(16.7)	0	--	0	--	2	(20.0)	4	(11.4)
10% or fewer graduating seniors have more than one	8	(57.1)	1	(16.7)	3	(100.0)	1	(50.0)	6	(60.0)	19	(54.4)
25% or fewer non-majors have participated	10	(71.4)	1	(16.7)	3	(100.0)	2	(100.0)	9	(90.0)	25	(71.4)

Type a, optional field study, professional or technical emphasis; b, optional field study, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; c, departmental requirement, professional or technical emphasis; d, departmental requirement, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; e, professional requirement.

students and/or to juniors and seniors. Data from Table 1 show that at Michigan State University the first of these trends seems to have changed. Only four (11.4 percent) of the departments limit the field study experience to superior students. The second limitation, however, still holds. Although thirty-two (91.4 percent) of the departments offer such experiences to seniors and twenty-five (71.4 percent) to juniors, only slightly more than one-third (37.1 percent) provide the opportunity for field study to sophomores. And freshmen have an even more limited choice, for only six (17.1 percent) of the departments allow field study experiences at that level. Again, those departments with a liberal arts emphasis seem to be much more open than those with a professional emphasis.

Only thirteen (37.1 percent) of the departments have 90 percent or more of the graduating seniors who have had field study experiences. As might be expected, these students are from departments where field study is a required part of the program. In departments where the experience is optional more than one-third (42.9 percent and 33.3 percent) have fewer than 10 percent of the graduating seniors who have participated in a field experience. Two new programs were not able to report but their field studies are at present very limited in enrollment; another department was not able to respond. If these are included, each percentage rises to 50 percent or more. These figures suggest that at least

in optional programs field studies are not as extensive in practice nor as popular as would at first be surmised. One is not surprised then that more than one-half (54.4 percent) of the departments have 10 percent or fewer graduating seniors who have had more than one field study experience.

Objectives and Evaluations

Only twenty-one (60.0 percent) of the departments have formally stated objectives for their field studies (Table 2). Since all of the departments with liberal arts or cultural field studies have formally stated goals, the ones that do not are professionally oriented, both optional and required. In these types of programs the objectives may seem to be more obvious and therefore departments may not feel the urgency or need to put them in writing.

The objectives checked and ranked in the questionnaires indicate a definite pattern and definite goals (Table 3). The application of theory to practical situations is the objective with the highest priority in four of the five categories. Only in those departments where the field study is a professional requirement does this objective take second place to professional preparation. This latter objective, as one might expect, ranks second for the other professionally oriented field studies, but it also has a high ranking--third place--for both categories which provide liberal arts or cultural experiences. Self-reliance and

Table 2. Objectives and evaluations of field study.

Departments:	a (N = 14)		b (N = 6)		c (N = 3)		d (N = 2)		e (N = 10)		Total (N = 35)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Formally stated objectives	7	(50.0)	6	(100.0)	1	(33.3)	2	(100.0)	5	(50.0)	21	(60.0)
Guidelines available for approving field study	9	(64.3)	3	(50.0)	1	(33.3)	2	(100.0)	7	(70.0)	22	(62.9)
Never attempted evaluation of field study program	7	(50.0)	4	(66.7)	1	(33.3)	1	(50.0)	4	(40.0)	17	(48.6)
Evaluated field study program to department's satisfaction	4	(28.6)	4	(66.7)	1	(33.3)	0	--	4	(40.0)	13	(37.1)
Evaluation of students by:												
Written reports	12	(85.7)	6	(100.0)	3	(100.0)	1	(50.0)	10	(100.0)	32	(91.4)
Oral reports	7	(50.0)	6	(100.0)	2	(66.7)	1	(50.0)	8	(80.0)	24	(68.6)
Agency or outside assessment	6	(42.9)	1	(16.7)	0	--	2	(100.0)	7	(70.0)	16	(45.7)
Interviews	8	(57.1)	3	(50.0)	0	--	1	(50.0)	7	(70.0)	19	(54.3)
Visitations and observations	5	(35.7)	2	(33.3)	1	(33.3)	0	--	5	(50.0)	13	(37.1)
Journals	3	(21.4)	2	(33.3)	1	(33.3)	2	(100.0)	5	(50.0)	13	(37.1)
Projects	6	(42.9)	4	(66.7)	1	(33.3)	0	--	3	(30.0)	14	(40.0)
Tests	2	(14.3)	4	(66.7)	1	(33.3)	0	--	3	(30.0)	9	(25.7)
Dissatisfaction with evaluation techniques or tools	10	(71.4)	3	(50.0)	0	--	2	(100.0)	7	(70.0)	14	(40.0)
Use of P/N in final evaluation	1	(7.1)	1	(16.7)	2	(66.7)	2	(100.0)	1	(10.0)	6	(17.1)

Type a, optional field study, professional or technical emphasis; b, optional field study, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; c, departmental requirement, professional or technical emphasis; d, departmental requirement, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; e, professional requirement.

Table 3. Departmental objectives for field study--tabulated, weighted, and ranked.

Departments:	a	b	c	d	e	Total
Professional preparation	2	3	2	3	1	2
Professional service	6-7	7	3	7	7	7
Self-reliance and self-direction	3	4	6	4	3	3
Knowledge of self (abilities, values, etc.)	5	2	3	4	4	5
Understanding and acceptance of others	6-7	5	7	4	5	6
Application of theory to practical situations	1	1	1	1	2	1
Development of awareness of societal issues	4	6	3	2	6	4

Type a, optional field study, professional or technical emphasis; b, optional field study, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; c, departmental requirement, professional or technical emphasis; d, departmental requirement, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; e, professional requirement.

self-direction, development of awareness of societal issues, knowledge of self, and understanding and acceptance of others are ranked in that order with some slight variations in range among types of programs. And ranking last in four of the five types of field study offerings is professional service. This close relationship of objectives among the various categories suggests a consistency of goals one might not ordinarily suspect between liberal arts and professional programs.

Half (48.6 percent) of the departments have never formally evaluated their field study programs to determine whether the objectives are being met, and only thirteen (37.1 percent) claim to have evaluated the program to their department's satisfaction (Table 2). This failure to evaluate field study experiences may suggest any of several things: a lack of interest, a shortage of personnel to carry out the evaluation, a fear of having to acknowledge that objectives are not being met, or, on the other hand, such confidence in the field study program that one might feel an evaluation to be a waste of time and energy because of what one feels to be obvious values.

Evaluation of students, however, must necessarily take place and the most frequently reported technique or tool for this is some type of written report. Thirty-two (91.4 percent) of the departments use a written report with thirteen (37.1 percent) of these in the form of a journal. The oral

report is the second most common evaluation technique; it is used by twenty-four (68.6 percent) of the departments. These and the other evaluation methods indicated in Table 2 seem to form no particular pattern by type of program. What is worthy of note is the fact that fourteen (40 percent) of the departments indicate dissatisfaction with their own techniques and tools. This fact may suggest that new evaluation materials and methods need to be developed for off-campus learning experiences.

In reporting their evaluation of students almost all of the departments use number grades (4.0-0.0); only six evaluate students by P/N (pass/no grade). Here again is evidence of the priority of traditional practices.

Inhibiting Factors

Faculty Time

Faculty members in all categories of departments indicated that their greatest problem in offering field studies is that of time (Table 4). Comments on questionnaires revealed that field study experiences often demand more advising time, that frequently the experiences themselves absorb considerable faculty time, and that there is no general policy for computing faculty load for advising and supervising students on an independent study field experience. As one faculty member wrote: "Field work requires more effort, planning, faith, hope, charity, etc., etc.,

Table 4. Inhibiting factors of field study--faculty, institutions, placement sites.

Departments:	a (N = 14)		b (N = 6)		c (N = 3)		d (N = 2)		e (N = 10)		Total (N = 35)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Faculty												
Problems:												
Time	12	(85.7)	4	(66.7)	2	(66.7)	2	(100.0)	9	(90.0)	29	(82.9)
Supervision	9	(64.3)	3	(50.0)	0	--	0	--	6	(60.0)	18	(51.4)
Coordination	5	(35.7)	3	(50.0)	0	--	0	--	5	(50.0)	13	(37.1)
Institution												
Never studied cost	12	(85.7)	2	(33.3)	1	(33.3)	1	(50.0)	2	(20.0)	18	(51.4)
Increase in cost:	7	(50.0)	4	(66.7)	2	(66.7)	1	(50.0)	7	(70.0)	21	(60.0)
Faculty	8	(57.1)	3	(50.0)	3	(100.0)	1	(50.0)	6	(60.0)	21	(60.0)
Program direction	7	(50.0)	3	(50.0)	1	(33.3)	1	(50.0)	6	(60.0)	18	(51.4)
Supervision	7	(50.0)	3	(50.0)	1	(33.3)	1	(50.0)	5	(50.0)	17	(48.6)
Planning	7	(50.0)	1	(16.7)	2	(66.7)	1	(50.0)	6	(60.0)	17	(48.6)
Placement sites												
Limited placement sites	7	(50.0)	1	(16.7)	0	--	1	(50.0)	6	(60.0)	15	(42.9)
Agencies provide supervision	6	(42.9)	2	(33.3)	1	(33.3)	2	(100.0)	4	(40.0)	15	(42.9)
Agencies assist in evaluation	9	(64.3)	2	(33.3)	1	(33.3)	2	(100.0)	5	(50.0)	19	(54.3)

Type a, optional field study, professional or technical emphasis; b, optional field study, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; c, departmental requirement, professional or technical emphasis; d, departmental requirement, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; e, professional requirement.

etc." The time problem was mentioned in every category and totaled to twenty-nine (82.9 percent) of the departments.

Cost to Departments

The cost of field study programs is a major consideration in some departments. Although eighteen (51.4 percent) reported they had never studied the cost factor, twenty-one (60 percent) reported that field study experiences lead to an increase in cost. This fact, that more departments indicate an increase in cost than even admit of studying it, suggests among other reasons the hesitancy that was expressed by one faculty member with a successful program. When asked if his department had ever studied the cost, he stated, "I fear to think of it." The cost is high because of the need for additional faculty, for program direction, supervising, and planning. This is true for all types of programs.

Sites

Having limited placement sites is another inhibiting factor in setting up field studies. Fifteen (42.9 percent) of the departments, thirteen of which are in the professional or technical areas, reported this problem. More outside agencies assist in evaluation (54.3 percent) than provide supervision (42.9 percent), but both services are limited. These problems all reflect the first problem mentioned, that of faculty time, for coordinating and contacting for

placements, supervising, and evaluating all throw an extra burden on faculty and can absorb much time.

Cost to Students

Table 5 reveals some problems which faculty members think make field study experiences difficult for students and which even inhibit some students from opting for them. Transportation and cost are the two big items with seventeen (48.6 percent) and sixteen (45.7 percent) of the departments reporting these. Such problems are not confined to one or two types of field experience but are spread throughout the categories.

Other Problems

Limited opportunities (28.6 percent) and expectations of outside agencies (17.1 percent) are other problems indicated. In general faculty do not think many students are dissatisfied with the amount of credit they earn nor do they think students are too bothered by red tape. More information on student problems will be indicated in the chapter on interview findings where students' own discussions of their problems will be presented.

Summary

In the thirty-five departments under investigation, field study experiences, as indicated by questionnaire

Table 5. Student problems as identified by faculty.

Departments:	a (N = 14)		b (N = 6)		c (N = 3)		d (N = 2)		e (N = 10)		Total (N = 35)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Cost	6	(42.9)	3	(50.0)	2	(66.7)	2	(100.0)	3	(30.0)	16	(45.7)
Red tape (arrangements)	1	(7.1)	2	(33.3)	0	--	1	(50.0)	1	(10.0)	5	(14.3)
Transportation	6	(42.9)	3	(50.0)	2	(66.7)	0	--	6	(60.0)	17	(48.6)
Expectations of outside agencies	4	(28.6)	1	(16.7)	0	--	0	--	1	(10.0)	6	(17.1)
Limited opportunities	7	(50.0)	2	(33.3)	0	--	0	--	1	(10.0)	10	(28.6)
Apathy	5	(35.7)	1	(16.7)	0	--	0	--	1	(10.0)	7	(20.0)
Time	5	(35.7)	2	(33.3)	0	--	0	--	1	(10.0)	8	(22.9)
Insufficient credit	3	(21.4)	1	(16.7)	0	--	1	(50.0)	2	(20.0)	7	(20.0)

Type a, optional field study, professional or technical emphasis; b, optional field study, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; c, departmental requirement, professional or technical emphasis; d, departmental requirement, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; e, professional requirement.

findings, are more frequently offered on an optional basis (twenty departments) than as a requirement (fifteen departments) and are more often than not open to non-majors (63.9 percent). No longer is it a general practice to limit such learning experiences to superior students (four departments), but most field study is still an upperclassman privilege. Although 91.4 percent of these departments offer such experiences to seniors and 71.4 percent to juniors, only 37.1 percent of the departments open up such opportunities to sophomores and 17.1 percent to freshmen. These limitations, together with the facts that almost half of those departments where the field study experience is optional have fewer than 10 percent of the graduating seniors who have participated in field study experiences and more than one-half of the departments have 10 percent or fewer graduating seniors who have had more than one field study experience, suggest that field study is not as common as might at first be expected.

Although only 21 (60 percent) of the departments have formally stated objectives, there was general agreement or similarity in the objectives checked and ranked in the questionnaire. Application of theory to practical situations is the objective with the highest priority; professional preparation ranks second. The consistency of response across categories suggests that there is more similarity than one might expect between liberal arts and professional programs.

Faculty time, institutional cost, limited opportunities, student transportation, and costs to the student are problems which inhibit both departments from offering or expanding field study experiences and students from participating freely in such experiences.

The failure of many departments to evaluate either their field study programs (48.6 percent) or the cost of these programs (51.4 percent) may suggest a lack of interest, a lack of personnel, a satisfaction with the status quo, or an unquestioning acceptance or confidence in innovative practices. And from the acknowledgment of the dissatisfaction which 40 percent of the departments express regarding their tools and techniques for evaluating students, one might conclude that evaluation is an area much in need of attention. Perhaps new methods, new tools, new techniques, new ways of looking at learning experiences must be developed.

CHAPTER V

INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Advantages and Disadvantages of Visitations

Questionnaire responses indicated to some degree the extent of and the opportunities for field study at Michigan State University. Some problems, too, were identified. However, for a consideration of such a varied topic as field study, a broader and more flexible approach seemed desirable. In order, then, to gain a better understanding of field studies--their extent, their objectives, their problems, and their values--and a more comprehensive answer to each research question, interviews were arranged. Visiting with a sufficient number of faculty members and students who were or had been involved with field studies would take a considerable amount of time, but it was felt that the insights that could be gained by an open but somewhat structured discussion with persons closely and recently involved in field study would be invaluable.

In most instances the request for an interview was graciously honored with both faculty and students giving much more of their time than had been requested. After discussing field study for an hour, one faculty member decided to forego

his lunch hour break in order to have the opportunity to continue the discussion. Another faculty member prolonged the interview through the dinner hour even though she had an evening class scheduled. In both sessions the structured questions had been covered, but the faculty members had more to say about field study experiences. Such interest was evidenced by many faculty members, among them several who asked if they might be allowed to attend the Field Study Committee meetings (only one student presented such a request). Students, too, seemed eager to express themselves. One actually asked, "Have you much time?" and then stated, "I could talk all day." Many other students were so eager to report that it was rather difficult to terminate the interviews.

The open-ended questions provided an opportunity for discussing views which both faculty and students seemed to want to share. In some instances pent-up frustrations were released; in others, satisfactions were acknowledged. There was an obvious advantage to such frank and open discussions, but problems are built into any research conducted this way. It is difficult to present in an organized way such varied responses, opinions, and ideas as these interviews generated. And many new topics, too, were introduced--topics which directly or indirectly related to various aspects of field study. To sift through this material--all of which was recorded on tape and thus available for thorough analysis--and to present only that which pertained to the research

questions was a challenge, but one more than compensated for by the added dimension the interviews brought to the study.

In order to safeguard the anonymity of the departments in the study all problems and findings have been discussed by topic rather than by department. The great diversity between departments and the unusual programs of some made such a presentation at times rather difficult, but the purpose of this study was not to single out the problems or valuable aspects of any particular department, but rather to look at the total field study program.

It is obvious that not all of the comments of faculty and students could be included in this study. The ones selected were chosen as typical or as illustrative of a particular point. All conversations, however, were reviewed and those general ideas which seemed pertinent to the topics under discussion were presented.

Descriptions and Extent of Field Study

Field study experiences as described by the faculty included a wide variety of new as well as more traditional field studies. A question about the actualization of these field studies--Was experience really as varied as might be suggested by the opportunities described?--was quickly answered by the students. Detailed descriptions of the many studies showed beyond doubt that a great variety of experiences were offered and enjoyed by students.

To understand better the many types of experiences actually reported, to recognize that the field studies of Michigan State University students parallel the numerous categories mentioned, and to acknowledge that these field studies "run the gamut," it seems appropriate to describe or list very briefly some of the actual experiences which were engaged in by the students contacted.

One student visited and lived in abandoned World War II incarceration camps in California, interviewed former inmates, and compiled his findings and reflections into a book which will soon be published. Another student lived, worked, and studied for two months in a California desert--a scientific research project. A young woman spent a term touring and acting with a West Coast theatre group; a young man lived and observed the Amish as a means of getting background for the project he designed. A newspaper for a religious organization was established, edited, and published by an enterprising young man (it is still being published), and another prepared both radio and television broadcasts for his field study. One student went abroad with a friend where together they gathered data for a comparative study of the teaching techniques of British and American professors. Another student arranged for interviews with a group of London businessmen for his self-designed study. One student did research for a senator, another interned in an attorney general's office, and still another spent time working and

studying in the Democratic offices in the State Capitol Building. Experiences included jobs in a CPA firm, in an auditing department, with the Cooperative Service in Washington, in an office on campus, and with the foreign exchange students in another university. Some of the students described field study experiences in probation courts, in the police department, in reform schools, in juvenile homes, and in welfare agencies.

Service-oriented experiences abounded. Some of the students worked with small inner-city businesses as management consultants, planned and set up community recreation programs and centers, interned in day-care centers, and worked with the physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, and the mentally retarded.

Other students were involved in encounter groups, leadership studies, family counseling, summer camps, and neighborhood surveys. One student studied some social problems of the inner city of Detroit; another, the social welfare system in Europe (he went abroad to do this). One investigated the deterioration of housing in a specific area of a city; another worked at the socialization of former mental patients.

All field studies, however, were not independent study projects. Several students were contacted who had participated in field trips that took them away from campus for two or three hours or even days at a time; other trips

lasted two or three weeks or even an entire summer. Students reported such group trips taking them to the Appalacian Mountains for geological study, to the deep South for a study of the park system, and to the East and South for forestry study. Many of the field trips were primarily observational in nature with some discussion or presentation by experts or professionals in the field; others were research oriented and actively involved the students in such follow-up projects as map making, soil analysis, or water study. At times these field trips were a preliminary experience to a more active participation in a subsequent field study.

These are many but not all of the field studies actually experienced by the students interviewed for this study. Although some of the most simple may have been the best and some of the most elaborate or impressive-sounding may not have been the most valid educational experiences, one fact seems obvious--not all learning occurs on campus.

Although the availability of field studies was indicated through the questionnaires and reported in the previous chapter, interview findings showed a slight difference or modification regarding one point. Field study experiences, it was reported, are available primarily to juniors and seniors, sometimes to sophomores, and to a limited extent to freshmen. According to the numbers previously cited (Table 2), were students to take advantage of the opportunities for field study when they are provided

them, the percentages of students enrolled in field study would be as follows: seniors, 42.1 percent; juniors, 32.9 percent; sophomores, 17.1 percent, and freshmen, 7.9 percent. The actual grade levels of the students interviewed were as follows: seniors, 45.3 percent; juniors, 40 percent; sophomores, 10.5 percent; and freshmen, 2.1 percent (graduate students accounted for the other 2.1 percent). A comparison of these figures suggests that freshmen and sophomores are not so apt to enroll for field studies even though the opportunity is available. Whereas one would expect 25 percent of the students to be freshmen or sophomores (Table 2), only half that many in this study were at those grade levels. Considering the fact that many upperclassmen expressed the desire to have a field study experience earlier in their programs, one may assume either that upperclassmen are selected for these experiences or that communication about such field study opportunities is deficient.

Objectives of Field Study

Clarification of Objectives

It has already been reported that only 60 percent of the departments offering field study claim to have clearly stated objectives. Yet conversations with faculty members from those departments where objectives have not been definitely set forth in writing, indicate that most

departments and faculty members offering field study experiences to undergraduates seem to know why they are providing such opportunities. However, contrary to what might at first be assumed from such an observation, the objectives and rationale were not always developed in such a way that they provided guidance for the selection or development of experiences, nor were the goals always in harmony with institutional goals. Some were success-oriented and some reflected the personal ambitions of the faculty members. For example, a few named such goals as job placement for students and innovation opportunities for faculty. One faculty member even gave as his department's objective the creation of opportunities for faculty to travel, but such objectives--perhaps more aptly defined as reasons--were the exception rather than the rule. Most problems with objectives were in developing and stating them as functional and attainable goals. In the discussion on evaluation this problem will be more in evidence.

Departments were primarily concerned with the two objectives having the highest rating on the questionnaires, application of theory to practical situations and professional preparation, and with those objectives related to various aspects of personal development. These departmental objectives are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Selected questionnaire items.

An * indicates at least 3/4 of the departments in the category reporting that particular questionnaire item; an x, at least 1/2.	a	b	c	d	e
	N=14	N=6	N=3	N=2	N=10
Objectives					
Professional preparation	*	x	x	*	*
Professional service		x	x	x	x
Self-reliance and self-direction	x	*		x	x
Knowledge of self	x	*		x	x
Understanding and acceptance of others		*		x	x
Application of theory to practical situations	*	x	*	*	*
Development of awareness of societal issues		x	x	*	x
Field study preparation experiences	x	x	*	x	x
Field study follow-up experiences	x			*	x
Guidelines for faculty	x	x		*	x
Evaluation techniques or tools					
Written reports or journals	*	*	*	*	*
Oral reports	x	*	x	x	x
Agency assessment				x	x
Interviews	x	x		x	x
Visitations					x
Projects				x	
Tests		x			
Satisfaction with evaluation techniques	x	x	x		x
Student problems					
Transportation			x		
Cost		x	x	x	
Faculty problems					
Time	*	x	x	*	*
Supervision	x				
Coordination					x
Cost studies		x	x	x	*

Type a, optional field study, professional or technical emphasis; b, optional field study, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; c, departmental requirement, professional or technical emphasis; d, departmental requirement, liberal arts or cultural emphasis; e, professional requirement.

The objectives as expressed by students reflected many of the same objectives given by faculty. One student stated his belief very simply:

> You can only learn so much theory in books. You have to get out into the practice of it to see what your field is really going to be like and to learn all you should.

Both faculty and students, attesting to such a value being realized through some field studies, reflected a commitment to the theory proposed by Henderson and noted in Chapter I--that the interweaving of the theoretical with the practical stimulates learning.

Closely related to this discussion, in fact one aspect of it, is the need for what one faculty member expressed as a "necessary reality base." In his discussion of the students he said, "We tell them a lot of what should be but they are naive about what is." That many students agree with this opinion is evidenced by their frequent use of the terms "real world" and "real life" when contrasting their field study with on-campus learning. Warned one faculty member:

> They think that they've been in a sort of cocoon and that we've been force feeding them all kinds of things we tell them they'll need--and they aren't all that sure.

Many departments, especially some of those quite professionally oriented, claimed it would be almost impossible to prepare students professionally, one of the objectives of their educational programs, were they not able to

provide field experiences; others, that they would be limited in the degree to which such an objective might be met without field studies.

The on-the-scene exposure provided by many field studies plays a dual function regarding professional preparation. Not only does it expose the student to new approaches and skills in his chosen profession but, if provided early enough, fulfills a need existing today which one faculty member pointed out did not exist some years ago when young people grew up working side by side with their fathers. The student may find through the experience that he is better able to make a career choice. Two students expressed real gratitude for this frequently overlooked value in field experiences. The first found that as a result of his off-campus experience he now knows what kind of job he wants.

> It was very valuable. It gave me a chance to apply some of the things that I've been talking about for so long and it also gave me a taste of something which I found very interesting. I really enjoyed it and it is actually because of the field experience that I am now looking for a job that will have some of the same experiences.

The second student realized just the opposite.

> I found out I had been in the wrong field. I have absolutely no interest in it whatsoever.

Perhaps this student will embark on other field studies in his search for a field he will find interesting. Several students expressed a desire for this option--to try alternatives as they select their occupations and their life styles.

Not only were many faculty concerned about professional preparation but also about developing some of those qualities in the students without which professional skills would be useless. One stated it thus:

> We're trying to develop in the student a sense that he is very competent without damaging his humility. The student knows we are trying to show him that there are jobs to be done--that have to be done. There are things he can do and can do better than other people can. Confidence! We want to build up confidence through field experience.

This emphasis on personal development, such as the building of self-confidence, was a primary objective of some of the departments offering field study. Other qualities such as independence, responsibility, self-knowledge, and appreciation of others were values repeated over and over again in both types of programs, those with a professional and those with a liberal arts emphasis. Little did one faculty member realize how wrong he was when he apologized for being "unusual" in his selection of objectives.

> I'm not really very typical for your study because I see objectives as personality growth, learning to take interpersonal risks, learning to deal with oneself, becoming aware. The particular content is less important to me than what the person learns about how one deals with life.

There are many supporters of the view that the college has a responsibility for the development of the whole personality. A few comments from some of the faculty members reveal this concern for other than cognitive goals.

> Our field study lends itself to developing maturity. It lends itself to confidence building. It allows students

> to delve into life as other than students. Many students don't know who and what they are and field study helps them determine this. It gets the student to build and create on his own.
>
> * * *
>
> These experiences provide the students with the chance to assess their own values and the values of others. They force them to reflect on what they want and to incorporate in their lives, in terms of a life style, the values most important to them.
>
> * * *
>
> We've asked students to set up their own programs because planning and follow-through encourages independence, self-reliance, and ability to act according to his capabilities.

Closely related to the above statement is another comment:

> We ask them to state their own goals. Many have never been on their own, never been asked to do that. Their objectives were stated for them. Nobody ever told them, "We want you to do something you want to do and to decide why you want to do it." So we ask them to do that.

Students see the importance of such activity and incorporate these values into their own set of objectives.

> We set up our own objectives. There are certain things you want to learn. They hope you'll gain independence--you'll become a seeker of information. It should put into perspective the rest of your academic career.
>
> * * *
>
> You're given a chance to do your own learning. You're not spoonfed by a professor and expected to regurgitate this data which the professor has thrown on you during the class. You more or less evaluate for yourself, think for yourself, and learn for yourself.

This idea that content or the cognitive aspects of the learning situation play a role secondary to that of acquiring certain attitudes or values was the feeling

expressed by another faculty member. His hopes were that field experiences would thrust the students so forcefully into reality that they would discover that learning is an on-going process, something that takes place because they make it take place and that need not be confined to any particular place or time.

> The most important thing is to know what learning is all about, to realize learning is not a set of abstract things to be memorized or to be combined. It is to be engaged in ongoing social and natural life and at the same time to be able to stand off from it and to integrate, to be able to pull these things together, to realize that it is a life-long process that is not just related to formal structural learning situations but to create an excitement of being able to interpret one's own experiences every day in a framework that allows you to both stand off as well as be involved. It's a whole mind set that if one should get the hang of it gives you a richness of perspective and it makes you demand things of yourself.

In the opening chapter the terms relevance, meaningfulness, and action were used to describe another objective which young people hope to reach through their educational experiences. An objective, last on the list but nevertheless enunciated by both faculty and students from various departments and one that encompasses some of the already-mentioned objectives, is professional service or service-learning. In the previously quoted Hazen Foundation report it is stated:

> It is hard to understand why so few attempts have been made to integrate the desire to serve with the educational experience, for it has long been taken for granted that learning is most effective when it can be directly tied in to some meaningful experience outside the classroom.[73]

---

[73] The Student in Higher Education, op. cit., p. 47.

From conversations with both faculty and students it was obvious that students' concerns become more humane and realistic when they grow out of direct contact with people who have problems.

Such definiteness of purpose as was expressed by many departments may tend to overshadow the fact that not all departments seemed to know exactly what they are about. There was a vagueness about some responses which indicated a feeling that the field experience may have some value but the department or faculty members have some question about just what that value really is. One faculty member simply stated:

> We have not had explicitly stated objectives for the field work course, but those who have offered the course have, I think, shared the notion that it was a "good thing" . . . to be able to supplement "book learning" with practical experience.

Another faculty member commented,

> I wish we had a better understanding of the objectives of the program. I think in any program like this it is probably worthwhile to take some time to try to develop some objectives even though anyone who's been in education very long knows these won't necessarily be the objectives that are achieved. But I think it's worth the effort to try to develop some.

His next comment revealed to some extent the hesitancy and the problems some faculty members face.

> I've certainly never figured out how to develop meaningful and measurable objectives. This is partly the value of the kinds of courses we teach where we aren't really teaching technical material or technical skills. If anything, we do hope to change some attitudes, I guess, but we're for the most part never very precise or

specific about this--either in developing the objectives or in trying to measure them.

Such statements did not seem to reveal any ill-will or lack of concern on the part of these and other faculty or departments giving similar responses. Rather they seemed to indicate a willingness on the part of some to work harder for that type of program which seemed a "good thing" even though they were not very precise or explicit about what that good thing was. They indicated, too, a lack of expertise, or perhaps time, to determine and specify such achievable goals and objectives as would be valid for their programs.

Selection of Experiences

"A precise statement of what the student must be able to do clearly indicates what experiences are necessary to provide practice in it." So states Paul Dressel in College and University Curriculum.[74] Most departments are organized in such a way that some form of curriculum committee functions at least informally if not formally. One might expect such a committee to be responsible for such field studies as are being offered, but such is not the case in more than one-fourth of the departments. In these latter departments the field study is, as one faculty member put it, a "one-man show." The faculty member plans, organizes, and carries out

[74]Dressel, op. cit., p. 209.

his ideas for off-campus learning with approval, or maybe just lack of disapproval, from the department chairman. In these instances the faculty member develops his own goals and objectives. In the majority of cases, however, the question of field studies, their objectives, their problems, their cost, and sometimes their effectiveness are a departmental concern and guidelines are set up for the appropriate experiences. But for approval of specific projects within the general guidelines, rarely does a faculty committee need to function. It is true that the faculty member must frequently have an endorsement or second approval of proposed experiences, but in only one instance must a committee be involved (Appendix VII, #18).

Such a procedure places a great deal of responsibility on individual faculty members whose departments at times must admit to errors in judgment. Several departments have forms to be filed where the objectives must be stated and the experiences must be described. This practice forces a certain specificity and definiteness of purpose which helps some faculty to be more thoughtful and objective in their endorsements.

The departments which involve a faculty committee or a group of faculty in studying off-campus learning see great value in a pluralistic approach. One man stated:

> It's good to bring faculty in. They get help in understanding the nature of the program. It also brings some new insights into the problem--about how best to

> conduct these experiences. So it's good we can spread it around, but I feel bad about field study being an overload.

Another saw the group approach as valuable because of individual differences between faculty.

> It varies greatly how much a faculty demands, how academically oriented he wants that program to be, whether he expects the student to do some research while he's out there, whether he's willing to accept the experience and reflection on it as a basis for credit. So I think in a lot of situations where the program is not entrusted to a dedicated group of people, there is a lot of concern about how you help faculty understand the nature of the kind of experience it ought to be and what the credit ought to be given for.

Students, too, are involved in the planning of field experiences, but this is usually on a one-to-one basis. Many students claimed that the freedom to plan was one of the most advantageous aspects of field study.

Two points of view about the organization or structure of field study experiences determine further the mode of operation which differs widely across campus. Some experiences are tightly structured with the student having few options to function as independently as he might wish. One determined faculty member expressed his views as follows:

> I am a firm believer in structure of field experiences. I don't agree with the typical approach of sending a student out and having him return ten weeks later with a term paper showing what he has accomplished. We keep pretty close tabs on what a student is doing. There is a need to structure these programs--to make sure they are meaningful learning experiences.

This statement came from a faculty member whose students were involved in independent projects which have as their

primary objective professional preparation. There was a series of group seminars prior to and weekly during the time of the field study and also some follow-up sessions after the term.

Although many faculty would agree that some structure is needed, not all would interpret structure so rigidly. In fact another department which also has group seminars or discussions prior to and following the field study professes a philosophy which leaves the student completely on his own during the field experience. In this instance, however, the absence of faculty supervisors or even the lack of contact with campus in no way disavows the value nor the existence of structure in the program.

From interviews with a few students it was obvious that some programs have been set up with very little structure and even an indefiniteness of purpose. A few faculty admitted having a lack of structure but claimed that development of independence or responsibility on the part of the student would result. One wonders what good can be accomplished when a student with no preparation seminars, with no carefully developed objectives or plan, and with no advising embarks on a field study experience. Some students not only survive but profit from the opportunity for self-directed learning, but not all can. One student who was anxious for such an experience--to be on his own--admitted his frustration when he floundered, realized he needed help,

but could not find it. His project had been "too big" but no one had helped him realize this. Another in a similar situation complained,

> Faculty have experience. They've directed a lot of these. They should have told me I couldn't do everything I planned.

This student had been working for six months on what he had thought would take three months.

Lack of structure can take another form. One student, contacted about a field study completed during a previous term, told about another project in which she was then currently engaged. She had enrolled for a field study, was halfway through the term, knew she would get approval for her project, but revealed that the faculty sponsor had not yet been informed of her particular project. "He doesn't care what we do," was her comment. Such an experience was unique among the eighty-eight students interviewed.

Areas of concern for some faculty members and for some students, too, were pre- and post-field study experiences. Even some of the departments which offered the field study as one of the final courses in a professional program frequently bemoaned the fact that these previous courses did not prepare the student sufficiently for the actual field experience. The interest in preparation programs or sessions, some currently in the process of being developed, and the concern for follow-up programs, discussions, or interviews were another indication that faculty recognize the need for

some structure in the program. One faculty statement sums up the feeling of many.

> Some kind of advance preparation is essential; some feedback while the student is out is essential; some follow-up of the student's experiences so he can really see and learn is essential.

In summary, efforts are being put forth by many individual faculty members and by department committees to clarify field study objectives, to involve more people in the determination of guidelines for field studies, and to select, by themselves and with students, valid learning experiences which will provide the student with opportunities to realize these objectives, but such effort is by no means universal.

Institutional Problems Related to Field Study

The problems related to field study are so intertwined that it is difficult to discuss one without moving into a discussion of others. Some overlapping, then, is inevitable and is not intended to overemphasize certain points but rather to clarify some problems.

Departmental and Institutional Climate

> Our department is blessed by being able to do pretty much what they want and everybody's doing what he wants, so if you decide that you want a new program you do it.

Such a laissez faire attitude as that described by the faculty member who made this remark about his department's approach toward field study serves to mitigate attempts at a unified departmental approach. An individual faculty member may be very supportive of the learning principles behind field study, but attempts at implementing a program are frequently isolated efforts on the part of one person. As in the case of the above-quoted faculty member, he is free to go ahead on his own in an atmosphere of permissiveness, but he is the only man in his department involved in off-campus study.

Other departments have forces at work which almost stifle the efforts of individual faculty members who are convinced that field study is a value worth striving for. One man described his efforts of many years with a twinge of bitterness.

> We have some people here who would just love to do what I'm doing but they have no way to do it. It has taken me years. I'm strictly independent. I believe if you want something you go out and get it yourself. Nobody helped me so now I am very cold and callous. I'll do anything for a student, but the level of bureaucratic development here is so intense that there is a restriction almost against everything. There are so many things that inhibit, restrict, and confront you.

This man was one of several faculty members who were convinced that field study in their departments would be discontinued were they to leave.

Students were disconcerted by such an attitude of indifference and even at times hostility.

> I guess they [faculty] are indifferent. I would hope they wouldn't be. It's funny but none of my professors ever said anything about field study. I think they should have.

* * *

> Faculty are aware of it but they couldn't tell you what is being done. They generally don't talk to you about it, and there are some I wouldn't dare ask.

All departments are not like those just described where the field study is developed and supported by only one or two faculty members rather than through departmental efforts and with departmental approval. In some departments the atmosphere is such that both faculty and students are not only supported but encouraged in their field study ventures. One of the departments with an optional program of field study and with an unusually large number of students enrolled for field study projects indicated a total departmental commitment to the program.

> Our faculty here just assume it's a normal part of their teaching. We don't have to persuade faculty in this department to take independent study or field study students. They just do it as a part of their work. It would never occur to them to do anything else.

No one of the attitudes toward field study as were just mentioned--a <u>laissez faire</u> attitude, a hostile attitude, or a supportive attitude--can be considered the typical attitude or approach at Michigan State University. In fact, not more than a few of the departments visited indicated negative attitudes, but, on the other hand, very few had total departmental involvement. Most departments fell

somewhere in between with a number of the faculty involved and with the department frequently supportive of but sometimes only tolerant of the program.

Concern by faculty for university-wide support of field study was greater than that for departmental support. Only a very few expressed the belief that their programs had recognition or approval outside their departments. This feeling of a lack of recognition and a lack of appreciation, a feeling which many seemed to have, was a factor which compounded the problem of an open attitude. However, at times the lack of visibility regarding field study activities was the result of a deliberate effort on the part of the department. Fearing negative reactions not only from the university community but also from the outside community, one man expressed the feelings in his department:

> There are many elements in the University that still regard learning as attending classes three hours a week and reading your homework. Also there are many in the legislature who do not think "running around town supporting Joe Blow for Congress" has anything to do with education. So we do not seek publicity. We just do it.

Students verified the existence of permissive, hostile, indifferent, and encouraging attitudes in their respective departments. Their biggest complaint about the environment, especially in departments where the experience was an optional one, was that an atmosphere of indifference prevailed to such an extent that they had difficulty even

finding out about the opportunities. The following remarks from students interviewed were not at all unusual.

> I heard about it from a kid down the hall who had it the year before, so I just took it.
>
> * * *
>
> I heard about it from a student instructor who helped us. He mentioned it and said if we ever had a chance for an elective, it was really great. He said you learn a lot and it's really an interesting experience, so I decided to take it.
>
> * * *
>
> I would never have found out about it except for this friend down the hall. More should know about this.
>
> * * *
>
> I was touring a department and saw this pamphlet. I asked about it and the professor said I could take it and I signed up right then.
>
> * * *
>
> I read an announcement telling about it. That's the only way I heard about it. No one said anything.

The students were about equally divided as to the method by which they found out about field study experiences. About one-third heard from faculty or through their departments; about one-third read about opportunities available to them through handouts, news releases, bulletin board announcements, or posters; and about one-third found out from peers or "by chance." The lack of open communication about field study opportunities, except in those departments where the program is firmly established, was a deterrent to an environment supportive of field study.

On the other hand, once students were among those whom one student termed the "privileged few" who had discovered field studies, they generally felt the faculty to be favorably disposed. One student could not speak highly enough of the encouragement he received.

> If he had not been there to let me know it could be done, I would never have tried it. Until three terms ago I didn't even know you could do a field study, and it has been the single most beneficial thing I have ever done in college. I learned more in that one term, I think, concerning my abilities and gaining confidence in my abilities by actually putting accumulated theoretical knowledge into practice and working on my own. But if it had not been for him, I would never have done it. He told me about it, he suggested I do it, he encouraged me.

This student, as well as others, realized that encouragement and support by the faculty was essential in order to have the openness necessary for an atmosphere conducive to field study. There are many reasons for negative or indifferent attitudes among faculty, attitudes that inhibit the development of field study. One of these, faculty workload, is difficult to separate from staffing and finance.

Staffing and Finance

Many faculty expressed concern about field study problems related to staffing and finance. Some of these concerns were revealed in the following statements.

> I am strongly in favor of field experiences if they are taught intensively; that is, if the instructor takes pains to see that the students are well prepared in advance, the experience itself is carefully planned,

and the students have to go through a well-designed evaluation. That takes time and many instructors will not take the time needed.

* * *

Field instruction programs are one of the most expensive and time-consuming aspects of the total curriculum. Financial resources are inadequate to meet the instructional needs.

* * *

Field experience is a necessary and expensive part of professional training. To develop it further we need more money, released time, and more university support and assistance.

* * *

There is too much overload time donated by the faculty.

* * *

Field study takes lots of time for placement and public relations. This has to be a voluntary contribution of time.

* * *

The most difficult problem we are faced with concerning our field work experience is that of limited faculty. We probably will be forced to reduce the field work experience to only our majors.

* * *

In principle we are committed to providing the opportunity for field study to every student in our department. However staff limitations and fund limitations and larger numbers of students make this increasingly difficult.

* * *

More faculty will be needed if we promote it. . . . We need more faculty to supervise.

Such comments from faculty members in all types of programs bear out the fact that work-load, staffing, and

finance are so interrelated that it is difficult to approach one topic without touching upon or discussing the others. Through the questionnaire survey it was revealed that the biggest problem for faculty involved in field study is time. Some field study projects involve faculty to a greater extent than others, but rarely does any type of field study come about without someone having to expend a large amount of time in planning, in organizing, in supervising, in advising, in pre-session work, in post-session work, in individual conferences, or in any combination of these.

In some of the departments, particularly those with programs which are a professional requirement, there seems to be a greater tendency to recognize the time-consuming aspects of the organization and supervision of field study projects, and therefore there has been some attempt to provide time for faculty to carry out these various functions. However, an effort to improve programs and to provide more supervision, coupled with the great surge in enrollment in some of these departments without a corresponding increase in faculty has compounded the problem. One faculty member expressed her feelings that the faculty are willing to work hard, but even with extra work there are still problems.

> I think any professional doesn't mind putting in extra time. I think this is part of the job. I think the problem is we're so heavily involved that most of us feel that we're not doing a very adequate job of much of what we're trying to do. I mean we're doing it. We're providing the experiences, we're providing the supervision--not always in the way I think we would

> like to provide it--but we lack personnel to handle the supervision, so this means that faculty members who are heavily involved in teaching courses, advising, and serving on committees are putting in a lot of hours over and beyond the usual working day. They are willing to do this, but that still is not the answer.

Faculty in departments which do not have long-established programs seem to be having the most difficulty with time. One hard-working young man, eager to promote the field study program but obviously having trouble finding time, said:

> It's all pretty much extra. It's very difficult to find out what the reward system is in the University. I feel that the ones who do the work tend to get things piled on their heads. The problem is pretty severe.

It was unusual to come upon a faculty member with the disposition one had:

> I'm having a ball. If I'm enjoying it, it must be because I like it and I feel there is a degree of success. My hobby and my work and my life are all the same thing--field work.

Rather than such an attitude, more faculty seemed to be sympathetic to such views as these:

> I am opposed to overload. I don't think it's right to say if you like it you ought to do more.

* * *

> As long as it's possible to put that time in, it's something I'd like to do, but if there is too much pressure for teaching too much at the same time, no.

Too few faculty members seemed to be able to say what one man did.

> Our chairman understands but doesn't try to equate load. When you're asked to take on a field study assignment, you discuss what it is you'll have to give up in the process.

Even though in general they expressed opposition to overload, some faculty members, because they wanted to open up opportunities to many students, overextended themselves and agreed to supervise field studies when they really were not in a position to do so. Such observations came from fellow faculty members who recognized that experiences without proper planning or supervision could be actually harmful.

Time is obviously a problem and one as closely related to staffing as staffing is to finance. Many departments are not in a financial position to enlarge or expand their staff, and some of these feel the field study program must be limited until such expansion is feasible.

Increased faculty is only one of the costs enumerated by some of the departments offering field study experiences. Other costs incurred in arranging for, in supervising, and in carrying out field study experiences included transportation and similar operating expenses. Occasionally equipment was mentioned.

About one-third of the departments denied any increase in expense because of field study. Such varied policies exist that it is easy to see reasons for such differences. Some departments pay mileage and transportation costs for faculty involved in arranging, supervising, or participating in field study experiences; others do not and the faculty member must absorb the cost. Several departments handle student transportation costs; most departments expect

the student to pay for his own transportation. One faculty member who has been very successful at getting outside funding to cover these operating costs claims it would be unjust to charge students, but one wonders if he would be willing to drop the program if outside funding ceased.

In summary, the greatest expense seems to be in adequate staffing. Some departments claim there is no added expense, but often the faculty in these departments are those who are burdened with overload. And all of this affects the attitude of the faculty toward field study.

Evaluation

The purpose of evaluation is to gather such data about the object of evaluation that decisions may be made about its worth and suggestions made about productive changes. The question of field studies and how they are to be evaluated is a question that must be answered if we are to deal responsibly with the improvement of undergraduate teaching. In this review of the evaluation of field studies the focus will be first on the program, then the cost, and finally student performance.

Program.--Although only slightly more than one-third of the departments indicated on the questionnaire that their programs had been evaluated to the department's satisfaction, even some of these admitted during the interviews that they would welcome more objective evaluations than those they

had completed. Perhaps the greatest deterrents to an evaluation of field study experiences are lack of well defined objectives which describe achievable goals, lack of expertise for the evaluation, lack of personnel who have the time to evaluate, and the general feeling that evaluation is not necessary.

Having objectives which define the desired student behavior in such a way that it is identifiable and measurable was a problem some departments did not recognize. Such problems were particularly evident when objectives were directed toward affective outcomes. For example, one can easily understand the possibility of problems in evaluating the following objectives:

To gain appreciation of the helping process.

* * *

To begin to identify strengths in one's own personality and knowledge which are important for success.

* * *

To act effectively in another culture.

* * *

To grow in independence and self-reliance.

* * *

To develop an attitude of active interest in learning on one's own.

* * *

To place a high value on the worth of persons, human personality, and life.

A different type of objective--for example, one which addresses itself to professional preparation--is much easier to define in terms of achievable goals. Statements like the following are more specific.

> To identify and demonstrate the unusual problems associated with the establishment and operation of _____.
>
> * * *
>
> To identify clearly the role of the host institution or agency in meeting particular needs of . . . special groups.
>
> * * *
>
> To study a variety of _____ developments at first hand and to discuss the problems involved.

Definite objectives, then, although they are written or at least stated by most of the departments, must not only define the student behavior but define it in terms of desired outcomes.

In general faculty expressed the most difficulty, the most reluctance, and the greatest need for assistance in evaluating the affective outcomes of field study programs. "We haven't come up with the research means to do this," said one faculty member who would like help. Perhaps the same insecurity accounts for such feelings as the following:

> Some faculty are very reluctant to get involved in that aspect and will only evaluate students on their reflections and the cognitive aspects of their experiences.
>
> * * *
>
> For some reason we're edgy about evaluating students on personal growth, attitude change, and personality characteristics like independence and broadmindedness. I think at least in this program it would be valid to do so.

The difficulty in evaluating experiences that are by nature subjective was evident in many departments. It is in this area that many faculty seem to be waiting for new methods or tools for evaluating their programs.

Other faculty did not want to evaluate because they were satisfied that theirs was a good program. Said one, "Yes, our objectives are being realized. We don't know in a systematic way. It's more impressionistic." And another was also confident about objectives being met. "I know instinctively," he claimed. These faculty were not able to be precise; they were only able to make general comments about the development of some personal attributes.

A few faculty members gave other reasons for not evaluating. "I'm just not interested in the evaluation aspect of the program," commented one. And another,

> I don't think anybody is going to ask me to do that [evaluate] in any formal way. On the other hand in coffee-room conversation it will come up, but it will be very impressionistic. We don't plan any formal evaluation.

Such unprofessional attitudes seem hard to justify.

On the other hand, some faculty members and departments were much involved in evaluating. Being clear about objectives, examining the process, and testing for both cognitive and affective changes were steps outlined by several departments. One man expressed his views,

> I have a feeling that people feel better about this kind of program if you can demonstrate to somebody else that something very valuable and exciting is happening to students.

And several commented about the fact that evaluation is an on-going process and that they are constantly undergoing change as a result of their efforts.

Cost.--Cost is another area where faculty and departments have been reluctant to evaluate. More than half of the departments say they have never evaluated the cost, but more than those who have attempted cost studies admitted that theirs may be among the many field study programs that are expensive ventures in education. Recognizing the time problem previously mentioned and the additional faculty sometimes needed for field studies makes it fairly easy to see the added expense even without evaluating it. Increased expense, however, should not be the sole criterion in the decision to add or omit field studies, for cost is a relative factor. Laboratory experiences are costly in their use of faculty time, equipment, and supplies, yet they are an established part of the curriculum. When changes are effected by cost studies, they are really the reordering of priorities. Field studies, like other educational experiences, must be measured against the things a department must give up in order to afford them. The question a cost study should answer is should a department divert funds in support of field study.

One faculty member claimed that the results of field studies seem to justify the expense, but another questioned the expenditure of time, money, and energy.

> It is an awfully expensive kind of educational experience when you consider the number of students you can handle and the large amount of faculty time.

Another, too, was concerned about the limited number of students being accommodated.

> Our real hangup is--can we really justify that kind of expenditure no matter how committed we are to the experience if we've got a large number of others who must have an ordinary classroom experience?

Another criticism about the cost of field study experiences was directed toward the added burden some of the programs place on students. Criticizing the entire educational system for limiting opportunities to those who could afford them, one faculty member stated:

> I'd say the major criticism of the field program is that it is very inequitable. It's pretty much the ability to pay that determines the quality of the experience the students have.

This statement came from a man whose department realized no increase in cost as a result of the field study program but whose participating students found field study quite expensive.

Some departments did not experience an increase in cost as a result of their field studies. In two instances the faculty analyzed the program in the planning stages and were able to provide some of the same types of experiences as other departments at no extra cost. Scheduling and seminars were involved in their cost-saving plans. Currently several departments are making efforts at studying ways of providing better field studies without increasing the cost.

Little has been done in this area, however, and what growth and expansion of field study programs has taken place seems far removed from valid research into the cost of providing these learning experiences.

Student Performance.--There are two aspects of evaluation of students which must be considered--evaluation to determine if students are meeting objectives, and grading or the reporting process to the student. Both aspects were criticized by students. They repeatedly stated that field work made their academic work more meaningful but frequently--too frequently according to the students--their experiences were not evaluated so as to measure whether the objectives set forth for the field study had been achieved. Instead a term paper or a report was the sole or major technique or tool for determining achievement and growth toward objectives. Faculty members justified the paper by claiming it forces the student to organize and reflect on and react to what he has learned. Such may be the case, but some students resented this. One student with the ability to express himself very eloquently explained that writing was his forte and that he got a high grade on his paper when, for the same experience, his friend who he thought performed more adequately on the field experience but who could not write so well received a much lower grade. Other comments from students revealed their dissatisfactions.

> It was a matter of problem analysis and writing a report. This might not be the best way for someone who might get a lot out of a field experience but would have trouble gathering it together in a report.
>
> * * *
>
> It [the written report] was a nuisance. A seminar type of follow-up would have been better--where you could share and have more participation.

The seminar follow-through was suggested by several students as an appropriate technique for evaluation, for they recognized not only the faculty member's opportunity to question, listen, and observe but also their own opportunity to continue learning by hearing about other students' experiences, by organizing and reporting on their own experiences, and by the continued reflection and thought generated by both of these activities.

Another evaluation technique was highly praised by students in one particular program. Both the faculty member and a graduate assistant observed the students, wrote out their evaluations of the students' performances in each phase of the field study experience, listed reasons for their evaluations, and then compared their reactions before finally sharing them with the students. Although the evaluation was very subjective, the students were satisfied. However, most departments do not have two persons available for evaluation nor do they have the opportunity to observe students so regularly on the field study experience.

Much more attention needs to be given to devising tasks which will reflect student growth. Some students rejected all traditional methods of evaluation and asked to be able to evaluate themselves. As one student said,

> I'd be more qualified to evaluate what I've been doing than a professor and I always felt that if I only did a half-good job I should get only half credit.

In general, the responses seemed to indicate a great need for some innovative ways to help students self-evaluate their experiences and to help faculty assess the growth in students which such experiences made possible.

Grading was another problem area, but contrary to general expectations, many students still preferred the more traditional number grade than the newer pass/fail or credit/no credit. One faculty member recognized this.

> Objectively it might be better to have pass/fail. It could perhaps be pass/fail/honors because I think there should be incentive in this kind of thing . . . something where you can have a definite label that you did outstanding work and were recognized for outstanding work. That would be an incentive to do your very best.

Students, at least some of them, verified his belief.

> I had the option of pass/fail or a number grade. I chose the number grade because I felt I could get a good grade and I did.
>
> * * *
>
> I think the number grades are all right. You've got to have a little bit of incentive to do better. Otherwise I think everyone might sit back and do it halfway.
>
> * * *
>
> I want a grade if it's good--for my GPA.

A few students were more objective about the learning situation and the corresponding evaluation.

> I don't think there should have been a grade involved. I really don't. I think everyone should have passed who participated. For once it should have been something that got you away from school. You should have been able to relax and let your mind absorb a lot of things . . . but it wasn't.

* * *

> I used to be real concerned about grades and grade points until I realized they weren't indicative of very much. Too often in field experiences professors don't really know what you're doing. You're doing it for yourself anyway.

* * *

> The professor's hangup is that he insists on grading us, but he's not grading us on the objectives. That would be impossible. It should be pass/fail.

In summary, evaluation, whether of the programs, the cost, or student performance, is an area which needs much attention. If planning for the future is to be done wisely, it should be based on evaluation findings and research.

Cooperation, Coordination, and Communication

Discussing field study experiences during visitations of Michigan State University departments was almost like visiting many small but separate colleges that exist near each other but that seldom exchange ideas about their programs, their methods, or their concerns. Cooperation in common ventures was extremely rare.

Such isolation regarding the development and implementation of field study experiences was keenly felt by many faculty members who frequently expressed surprise at the knowledge that any faculty in other departments felt as they did. Several viewed with interest the development of the Field Study Committee and expressed the hope that through this committee some common problems could be solved, some policies clarified, and some expertise given to the many who felt in need of assistance. A few faculty indicated they would like to be actively involved in committee activity or at least have an opportunity to present their concerns to the committee. Frequently it was asked whether such a committee would eventually serve as a coordinating board or if it would at least look into the feasibility of establishing such an office or board. In expressing their needs most faculty members did not want nor desire to have a central placement office for off-campus studies. Rather they hoped for some centralization on campus, some board, organization, or office where information about possible placements could be obtained or exchanged, where mutual problems could be studied, and where cooperative ventures might be facilitated. As one faculty member complained:

> Our problem, a part of our cost, is that we don't even know where to start.

There were several other suggestions regarding communication on campus. One faculty member requested a campus

symposium at which faculty members with more experience could share their ideas with those newer in this endeavor. Another suggested having a liaison person from each department meet in sharing sessions. And many asked if and how they could get help and feedback from the already existing committee which was addressing itself to some of the problems of field study.

Many problems were identified through interviews, by means of questionnaires, and at discussions of the Field Study Committee which met at the time the study was in progress. Such questions as the following were asked.

> Is liability insurance the responsibility of the university or the receiving agency?
>
> If a field study experience is required, what obligation, if any, does the university have to provide the student with transportation?
>
> Are agencies required to respond to more than one department and thus expend their time and patience because of a lack of interdepartmental cooperation on campus.
>
> Can simulated experiences be substituted for some field experiences?

Other problems, too, were identified by the faculty. They need to know what is being done in departments other than their own.

> How much credit is or should be given for a field experience?
>
> Should a student be allowed to earn credit for a salaried position or field experience?
>
> Do outside agencies provide board and room for interns?

One faculty member gave his reasons for faculty wanting to share.

> I think that part of the desire on the part of these people is to find out what happens elsewhere on campus, so they can go back to their departments and say, "This is the way it's done in most departments and these are the practices that are found to be helpful. Could we institute these here?" I think that's part of the desire people have--to get some leverage on their own programs and to improve on the way in which their programs function.

Such sharing will not immediately solve all problems, for there are many conflicting views about some of the practices surrounding field study. For example, one of the above-mentioned questions was about earning both pay and credit through the same experience. A few comments will show the strong feelings for and against such a practice.

> It is my understanding and the department's feeling that if the student is getting paid for that experience, he should not get credit.

* * *

> We would not place students on internships without pay because we think that is slave labor.

* * *

> We don't permit students to accept pay. There are mutually conflicting objectives--getting paid and getting credit. But actually I'm not completely convinced they are irreconcilable. The real question is whether it is enough of an educational experience to justify credit.

* * *

> The student realizes he's doing something worthwhile when he gets paid. You have to have some kind of reward besides the grade.

* * *

> I personally have a basic philosophical problem about it.

Another problem about which there were conflicting views and diverse practices is transportation. Again faculty revealed their personal opinions.

> I would argue that students should not have to pay for transportation. They pay tuition and the university should pick up the tab.
>
> * * *
>
> Students should pay for transportation. We have built in a student activity fee to pay for field trips.
>
> * * *
>
> Sometimes there was no way to get students to their destination unless I drove. I felt responsible.
>
> * * *
>
> I'm not required to transport students and I don't.
>
> * * *
>
> I feel that for required field studies which are an integral part of the program, the university should to some degree subsidize the department for transportation.

Other questions and problems would also elicit many different opinions and views in an open discussion, but the faculty members want such an opportunity for sharing and reaching common solutions.

Cooperation and communication with agencies, labor, government, businesses, and other placement sites is another problem to which many faculty thought attention should be given. Outside agencies or placement sites to which the students frequently go are not ordinarily organizations that

have education of young people as their primary role. Although there is collaboration between the university and these agencies, many faculty members complained that failures on the part of the agencies to respond to the challenges before them were the fault of the university:

> By and large agencies are misused. We do not first of all sit down and help the agency define its resources as an educational kind of thing. If we did that, the agencies would be able to make much more appropriate choices and also we as a community of training people would be going into the agencies and would have more coordination there. . . . Agencies get caught up in the pull. At some point extreme demands are made on them. I think there is some place within the whole university structure that someone or some group of people or some rotating committee should have a primary job, at least for the immediate future, to keep current what is available and to help agencies define their strengths as training resources.

Occasionally faculty and students complained that agencies stressed service to the detriment of the learning experience. For two weeks one student learned and from then on he was given only routine, tedious tasks. "It was," he said, "a sheer waste of time." Experiences such as this seem to demand more responsibility on the part of the faculty member to communicate with personnel involved, and some faculty members did indicate that when situations similar to this one occurred, they pulled the student out of the field study.

Students do not mind giving service. In fact if service and learning can complement each other, the students are very satisfied. Many of their experiences were described

as such. Again it was contact with, preparation for, and involvement in the "real world."

Another aspect of the relationship between the university and outside groups centered around placement. Here were several problems: in some instances there were insufficient openings for students; in others, too many openings; there were students contacting agencies; there were several departments contacting the same agency; and there was a lack of continuity in some placements. From different faculty came suggestions for alleviating some of these problems and most frequently the suggestion was again for a coordinating office or board on campus that could function as a clearing house for some of these problems.

Another problem which several faculty members complained about was the excessive amount of time spent in making arrangements for field study term after term. Some departments are investigating contractual arrangements in order to eliminate the duplication of time and effort on the part of both the agency and university personnel. In this area, too, faculty members expressed the desire to know about the practices and recommendations of other departments.

Thus coordination, cooperation, and communication are important within as well as outside the campus walls. They have a direct bearing on many factors that enhance or inhibit good learning through field studies.

Field Study as Seen by Students

Valuable Aspects

It was by far the best class I have taken.

* * *

I can't speak highly enough about it.

* * *

It was better than any of my classes on campus.

* * *

It was a superb learning experience. I feel that my life is ascending and that was a high point. I learned a lot. I enjoyed every day. I loved it. I was doing things I really wanted to do.

* * *

I can't think of any bad things about it. I'm really glad I participated.

Such expressions of praise for their field studies came from the vast majority of students who had experienced these. There was no particular relationship between these highly complimentary statements and the types of projects undertaken. Independent ventures, group projects, intern or work type experiences--all had students who claimed that their off-campus learning was, if not the very best, one of the most valuable learning experiences they had had. Several students expressed a desire to see field study made a mandatory part of the curriculum and faculty members recognized their intense interest. One faculty member said,

> I think it's going to grow in popularity as students demand it. I don't think it's going to grow in popularity because the legislature decides to appropriate funds

> for it or even because central administration proclaims it a great thing. I think it's going to come because students are going to demand it.

Lacking in the above-mentioned expressions of praise were reasons for students' feeling field study to be so valuable. However, many students did tell why they found the experiences meaningful. Some saw the most important value to be the touch with reality provided by the field study.

> You get out to see the real world situation. You can read about it and look in a book. It's easy for professors to say how things go, but you <u>see</u>.

* * *

> I wouldn't trade it for anything else. I've gotten a lot more useful things than I have ever gotten before to prepare me for the "big world."

* * *

> This was by far the best class I have had, and I wish I could have spent more time than I did. On campus as far as classes are concerned, it's a lot of theory and I've had a lot of trouble relating it to the outside environment. When I got in the outside environment I could see why I needed all those classes I really didn't want earlier.

* * *

> We were dealing in the real world. That's what made the project worthwhile.

Other students saw other values. Again their own words tell best how they felt and what they thought were the benefits of field study. One stressed self-confidence.

> I learned more in that one term. It was mostly concerning my own abilities and gaining confidence in my abilities--by actually putting accumulated theoretical knowledge into practice and digging on my own for my own self.

Independence and responsibility were values seen by another student.

> It's a very realistic experience. It gives you a chance to work completely unstructured. You see, I had a responsibility, I got credit, but it was more. Independence! It was completely up to me what I wanted to do.

And the student who stated the following expressed ideas that several others mentioned--the value of being in a different environment, the value of learning at one's own rate, and the value of self-determination.

> The things I liked best about the whole situation were: it got me away from the classroom, I got to go at the pace I wanted, I got to study those things that I wanted and felt I wanted to know more about, I designed and carried out my own project.

Still another student expressed what he thought was the value of doing things on one's own.

> I knew there were other things to be done and I could do them. Many feel trapped into rigid standards. They feel they have to look for things in an academic fashion rather than in just a curious fashion and I think that's too bad, because curiosity is probably the greatest gift of the intellect. So many students feel that they have to be curious and look into what will please the professors most.

One young man praised his professor for allowing him to proceed independently.

> He would sort of let you search what you wanted to get out of a course and how you wanted to get it out. I learned more in a much shorter time and retained more than what I do on campus.

The enthusiasm for field experiences lay in the fact that 1) students saw the relevance of their experiences and their usefulness to them for the future, and 2) they opted

for these experiences. Such enthusiasm should not be surprising, for when learning experiences are freely chosen they are more likely to reflect the personal preferences and personalities of the students. But this very fact makes student evaluation biased and therefore only one element in the evaluation of the worth of field study in relation to all other learning methods. Nevertheless, motivation was at a high level, and student learning and memory are closely tied to motivation. What one student said was probably very true.

> I thought I'd learn quite a bit in a program set up by myself--and I did.

There seemed to be another observation of a few students with regard to their off-campus experiences. Many expressed the belief that the faculty sponsors, moderators, supervisors, or advisers were among the most outstanding faculty on campus. Praise was generous:

> Our professor really made it worthwhile so I guess it depends on who you have. In his case it was really something. It was just really astounding what he did for us. He really worked. I don't know other profs who worked so hard.

This was said about an extended field trip. But for another type of program the comment was similar:

> The professor really made the program. Basically it was his attitude. He was always there to help you if you needed it.

Such high praise from so many students might suggest that they experienced no problems with field studies. Such was not the case, and these problems will now be considered.

Problems

Although more than twice as many praised field study experiences as criticized them most of the students had some complaints, had experienced some problems, and offered some suggestions for improvement.

Faculty members bore out the complaints of the students when they indicated what they thought were the biggest problems for students--transportation and cost (Table 5). These problems were more frequently mentioned by students then any other problems. Such statements as, "Well, I am fortunate, I have a car." frequently preceded expressions of concern about acquaintances or friends who could not participate in field studies because they had no transportation. Many of the students contacted did not have cars but had managed to arrange transportation with others or to use some other means of reaching their destinations. Some students told of riding buses for three hours a day. Others told similar stories, because not many had faculty sponsors or department chairmen who felt like the man who said, "If I require a student to go out, I've got to get him out there. Who else?"

In general students did not object to paying for transportation; in fact, they expected to do that. But they did express the feeling that the university should investigate transportation problems and try to provide some solution

to them. As one student said, "It's not the extra financial burden. It's the hassle, the red tape. The university should try to alleviate this."

The cost of some of the experiences was another problem. Some reported that they incurred only minimal expenses by electing a field study experience, but some of the experiences were very expensive and were therefore limited to those who could afford them. A few of the departments partly subsidized some of the students because of the research they were carrying out, and one department whose students rendered services through their learning experiences used the money received for the services to pay for transportation and other costs. Most of the more elaborate and creative experiences, however, and all those which took the students abroad were available only to those who could afford them. And even regarding these students, one student observed that "a lot of kids were really hurting."

Faculty members did not realize or at least did not suggest that a problem many students face is with the faculty themselves. Although many students have been quoted as wanting independence and responsibility, there is no fixed line of demarcation between independence and dependence. Students may be likely to resent the teacher who directs their activities too closely, but they are at the same time likely to be anxious when given too much independence. Some

told of times when they really needed more direction and could not find it.

> The only difficulty I encountered was getting the faculty members to help me out, especially because they are quite busy.

* * *

> I don't think there was enough supervision. We were just put in a situation and expected to carry on.

One student told of what he called his "hit and miss" contact with his adviser. "We missed a lot of times," he complained. Another said he felt uncomfortable when he sought help, "I always had the feeling I was interrupting him."

A few students said they had not been so much concerned about getting help as much as finding a faculty member who would approve the field study initially. Statements ranged from those which described faculty as being supportive and encouraging to those which indicated that the student had great difficulty in finding a faculty member to advise him. One can understand the difficulty some students faced when one realizes that attitudes such as the following exist. As one faculty member said, "It's a privilege, not a right. Some students can't get a faculty member to sponsor them. That's their problem."

Usually students did not attribute their difficulties in this area to negative attitudes as much as they did to the fact that the faculty involved in field studies were

frequently those who were so busy they did not always have the time to take on more. One student was so apprehensive about the load on faculty that he did not want publicity released on field studies for fear that his own chances of taking more off-campus studies would be lessened.

Such an attitude, one of concern for one's own interests, was just the opposite of what most students expressed and considered another big problem on campus--communication or publicity about field study opportunities. One faculty member believed that

> The word of mouth method of describing a course on this campus I feel is much better than the written word. The students tell other students. Here is your communication system.

But students disagreed with that procedure or lack of procedure. They felt that there should be greater efforts made to let students know of the availability and values of these field study experiences. One student said she would be willing to visit classes in order to tell other students about "such a good thing."

Communication about field study would perhaps alleviate another concern expressed by many students and already briefly mentioned. Students wanted the experiences earlier.

> You should do it at an earlier stage. That's what I feel anyway. . . . Now I have confidence. I should have had this happen to me earlier because if I had, I am sure I would have been better motivated to do well in other courses.

Those in professional programs admitted that a certain amount of theory should be acquired before much exposure to the field, but they did not think that for some of the experiences they should have had to wait so long.

Insufficient preparation was another area of concern for some students. Many wanted to be on their own, it is true, but they also wanted to know what to expect.

> Some professors have a tendency of not preparing you very well for what you're really supposed to do. They tell you the basis behind the whole thing, but you really don't know what you're doing sometimes.
>
> * * *
>
> I would really like to know what my professor expects and he doesn't let me know at all.
>
> * * *
>
> They should be a little more realistic and really tell students what it's all about and not just say, "You'll get practical experience."

Such complaints were not too common, perhaps because many students found the desired structure and assistance they needed, but even these few expressions of concern revealed that students want and need some guidelines within which to operate.

Students' concerns about evaluation and grading have already been discussed. Here was a contradiction--students asking for non-traditional ways of learning but still clinging to the more traditional ways of grading. Although many students expressed real concern about having their experiences evaluated by means of term papers or reports, there

were relatively few who petitioned for pass/fail or credit/no credit options.

In summary, students are enthusiastic about field experiences, seem willing to pay when they can, want these experiences sooner, have transportation problems, think opportunities should be publicized more, believe all students should have the same opportunities, express contradictory ideas about grading, would like to be more adeuqately prepared, and would like the faculty to be more available but not at the risk of curtailment of independence.

Summary

Because of the many and varied field study programs and experiences offered through the different departments, it is difficult to generalize about these. We can, however, make some observations.

Many departments have well-stated and well-formulated objectives for their field studies, but a number of departments are vague or unclear in the determination and expression of their goals. Yet efforts are being put forth by many individual faculty members and by department committees to clarify field study objectives and to involve more people in the determination of guidelines for field studies.

There are certain institutional factors and problems which inhibit or impede the realization of field studies.

Some of these are environmental factors; staffing and finance; evaluation; and coordination, communication, and cooperation.

The climate may perhaps best be described as sometimes supportive and sometimes tolerant of field study. Open encouragement is generally lacking.

Staffing, workload, and finance are interrelated; the greatest expense to the University seems to be in adequate staffing. Some departments claim there is no added expense, but often the faculty in these departments are those who are burdened with overload.

Evaluation, whether of the program, student performance, or the cost, is an area which needs considerable attention. Growth has not seemed to be based on data generated from evaluation.

Cooperation, communication, and coordination are also areas which, if improved, would alleviate some of the problems departments on campus and agencies off campus are experiencing.

Students, too, experience both positive and negative feelings about their field studies. The values which they see in these experiences, however, far outnumber their criticisms or complaints. In general they would like more opportunities for field study, would like these experiences sooner, and would like all faculty to be more supportive and encouraging toward field studies.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

The purpose of this study has been to examine some undergraduate field study experiences at Michigan State University in an attempt to provide guidelines and directions for the further development and implementation of such experiences in liberal arts colleges and universities.

A review of literature indicates that such experiences as field trips, foreign study, service-learning projects, work-study programs, and off-campus independent study projects are expanding and growing in popularity. To find evaluations of such field study programs and to make comparisons was almost impossible not only because of the limited number of such research studies but also because of the use of broad categories such as independent study and the narrow focus of others such as work study. However, in the studies which were reviewed some of the following trends, restrictions, problems, and values emerged.

The opportunity for field study has increased for the student of average ability but is still confined mostly to the junior and senior years of study. It has provided

opportunities for learning which cannot be duplicated on campus, and it has promoted independence and responsibility. Revealed, too, is the fact that the key to a successful field study is the faculty member, and yet one of the most frequently-mentioned problems is the extra burden or load such study places on the faculty. Evaluation and supervision were also mentioned as problem areas.

Findings and Conclusions

The present study confirms the fact that such observations and problems found in earlier studies are still persisting today. From the thirty-five departments under study, questionnaire returns indicated that faculty time, institutional cost, limited opportunities, student transportation, and costs to the student are problems which inhibit departments from offering or expanding field study experiences and students from participating freely in such experiences. Also revealed through questionnaire returns was the general agreement or similarity in the objectives set forth by the departments. Application of theory to practical situations and professional preparation were objectives with the highest priority and were named quite consistently regardless of whether or not the programs had a liberal arts or a professional emphasis. Certain affective outcomes and behavioral changes were also objectives which reached across most departments. However, the failure of

many departments to evaluate either their field study programs or the cost of these field studies and also the general dissatisfaction with what evaluation has taken place suggests problems with the statement of objectives in terms of attainable goals as well as with evaluation--both areas which need considerable attention.

Faculty and student interviews uncovered other institutional factors or problems which inhibit or impede the development of field studies. The environment is sometimes supportive and sometimes tolerant, but open encouragement is generally lacking. Staffing and finance are problems which are interrelated. The greatest expense seems to be in adequate staffing. Sometimes when funds are not readily available, and this is frequently the case, the faculty involved in field studies are burdened with overlaod and excessive time demands. Cooperation between departments, communication on campus, and coordination with outside agencies are other areas which, if improved, would alleviate some of the problems.

Students involved in field studies felt they were a privileged group and that opportunities for field study should not only be extended to other students but should be available to them sooner. Nevertheless, despite all their praise for their experiences and the professional and personal growth realized through them, students had some criticisms. They found communication faulty,

faculty--except for those faculty directly involved--not always supportive, and costs and transportation burdensome and inequitable.

Recommended Guidelines

If field study experiences are to be implemented in liberal arts colleges and universities, there are certain recommendations or guidelines which seem essential:

1. Objectives for field study experiences must be in harmony with institutional objectives. Some tasks are appropriate for educational institutions; others are not. Although many field experiences have dual purposes--service-learning experiences or work-study experiences--learning must have priority in the rationale for and in the performance of these experiences.
2. Objectives must be developed which state the desired outcomes of field experiences in terms of achievable goals and in such a way as to provide direction and guidance for the selection of appropriate experiences. Although some field study programs have been set up with clearly defined objectives, too many have been initiated with vague or unclear objectives or with objectives that cannot be realized or measured. Such field studies frustrate the faculty who

are not quite sure what they are about and the students who are not quite sure what to expect.

3. The process of evaluation must be on-going and must include the program, the costs, and student performance. The area of evaluation has proven one of the most difficult areas related to field study experiences and an area in which many faculty seek support and assistance. Some faculty have the feeling that their program is a "good thing," but they have no data by which to judge this. Objectives must be developed with evaluation in mind and objectives must in turn be modified by what evaluation reveals. New methods of evaluating student performance must also be investigated. Innovative ways of assessing student growth should be directed toward student self-evaluation as well as evaluation by faculty. Students complain that too frequently evaluation is not based on their participation or performance in field studies but rather on their ability to write a term paper.

4. A supportive climate which encourages both faculty and students in field studies must be generated. Faculty feel isolated in their attempts to promote field studies when theirs is a "one-man show" and they do not have departmental support but merely tolerance. And students, when they must rely "on

chance" to discover appropriate field study opportunities, feel a lack of faculty support and encouragement--both of which are necessary for an environment conducive to field studies.

5. Field study experiences must have structure. This does not mean that such structure need be tightly set up nor does it mean that the student is not involved in the planning and design of the experience. It does mean, however, that there should be student preparation for the experience, that the experience should be planned so that the objectives are fully understood and serve as guides, and that there will be some follow-up. Where structure seems to be lacking, students complain of their frustration in not knowing what is expected and not knowing how to proceed in a way most beneficial to them. For faculty, structure demands planning that extends far beyond initial arrangements. It includes guides for student learning, procedures for selecting experiences, and better evaluation instruments. It must not, however, be overly restrictive but should allow for a maximum of freedom within a well-developed framework.

6. There must be a realistic approach to the cost of some field study programs and some rational decisions made about their support. Such support should extend

to faculty providing the experiences and to students opting to take them. The study pointed out that the cost of field study programs has been one of the most inhibiting factors both for departments and for students, but only limited attempts have been made to study ways to reduce costs and even fewer attempts have been made to provide some field experiences for all and not just for those with the ability to pay. Cost studies should be a part of the planning process. ways to reduce costs must be considered, and valid data derived from cost studies should be used in making decisions about or in instituting changes in field study programs.

7. Faculty must be given time for planning, advising, supervision, and evaluation. One of the most difficult problems for faculty is the extra time or overload demand which they frequently experience when attempting to provide field studies. If field study is deemed essential, faculty should be given support and encouragement in their efforts; recognition of loads is one way to accomplish this, and the result will be more positive or favorable attitudes and a better educational climate. Students, too, need faculty who are available. Such availability also contributes to a more favorable learning situation.

8. Students should be allowed to participate in the planning and design of some field studies. Many students are seeking greater responsibility. Since some field studies are set up in such a way that they do provide opportunities for growth in independence, self-reliance, and responsibility, and since these are valid objectives, such participation, together with faculty assistance, should be encouraged.
9. Agencies and outside organizations should, whenever possible, be involved in the planning of field study. The primary function of these agencies is not usually education. Institutions of higher education should understand this and assist the agencies in the identification of valid learning experiences and in determining the extent of student involvement. The fact that the final responsibility for and control of the learning situation must remain with the educational institution should be so thoroughly understood that neither will the agency exploit the student by demanding too much service or too much routine work nor will the university exploit the agency by overtaxing its resources or by denying needed support and assistance. By involving the agency from the beginning or at an appropriate planning point, there will be more assurance of a most profitable

university-agency relationship, one that will promote real learning.

10. Guidelines providing for consistency of policy must be set up. When contradictory policies are set forth by different departments, confusion and frustration result. This confusion reaches students who take courses from various departments, faculty who observe their own restrictions critically, and agencies that work with many different persons from campus. Depending upon the size of the institution, a committee, a central planning board, or an office should address itself to developing and evaluating such guidelines.

11. Ways must be established to provide communication about the coordination of field study activities. When students do not know about opportunities available to them and when faculty feel isolated in their attempts to provide good experiences, there is much wasted effort. Lack of information hampers much progress which could be gained by sharing. A liaison person or coordinator should be appointed from each academic unit offering field studies to work with the above-mentioned central planning board or office. Duplication of efforts could thus be reduced; agencies would be less frequently bothered; and interdepartmental studies could be facilitated.

Need for Further Research

Even following such directives as are suggested by these guidelines, institutions of higher education which establish field study activities must continue to address themselves to studying ways of improving these learning experiences. Further research is needed on: the relationship between the granting of credit and the time spent in the field study activity; appropriate methods for evaluation; new ways of grading; simulated learning experiences; and mechanisms for involving more off-campus personnel and organizations in the educational venture.

The renewed interest in finding ways of adding depth and relevance to the learning experience, the obvious advantages of joining theory with practice, and the restiveness of students who find the physically inactive lecture-recitation methods stultifying--all these are signs which urge educators to sharpen up the effectiveness of field studies, to bring them within reasonable cost, and to exhaust all existing opportunities in the process of extending education beyond the narrow boundaries of the campus into the larger community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aydelotte, Frank. Breaking the Academic Lockstep. New York: Harper & Bros., 1944.

_____. "Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities." Bulletin of the National Research Council, VII, Part 4, No. 40 (January, 1924), 9-18.

_____. "Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities." Bulletin of the National Research Council, X (April, 1925), 1-96.

Bonthius, Robert H.; Davis, F. James; and Drushel, J. Gerber. The Independent Study Program in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

Brick, Michael, and McGrath, Earl J. Innovation in Liberal Arts Colleges. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Brownell, Baker. The College and the Community. New York: Harper & Bros., 1952.

Dearing, Bruce. "The Student on His Own: Independent Study." Higher Education: Some Newer Developments Edited by Samuel Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Dressel, Paul L. College and University Curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1968.

Dressel, Paul L., and DeLisle, Frances H. Undergraduate Curriculum Trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Dunivant, Noel, Jr. Bridging the Gap. The Winston-Salem Service-Learning Project in Community Resource Development, 1969.

Eberly, Donald J. "Service Experience and Educational Growth." Educational Record, XLIX, No. 2 (Spring, 1968), 197-205.

Felder, Dell. "Independent-Study Practices in Colleges and Universities." The Journal of Higher Education, XXV, No. 6 (June, 1964), 335-338.

Gould, Samuel B., and Cross, K. Patricia, eds. Explorations in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Heist, Paul, and Wilson, Robert. "Curricular Experiences for the Creative." The Creative College Student: An Unmet Challenge. Edited by Paul Heist. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Henderson, Algo D. The Innovative Spirit. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Lynd, Helen Merrell. Field Work in College Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Colleges Today and Tomorrow. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Mayhew, Lewis B., and Ford, Patrick J. Changing the Curriculum. San Francisoc: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

McGrath, Earl J., and Meeth, L. Richard. "Organizing for Teaching and Learning: The Curriculum." Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. Edited by Samuel Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Nesmith, James N. "Report of Inquiry into the Structuring and Evaluating of Field Study as a Method of Improving Teaching and Learning." Unpublished report to The Danforth Foundation, Stephens College, Missouri, Fall, 1969.

O'Connell, William R., Jr. "Innovations in Undergraduate Instruction: Service-Learning as a Southern Strategy." Address at American Association for Higher Education Meeting, Chicago, March, 1972.

Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1967.

Scott, Harry V. "American Higher Education: Some Features of the Current Scene." The North Central Association Quarterly, XLVI, No. 3 (Winter, 1972), 340-347.

The Student in Higher Education. Report of the Commission on the Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Connecticut: The Hazen Foundation, 1968.

Taylor, Mary Barbara, and Sinclair, J. H. "Honors Work in Institutions Accredited by the American Association of Universities." School and Society, XXXIII, No. 842 (February 14, 1931), 247-250.

Thompson, Mary Magdala. "A Survey of Problems Impeding the Growth of Independent Study in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1971.

Umstattd, J. G. "The Prevalence and Practice of Independent Study." The Journal of Higher Education, VI (October, 1935), 364-376.

Wilson, James W., and Lyons, Edward H. Work-Study College Programs. New York: Harper & Bros., 1961.

General References

Axelrod, Joseph; Freedman, Mervin; Hatch, Winslow; Katz, Joseph; and Sanford, Nevitt. Search for Relevance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Baskin, Samuel. "Independent Study Methods, Programs, and For Whom?" Current Issues in Higher Education. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1962.

Berdie, Ralph F. "The Study of University Students: Analysis and Recommendations." The Journal of College Student Personnel, XIII, No. 1 (January, 1972), 4-11.

Bonthius, Robert H.; Davis, F. James; and Drushel, J. Gerber. "Independent-Study Programs." The Journal of Higher Education, XXV, No. 8 (November, 1954), 411-416.

Bowen, Howard R., and Douglass, Gordon K. Efficiency in Liberal Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Brown, Robert D. "Evaluation of Experimental Colleges: Some Questions That Need Asking." The Journal of Higher Education, XLIII, No. 2 (February, 1972), 133-141.

Butz, Otto. To Make a Difference. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Campbell, Vincent N. Self Direction and Programmed Instruction for Five Different Types of Learning Objectives. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, December, 1963.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less Time, More Options. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New Students and New Places. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Coffin, William Sloane, Jr. "Universities and Social Order." Twenty-Five Years 1945-70. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Dressel, Paul L., and Associates. Evaluation in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.

Dykes, Archie R. "Innovation in Higher Education." School and Society, XCIV, No. 2276 (April 2, 1966), 179-181.

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Newcomb, Theodore M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Garrison, Karl C. Faculty Roles in Service-Learning. Raleigh, North Carolina: Department of Administration and Board of Higher Education, October, 1970.

Goff, Jerry G., and Wilson, Robert C. "Faculty Values and Improving Teaching." New Teaching, New Learning. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Goldberg, Maxwell H. "Design for Liberal Learning." School and Society, C, No. 2340 (March, 1972), 178-180.

Gould, Samuel B. "Is Nontraditionalism Becoming a Tradition?" Today's Education, LXI, No. 4 (April, 1972), 18-21.

_____. Today's Academic Condition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

Gruber, Howard E. "The Uses and Abuses of Negative Results." Learning and the Professors. Edited by Ohmer Milton and Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1968.

Haywood, Robert. "Independent Study for Freshmen." Improving College and University Teaching, XVI, No. 4 (Autumn, 1968), 279-280.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. Institutions in Transition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.

Karman, Thomas A. "The Defiance College Winter Term." Improving College and University Teaching, XIX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1971), 309-313.

Keppel, Francis. The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Knowles, Asa S. "Changes in the Traditional Concepts of Higher Education." School and Society, XCIX, No. 2336 (November, 1971), 405-409.

Lee, Calvin B. T., ed. Improving College Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Mosteller, Robert P. Service-Learning: A Real World Search for Truth. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Internship Office, September, 1970.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "And Now the Future." Twenty-Five Years 1945-70. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

McKinnon, D. W. "Educating for Creativity: A Modern Myth?" The Creative College Student: An Unmet Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Minter, W. John, ed. The Individual and the System. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1967.

Minter, W. John, and Thompson, Ian M., eds. Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, November, 1968.

Richardson, Elliot L. "Directions in Higher Education." School and Society, C, No. 2342 (Summer, 1972), 295-297.

Roszak, Theodore, ed. The Dissenting Academy. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967.

Sanders, Irwin T.; Ward, Jennifer C.; and Perkins, James R. Bridges to Understanding. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

Sanford, Nevitt. "The Goal of Individual Development." Twenty-Five Years 1945-70. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

_____, ed. The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Sigmon, Robert Lee. Service-Learning: An Educational Style. Address at University of North Carolina at Charlotte, July 16, 1970.

Smith, G. Kerry, ed. Agony and Promise. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

_____, ed. Stress and Campus Response. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Stephens, E. Robert, and Stenges, Charles A. "Commentary." The Journal of Higher Education, XLII, No. 4 (April, 1971), 303-307.

Sturner, William F. "Environmental Code: Creating a Sense of Place on the College Campus." The Journal of Higher Education, XLIII, No. 2 (February, 1972), 97-109.

Tarcher, Martin. "Learning Through Involvement." Twenty-Five Years 1945-70. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Taylor, Harold. The World as Teacher. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1969.

Thompson, Mary Magdala, and Dressel, Paul L. "A Survey of Independent Study Practices." Educational Record, LI, No. 4 (Fall, 1970), 392-395.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

IDENTIFYING QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX I

UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES

IDENTIFYING QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Does your department offer some form of undergraduate field study experience*? Yes_____ No _____

(If you checked no, please disregard the remaining questions, sign, and return.)

2. Are such experiences optional? Yes_____ No_____ Professional requirement? Yes_____ No_____ Departmental requirement? Yes_____ No_____

---

*Field studies in this survey will refer to undergraduate, off-campus@ field experiences for which credit is given. Field study may include such experiences as:

observations
intern programs
work-study programs
travel experiences
residence or study abroad#
cultural projects or opportunities
other off-campus experiences

Field study should not include:

independent reading or study assignments
independent study groups
independent laboratory experiments
other similar projects

@On-campus experiences may be included provided they are comparable to off-campus field experiences; i.e., they remove the student from the closely supervised classroom or laboratory situation and provide him with the opportunity to seek and make use of the resources of a field of interest in a manner different from the usual independent research project.

#Credit must be more than that earned through formal enrollment in a foreign institution.

3. Which are the specific courses within your department in which undergraduates may be given credit for a field study experience?

_____

_____

_____

(Please indicate by course number.)

4. Will you please name the faculty member(s) with whom further contact concerning field study experiences may be made?

Name_____ Title_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

5. Will you please include general information (program descriptions, brochures, etc.) concerning field study experiences?

Yes_____ No_____ None available_____

_____

Questionnaire has been completed by:

Name_____

Title_____

Department_____

_____

Please return completed questionnaire to:

Mary Ellen Quinn, R.S.M.
325 Administration Building
Michigan State University

APPENDIX II

UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

CURRENT PRACTICES AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX II

UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES*

CURRENT PRACTICES AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT_____

FIELD STUDY COURSE(S)_____
(Indicate by course number)

---

*Field studies in this survey will refer to undergraduate, off-campus@ field experiences for which credit is given. Field study may include such experiences as:

observations
intern programs
work-study programs
travel experiences
residence or study abroad#
cultural projects or opportunities
other off-campus experiences

Field study should not include:

independent reading or study assignments
independent study groups
independent laboratory experiments
other similar projects

@On-campus experiences may be included provided they are comparable to off-campus field experiences; i.e., they remove the student from the closely supervised classroom or laboratory situation and provide him with the opportunity to seek and make use of the resources of a field of interest in a manner different from the usual independent research project.

#Credit must be more than that earned through formal enrollment in a foreign institution.

INSTRUCTIONS: Enter the NUMBERS or CHECKMARKS (X) indicating your responses to the following items on the lines provided. Respond to the questions only as they apply to the course(s) you list above. Omit any questions which do not apply to your offerings.

1. Field study experiences as offered in the course(s) indicated may be described as: (Check all applicable)

_____Observations
_____Intern programs
_____Community service programs
_____Work-study programs
_____Travel
_____Residence, study, or service abroad
_____Cultural experiences
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

2. These field study experiences provide: (Check all applicable)

_____Limited contact in or with the field
_____Actual involvement as a learner with limited responsibilities and well understood goals
_____Actual work or service experience without pay
_____Actual work or service experience with pay

3. The field study experiences indicated are available to: (Check all applicable)

_____Department majors only
_____Superior students only
_____Seniors
_____Juniors
_____Sophomores
_____Freshmen
(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

4. Such field study is required of: (Check all applicable)

_____Department majors only
_____Seniors
_____Juniors
_____Sophomores
_____Freshmen
(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

5. Selection of participants for these field study experiences is based upon: (Check all applicable)

_____High school performance
_____College grade-point average
_____Student's desire to participate
_____Recommendation of faculty or staff
Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

6. Optional field studies are generally chosen by: (Check all applicable)

_____Superior students
_____Average students
_____Students with low GPA's
_____Upperclassmen
(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

7. Approximately what percentage of graduating seniors from your department have participated in the field study experiences indicated? (Put percentage on line)

_____

8. The above percentage is based on:

_____Complete data
_____Systematic sampling
_____General estimate
(EXPLAIN IF NECESSARY)_____
_____
_____

9. Approximately what percentage of students having participated in these field study experiences are non-majors?

_____

10. These field study experiences are offered: (Check all applicable)

_____Fall term
_____Winter term
_____Spring term
_____Summer term
_____(REMARKS)_____

11. The ordinary duration of a field study experience is

_____Less than one term
_____One term
_____More than one term

12. The field study experience is a

_____Full-time commitment
_____Part-time commitment (Student may be taking other courses at the same time)
(REMARKS)_____

13. The objectives of the field study experiences have been formally stated and published with rationale?

_____Yes
_____No
_____(REMARKS)_____

14. The objectives of the field study experiences indicated are: (RANK IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE. OMIT OR ADD ANY)

_____Professional preparation
_____Professional service
_____Self-reliance and self-direction
_____Knowledge of self (abilities, values, etc.)
_____Understanding and acceptance of others
_____Application of theory to practical situations
_____Development of awareness of societal issues
_____Other (SPECIFY AND RANK)

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

15. Pre-field/study experiences which prepare a student specifically for the field study include:

_____Orientation seminar(s)
_____Faculty interview(s)
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

16. Post-field/study experiences or follow-up programs include:

_____Seminar(s)
_____Conferences
_____Group discussions
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

17. These field study experiences are usually

_____Student generated
_____Faculty generated
_____(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

18. Proposed field studies are approved by:

_____Individual faculty member
_____Department chairman
_____Committee
_____Field study coordinator
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

19. Guidelines are available to this person or persons for the approval of field studies.

_____Yes
_____No
_____(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

20. A student enrolled in a field study is evaluated by: (Check all applicable)

_____Faculty member
_____Agency or outside personnel
_____Fellow students
_____Self
_____(REMARKS)_____

21. Techniques or tools used to evaluate students are: (Check all applicable)

_____Written reports
_____Oral reports
_____Agency or outside assessments
_____Interviews
_____Visitations
_____Journals
_____Projects
_____Tests
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____

22. You are satisfied with your evaluation tools and techniques?

_____Yes
_____No
_____(REMARKS)_____

23. Students completing a field study receive grades of

_____4, 3.5, 3, 2.5, etc.
_____C/NC
_____P/N
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____

24. Students seem satisfied with the grading practice?

_____Yes
_____No
_____(REMARKS)_____

25. Students are generally satisfied with the number of credit hours received for the time spent on the field study?

_____Yes
_____No
_____(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

26. Funds are available to students for the field study?

_____Yes
_____No
_____No extra expense involved for the student

27. When students refrain from selecting optional field study experiences, the principal reasons seem to be: (Check all applicable)

_____Cost
_____Apathy
_____Fear of self-direction
_____Red-tape (arrangements)
_____Limited opportunities
_____Time
_____Transportation
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

28. Students required to participate in a field study seem to experience problems with: (Check all applicable)

_____Cost
_____Red-tape (arrangements)
_____Transportation
_____Expectations of outside agency or placement
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

29. Faculty attitudes toward field study are

_____Favorable
_____Unfavorable
_____(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

30. Special problems for the faculty or department in relation to the field studies indicated are: (Check all applicable)

_____Faculty time
_____Supervision
_____On-campus communication
_____Coordination
_____Limited placement sites
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

31. Placements for field study experiences are:

_____On campus
_____Off-campus educational institutions
_____Other off-campus sites
BRIEFLY DESCRIBE EXPERIENCES_____
_____
_____
_____
(Use back of page if necessary)

32. Outside agencies or placements provide supervision?

_____Yes
_____No
(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

33. Outside agencies or placements cooperate in evaluation?

_____Yes
_____No
(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

34. Outside agencies or placements rely too much on service? (Would they find it inconvenient to function without the student?)

_____Yes
_____No
(REMARKS)_____
_____
_____

35. The cost of offering these field experiences has been studied?

_____Yes
_____No

36. Field study leads to

_____An increase in cost
_____A decrease in cost
_____Some increase and some decrease
_____No change

37. An increase is found in the following areas: (Check all applicable)

_____Faculty
_____Planning
_____Program direction
_____Supervision
_____Evaluation
_____Others (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

38. A decrease is found in the following areas: (Check all applicable)

_____Faculty
_____Equipment
_____Program direction
_____Other (SPECIFY)_____
_____
_____

Answer the following questions as they pertain to <u>all</u> field study offerings in your department.

39. Students may participate in more than one field experience?

_____Yes
_____No
_____(IF YES, EXPLAIN)_____
_____
_____

40. If yes, approximately what percentage of graduating seniors from your department have more than one field study experience?

_____

41. Concerning self-evaluation of the field study program, the department has:

_____Never attempted a formal evaluation
_____Tried successfully to formally evaluate it
_____Evaluated it with limited success
_____Evaluated it to the department's satisfaction

42. Reports or informal summaries of evaluation studies are available and will be returned with this questionnaire?

_____Yes _____No

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: Use the space below to comment on problems related to the design, administration, financing, or other aspects of field study experiences to which this questionnaire did not give you an opportunity to respond.

(Use back of page if necessary)

Questionnaire has been completed by:

Name_____

Title_____

Department_____

Please return completed questionnaire to:

Mary Ellen Quinn
325 Administration Building
Michigan State University

APPENDIX III

DEPARTMENTS OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES

APPENDIX III

DEPARTMENTS OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

- Agricultural Economics
- Crop and Soil Sciences
- Fisheries and Wildlife
- Forestry
- Packaging
- Park and Recreation Resources
- Resource Development

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

- *Art
- *English
- Music
- German and Russian

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

- Accounting and Financial Administration
- Business Law and Office Administration
- Economics
- Marketing and Transportation

COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION ARTS

- Audiology and Speech Sciences
- Communication
- Journalism

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

- Counseling, Personnel Services, and Educational Psychology
- *Elementary and Special Education
- Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
- *Secondary Education and Curriculum

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Mechanical Engineering

COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY

Family and Child Sciences
Family Ecology
Human Environment and Design

JAMES MADISON COLLEGE

JUSTIN MORRILL COLLEGE

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

Geology
*Mathematics
*Nursing
Science and Mathematics Teaching Center

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Anthropology
Criminal Justice
Geography
Political Science
Psychology
Social Work

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

Humanities
Social Science

COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Medical Technology

Jointly shared departments are listed under only one college

---

*Departments eliminated from the study. See Chapter III.

APPENDIX IV

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY

APPENDIX IV

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY

1. What kinds of field study experiences are included in your department?

2. How long has field study been offered through your department?

3. How extensive is the practice of field study?

   3.1 Available to all applicants?
   3.2 Restricted by GPA's, grade levels, etc.?
   3.3 Available each term?
   3.4 Limited to certain faculty directors?
   3.5 Restricted to a certain number of credit hours?
   3.6 Increasing in popularity and demand?

4. What types of students opt for field study?

5. How are students informed about or introduced to the concept of field study?

   5.1 By chance?
   5.2 Literature?
   5.3 Other?

6. Have objectives been developed with rationale and are they known to

   6.1 Faculty?
   6.2 Students?

7. What are the objectives?

   7.1 Professional preparation?
   7.2 Professional service?
   7.3 Self-reliance and self-direction?
   7.4 Knowledge of self (abilities, values, etc.)?
   7.5 Understanding and acceptance of others?
   7.6 Application of theory to practical situations?
   7.7 Development of awareness of societal issues?
   7.8 Other?

8. How are faculty and students introduced to the objectives and rationale for field study?

   8.1 Orientation meetings?
   8.2 Literature?
   8.3 Peers?
   8.4 Other?

9. How are students evaluated?

10. Do these methods of evaluation address themselves to goals or objectives of the field study?

11. Has your department ever evaluated your program of field study?

   11.1 Never?
   11.2 Tried unsuccessfully?
   11.3 Limited success?
   11.4 To your satisfaction?

12. What was included in the evaluation?

   12.1 Student testimony?
   12.2 Test performance?
   12.3 Post graduation activities?
   12.4 Other?

13. Did you evaluate the process as well as the outcomes?

14. Have students ever evaluated the evaluation process?

15. Are faculty members for the most part favorable toward field study experiences?

16. Is your program of field study known and appreciated outside your college or department?

   16.1 By top administration?
   16.2 By other universities?
   16.3 By general public?

17. Have you found that field study leads to a change in expense?

   17.1 Increase?
   17.2 Decrease?

18. What are some field study problems related to:

    18.1 Faculty?

        18.11 Excessive time demands?
        18.12 Coordination?
        18.13 Other?

    18.2 Agencies or placements?

        18.21 Too much emphasis on service?
        18.22 Coordination?
        18.23 Location?
        18.24 Insufficient openings?

    18.3 Students?

        18.31 Apathy?
        18.32 Expense?
        18.33 Transportation?

19. What suggestions do you have for coping with these?

    19.1 On the part of the university?
    19.2 On the part of the department?
    19.3 On the part of the faculty?
    19.4 Other?

20. What problems do you anticipate in field studies and how should the university respond to these?

21. What do you see as the most important outcomes of field study in your department?

22. What do you see as the future of field study in your department?

APPENDIX V

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

APPENDIX V

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR STUDENTS

1. What field study experience(s) have you had? Include only those for which credit was given.

   1.1 As a freshman?
   1.2 As a sophomore?
   1.3 As a junior?
   1.4 As a senior?

2. Describe your field study experience(s).

3. What kinds of field study experiences were available to you and why did you choose the one(s) you did?

4. Was a field study optional or required in your program?

   4.1 If optional, what made you choose it?
   4.2 If required, would you have chosen it regardless of the requirement?

5. How did you find out about the opportunity of enrolling for a field study?

   5.1 Literature?
   5.2 Faculty?
   5.3 Peers?
   5.4 By chance?
   5.5 Other?

6. When did you find out about the opportunity of enrolling for a field study?

   6.1 Prior to enrollment at M.S.U.?
   6.2 First year at M.S.U.?
   6.3 Other?

7. Did the following factors present problems for you in choosing or in participating in your field study experience?

   7.1 Cost?
   7.2 Distance?

7.3 Credit hours (too few for time expended)?
7.4 Limited opportunities?
7.5 Red tape (arrangements, etc.)?
7.6 Time?
7.7 Expectations of faculty?
7.8 Expectations of outside agency or placement?
7.9 Insufficient preparation?

8. Were you required to give service during your field study?

8.1 Service as a part of learning?
8.2 Too much service?
8.3 Service with pay?

9. How was your field study experience evaluated?

9.1 Journals?
9.2 Reports?
9.3 Assessments?
9.4 Discussions?
9.5 Interviews?
9.6 Projects?
9.7 Tests?
9.8 Observations?
9.9 Other?

10. How was your field study experience graded?

10.1 4, 3.5, 3, 2.5, etc.
10.2 C/NC
10.3 P/N
10.4 Other

11. Were you satisfied with these procedures?

11.1 Evaluation techniques?
11.2 Grading system?

12. Have the objectives and rationale of field study experiences been clear to you?

13. What are the objectives as you know them?

13.1 Professional preparation?
13.2 Professional service?
13.3 Self-reliance and self-direction?
13.4 Knowledge of self--abilities, values, etc.?
13.5 Understanding and acceptance of others?
13.6 Application of theory to practical situations?
13.7 Development of awareness of societal issues?
13.8 Other?

14. How were you introduced to these objectives?

    14.1 Orientation meetings?

        14.11 With faculty?
        14.12 With students?

    14.2 Literature?

    14.3 Other?

15. How would you evaluate your field study as a learning experience?

    15.1 Valuable?
    15.2 Mediocre?
    15.3 Inferior?

16. Are there any special advantages or disadvantages of field study not already mentioned?

    16.1 Advantages?
    16.2 Disadvantages?

17. Do you think that most students are aware of the possibility of enrolling for a field study experience?

18. Do you think the environment here (faculty attitudes, etc.) affects the practice of field study?

    18.1 Positively?
    18.2 Negatively?

19. What do you think about the future possibilities of field study in your department or college?

APPENDIX VI

DEPARTMENTS NOT OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES

APPENDIX VI

DEPARTMENTS NOT OFFERING UNDERGRADUATE FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

- Agricultural Engineering
- Animal Husbandry
- Biochemistry
- Dairy Science
- Food Science and Human Nutrition
- Horticulture
- Poultry Science
- Natural Resources

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

- History
- Linguistics and Oriental and African Languages
- Philosophy
- Religion
- Romance Languages
- Theatre

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

- Management
- Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Management

COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION ARTS

- Advertising
- Television and Radio

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

- Administration and Higher Education

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Chemical Engineering
Civil and Sanitary Engineering
Computer Science
Electrical Engineering and Systems Science
Metallurgy, Mechanics, and Materials Science
Engineering Instructional Services

COLLEGE OF HUMAN MEDICINE

Obstetrics, Gyneocology, and Reproductive Biology
Surgery

LYMAN BRIGGS COLLEGE

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

Astronomy
Biophysics
Botany and Plant Pathology
Chemistry
Entomology
Physics
Statistics and Probability
Zoology

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Sociology
Labor and Industrial Relations
Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture
Multidisciplinary Major Program

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

American Thought and Language
Natural Science

COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Anatomy
Microbiology and Public Health
Pathology
Pharmacology
Physiology
Large Animal Surgery and Medicine
Small Animal Surgery and Medicine

Jointly shared departments are listed under only one college.

APPENDIX VII

TABULATED QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

NOT INCLUDED IN TABLES

APPENDIX VII

TABULATED QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

NOT INCLUDED IN TABLES

Responses from 45 faculty members representing 35 departments.

1. Field study experiences as offered in the course(s) indicated may be described as: (Check all applicable)

20	Observations
11	Intern programs
14	Community service programs
10	Work-study programs
5	Travel
9	Residence, study, or service abroad
7	Cultural experiences
	Other (SPECIFY)
6	Clinics, classrooms, etc.--participation in activities.

2. These field study experiences provide: (Check all applicable)

17	Limited contact in or with the field
27	Actual involvement as a learner with limited responsibilities and well understood goals
20	Actual work or service experience without pay
8	Actual work or service experience with pay
	(Most responses indicated more than one option.)

5. Selection of participants for these field study experiences is based upon: (Check all applicable)

	High school performance
9	College grade-point average
28	Student's desire to participate
21	Recommendation of faculty or staff
	Other (SPECIFY)
4	Requirement of major or minor
2	Availability of space
	(Sixteen responses included both the third and fourth items. The college grade-point average was never used alone.)

6. Optional field studies are generally chosen by: (Check all applicable)

16 Superior students
8 Average students
1 Students with low GPA's
8 Upperclassmen
3 No pattern

10. These field study experiences are offered (Check all applicable)

4 Fall term
Winter term
3 Spring term
4 Summer term
(REMARKS)
16 All terms
8 Fall, winter, and spring
7 Other combinations of terms

11. The ordinary duration of a field study experience is

10 Less than one term
23 One term
7 More than one term

12. The field study experience is a

13 Full-time commitment
21 Part-time commitment (Student may be taking other courses at the same time)
(REMARKS)
8 Both possibilities

15. Pre-field/study experiences which prepare a student specifically for the field study include:

21 Orientation seminar(s)
19 Faculty interview(s)
} 12 responses included both items.
Other (SPECIFY)
9 Other courses
4 Class discussions
5 Handouts and readings
2 Visits to sites

16. Post-field/study experiences or follow-up programs include:

11	Seminar(s)
14	Conferences
11	Group discussions
	Other (SPECIFY)
6	Papers, reports, logs
4	Classes (with or without presentations)
2	Evaluations

17. These field study experiences are usually

5	Student generated
20	Faculty generated
	(REMARKS)
9	Both possibilities

18. Proposed field studies are approved by:

#1	8	Individual faculty member
#2	2	Department chairman
#3	1	Committee
#4	7	Field study coordinator
		Other (SPECIFY)
	7	Items #1 and #2
	6	Items #1 and #4
	5	Other combinations

20. A student enrolled in a field study is evaluated by: (Check all applicable)

				Combinations
#1	22	Faculty member	7	#1 and #2
#2	1	Agency or outside	2	#1 and #3
		personnel	1	#1, #2, and #3
#3		Fellow students	5	#1, #2, and #4
#4	1	Self	2	#1, #2, #3, and #4
		(REMARKS)	5	Other combinations

24. Students seem satisfied with the grading practice?

38	Yes
	No
	(REMARKS)
1	Don't know
2	New course

26. Funds are available to students for the field study?

6	Yes
26	No
7	No extra expense involved for the student

29. Faculty attitudes toward field study are

35	Favorable
	Unfavorable

31. Placements for field study experiences are:

#1	1	On campus
#2		Off-campus educational institutions
#3	23	Other off-campus sites
		BRIEFLY DESCRIBE EXPERIENCES
	3	Items #1 and #3
	8	Items #2 and #3
	2	Items #1, #2, and #3

34. Outside agencies or placements rely too much on service? (Would they find it inconvenient to function without the student?)

	Yes
29	No

38. A decrease is found in the following areas: (Check all applicable)

1	Faculty
4	Equipment
	Program direction
	Other (SPECIFY)

Decrease refers to cost.

39. Students may participate in more than one field study experience?

35	Yes
5	No