PCOM Psychology Dissertations   Student Dissertations, Theses and Papers

2009

Investigation of the Attitudes of Doctor of Psychology Students in an American Psychological Association Accredited Doctoral Program

McKenzie L. Walker
Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, library@pcom.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.pcom.edu/psychology_dissertations

Part of the Clinical Psychology Commons

Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine

Department of Psychology

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ATTITUDES OF DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

STUDENTS IN AN AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ACCREDITED DOCTORAL PROGRAM

By McKenzie L. Walker

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of

Doctor of Psychology

October 2009

PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dissertation Approval

This is to certify that the thesis presented to us by _McKenzie C. Walker_

on the _2nd_ day of _June_____, 20_09_, in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of Psychology, has been examined and is

acceptable in both scholarship and literary quality.

Committee Members' Signatures:

Robert A. DiTomasso, Ph.D., ABPP, Chairperson

Robert Cuzzolino, Ed.D.

Matthew Schure, Ph.D.

Robert A. DiTomasso, Ph.D., ABPP, Chair, Department of Psychology

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my committee, Dr. Robert DiTomasso, Dr. Robert Cuzzolino, and Dr.

Matthew Schure for their dedication and commitment to this project. A special thanks to

Dr. Robert DiTomasso for his ongoing support and patience and a special thanks to Dr.

Virginia Salzer for her self-less commitment to her students, I could not have fulfilled

this obligation without you both.

I dedicate the success of this journey to my family and my friends who provided support,

encouragement, and a shoulder when I needed it. Thank you to mom, dad, John, Josh and

my "ber-ber." Thank you also to my girls. You have always kept me focused and had

faith in me. I "heart" you. "Work Hard, Play Hard."

I would also like to remember my late grandmother, Kathryn F. Walker, whose life was

an example of determination and adversity.

Abstract

Student and faculty/administration perceptions of a quality doctoral psychology

program may vary. There is minimal research on the perceived quality of doctoral

programs and how this is measured, based on student perceptions. Doctoral programs

require great investments of time and money. This study focuses specifically on a

program self-assessment for the 2008-2009 academic year of the Philadelphia College of

Osteopathic Medicine Doctor of Psychology program, self-study survey with the doctoral

students. The study was conducted using archival data from 108 Doctor of Psychology

students identified as being currently enrolled in the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic

Medicine, Doctor of Psychology program. A multiple regression was performed using the

independent variables of student perceptions of faculty as role models, availability of

faculty, promptness of faculty in returning phone calls and returning papers and

assignments, approachability of the faculty, program administration investment in

resolving student concerns, approachability of the program administration, and the extent

to which the program administration is open to feedback; this also involved students'

perceptions of opportunities for involvement with faculty in scholarly activities, male

student versus female student perceptions of faculty as mentors, and opportunities for

meaningful interactions with peers as predictors against the dependent variables of

overall quality rankings of "poor, fair, good, very good, and excellent." Analysis of

Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the degree of differences between the overall

quality of the program in preparing the student ultimately to practice as a doctoral level

clinical psychologist and degree of differences between the overall quality of the program

in preparing the student in the cognitive-behavioral empirically supported approach to

clinical psychology; this involved the factors of program faculty as role models, faculty

availability, faculty promptness in returning phone calls, papers, and e-mails, as well as

respect and courteousness toward students, the investment of the program administration

in resolving student concerns, approachability of program administration, extent to which

the program administration is open to feedback, perceived opportunity for involvement

with faculty in scholarly activities, gender differences in overall quality of faculty as

mentors, and opportunities for meaningful interactions with peers. A probability level of

.01 was used for statistical significance of the findings with the Pearson Correlation and

Coefficient of Determination. A multiple analysis of the variance (MANOVA) was

completed, using the variance of students who are years in the program beyond 5 years

versus those students who are maintaining academic pace to graduate in 5 years as the

independent variables and the overall rating of preparation to practice as a doctoral level

clinical psychologist and for preparation in a cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported

approach to clinical psychology as dependent variables. Results find significant

correlations between factors related to student perceptions of program faculty, student

perceptions of program administration, student perceptions of the quality of mentoring

they receive from program faculty, and overall quality rating of the quality of their

interactions with their peers; it also includes preparing students to practice as doctoral

level clinical psychologists as well as overall quality ratings in preparing students to

utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches. No significance was

found regarding gender differences and overall rating of quality based on the quality of

mentoring perceived by the students or based on the year of enrollment in the program. The results of the current study are of great importance to the ongoing support and advocacy of students who enroll in costly and time consuming educational programs and for programs that are dedicated to ensuring both the educational integrity and positive experience of their students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Student and faculty/administration perceptions of a quality doctoral

psychology program may vary. There is minimal research on the perceived quality of

doctoral programs and how this is measured, based on student perceptions. Doctoral

programs require great investments of time and money. Most students adequately

anticipate the financial reward associated with the financial overhead to obtain their

degrees in higher education (Menon, 2008). In addition to obtaining a degree, the

process of the academic experience and the value of the experience as seen by the

student are also important contributing factors to the overall appreciation for the

commitment and willingness to spend their time and money. There is neither enough

understanding of the perceptions of student wants and needs, nor is there sufficient

information about what it is that constitutes a quality doctoral program to increase

student satisfaction. There are multiple factors such as race, religion, gender, location,

and personal ability that may impact how a student determines whether or not to

pursue a degree (Menon, 2008). Despite these various personal variables, students

choose to attend programs for higher education.

The cost to attend a college or university has been steadily increasing. During

the past 10 years, with inflation considered, the amount of tax credits and deductions,

federal grants, and loans subsidized by the government has increased 151%. Based on

data presented by Michael Carter (2005), the national average of tuition and student

fees for in state residents at public universities is $4,694 per year and private

institutions average approximately $20,000 per year. Comparatively, junior colleges and two-year college programs average $2,076 per year. Altogether, 94 billion dollars had been given to students in 2006 to fund their educations (Davidson, 2007). Tuition at public universities went up by 35%, again after adjustments for inflation, between 2001 and 2006. This is reportedly the largest increase on record for a five year measurement (Block, 2007). Davidson (2007) also points out, that despite legislation increasing assistance to students, there has been no pressure until recently to monitor tuitions charged at these institutions. However, amendments to the Higher Education Opportunity Act have identified the need to monitor tuition costs and have given heed to the institutions that in July of 2011, all costs associated with annual attendance at institutions of higher learning will be available on a national database for consumer access. The legislation is packaging such action as the "College Affordability and Transparency List." This will then be utilized to underscore institutions that fall within the top 5 percent of all institutions nationally within the following categories: (a) overall highest tuition rate, (b) highest net price, (c) highest tuition increase over a three year period, and (d) highest net increase over a three year period. Additionally, those institutions falling within the lowest 10 percent of overall tuition and net cost will also be published. This will assist students because they will be able to benefit from objective information, thus, allowing them to make informed decisions as consumers of higher education, while holding colleges and universities to a higher standard both of academic quality and of financial responsibility to potential and current students (Higher Educational Opportunity Act, 2008).

As previously mentioned, there is a great deal of time and financial commitment on the part of students who decide to enter into a career as graduate students. An additional concern regarding student attitudes and opinions toward a quality graduate degree experience includes the impact that such personal and program characteristics have on the decision to withdraw from a graduate degree program (Cooke, Sims, & Peyrefitte, 1995). The reason for student withdrawal from a graduate program is an important consideration both for prospective graduate students as well as for administrations concerned with student attrition rates.

Purpose of the Study

This paper will focus specifically on the program self-assessment and quality enhancement component of the Commission on Accreditation (CoA) standards. In compliance with the re-accreditation process for the 2008-2009 academic year, the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Doctor of Psychology program, completed a self-study survey with the doctoral students. The results of this student survey will be used to analyze the areas of strength and the areas of weakness within the program, based on the perceptions of the doctoral students currently enrolled in the doctoral program. Relationships between student attitudes around strengths and weaknesses of the program will also be analyzed in order to find a greater understanding of the factors associated with student attrition rates.

Ellis (2001) states, "the best suggestions that can be made on enhancing doctoral programs come from doctoral students themselves (pg. 42)." The purpose of this study is to evaluate student opinions and perceptions of the Doctor of Psychology

Program at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine. In preparation for re-accreditation of the American Psychological Association (APA), the psychology department surveyed the doctoral students to evaluate student opinions and perceptions of the program. This data set provides invaluable information about students' perceptions of their academic experience. The minimal information available in the literature around this topic points to the clear necessity of such research.

Statistical analysis of student perceptions will give a voice to the needs of the doctoral student body and their sense of preparedness and acquisition of knowledge as they invest their time and finances into the experience. Programs invested in their students in order to provide them with the best all around education to prepare for careers in the field as a psychologist will also benefit from this research.

Overview of the Literature Review

The literature on this subject is minimal and indicates a clear need for further investigation. This review will focus on the identified areas of program mission, of faculty, of departmental procedures, of administration, of peers, of program resources, of competencies in expected skills, of experiences in the professional field, and of experiences of diversity.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Accreditation

One clear measurement of a psychology programs commitment to quality

education and to serving the student body as future professionals in the field of

psychology is the accreditation process through the American Psychological

Association The accreditation and re-accreditation process is tedious and painstaking.

It requires great commitment of the administration, faculty, and student body.

However, the reward for such an endeavor is great, allowing students to be even more

competitive in the workforce. The seriousness of APA accreditation in the field of

psychology is highlighted by APA itself because the organization has created an

authoritative body, The Commission on Accreditation (CoA).

The APA (2008) Commission on Accreditation (CoA) is a sub-committee that

focuses on the quality of programming aimed at doctoral graduate programs,

internships, and postdoctoral residencies. The purpose of the CoA is to oversee the

accreditation process, holding academics accountable for meeting and consistently

maintaining the standards for APA accreditation. For the purpose of this discussion

the focus will remain on doctoral graduate programs. One requirement of the

accreditation process is an in-depth review and self-reflection of the academic

program and curriculum including student competencies. This falls under the domain

of "program self-assessment and quality enhancement (pg. 16)" in the CoA handbook

(APA, 2008). The CoA evaluates programs on eligibility; program philosophy,

objectives, and curriculum plan; program resources; cultural and individual

differences and diversity; student-faculty relations; program self-assessment and

quality enhancement; public disclosure, and relationship with accrediting body. Each

of these areas will be discussed in greater detail as this document progresses.

First, the eligibility domain is an umbrella evaluation of the preparedness of

the academic institution to be eligible to pursue accreditation. Core eligibility

requirements include: the affiliation of the specific program as recognized by the

larger institution with which it resides, the mission of the program integrating the

greater mission of the educational institution as a whole, minimum educational

obligations from the program, respect for diversity and culture, and policies available

and clear for students and faculty (APA, 2008). Meeting such requirements helps both

CoA and the institution from proceeding if these expectations are not currently met. If

an institution meets such requirements, the CoA will move on to focus in greater

depth with the programs qualifications for accreditation.

Program philosophy, objectives, and curriculum plan evaluate the program's

philosophy on the education of psychology and the training model adopted by the

institution as it represents psychology as a science. This area of assessment also

emphasizes the need to use competency-based evaluations of the students and the

curriculum as it prepares future graduate students to become members of the

professional field. Program resources hold the program accountable for providing the

appropriate level of leadership, faculty with experience, programs and up-to-date

technical and research support, and outside resources available for contact if the

program is unable to fulfill student needs readily (APA, 2008). Again, the importance

of such expectations demonstrates to the CoA that the academic institution is

providing the student with the most current access to technological, academic, and

real-world experiences worthy of exceptional recognition from APA. This also shows

future employees that the "new professional" had been exposed to adequate training

and is prepared to begin a career as a doctoral level employee. Additionally, the

expectation that the academic program be responsible to find resources available to

students if the program itself cannot provide them also shows ownership and

accountability of the academic program to the success and experience of the student

who is studying at that particular institution.

     The CoA's expectation of cultural and individual differences and diversity

requires that the academic program make it a priority to integrate and discuss actively

the importance and the impact of diversity and cultural differences in the field of

psychology; this expectation concerning difference and diversity also extends to its

application to the individual student and student body as a whole. Additionally, the

area of student-faculty relations addresses the interactional expectations between

faculty and the student body. The CoA has outlined specific expectations for doctoral

graduate programs that highlight the need for faculty to recognize their power

differential and approach students with a level of respect and professionalism that

shows the value of the student. This domain also provides guidelines about the

interaction between students and faculty in regard to upholding policy and

professional endeavors engaged in by faculty and students together (APA, 2008).

Again, this expectation highlights the need to recognize the power differential

between professor and student, requiring a level of ownership and professional

responsibility on the faculty and administration.

The CoA also expects programs to complete regular program self-assessments and quality enhancement. This requires that the administration and faculty involved in the program itself evaluate their practices and student progress to assure that they are doing all they can to prepare students in the best possible way. The goal is to give insight into the programs and allow greater understanding of the program's own operations as an educational body, again holding the institution responsible to monitor itself and to adjust, as needed. The area of public disclosures requires that programs provide proper and up-to-date representation of program status and mission/objectives to outside bodies that examine the program. It holds the representation of the program to be in accord with the actual performance and goals of the program. This is particularly important to students who are looking for a "goodness of fit" in a program, prior to making both the monetary and time commitment to a specific program; it also represents the success level of the academic program adequately.

Finally, the relationship with the accrediting body provides the expectation that the academic program follows the expectations and guidelines set by the CoA throughout the accreditation process and throughout the actual accreditation status. This is important because it ensures the integrity of the program as an accredited body and holds the program to a continuous standard (APA, 2008).

After the institution has met the accreditation qualifications, the only way in which the acknowledgement of student opinion and perception of the program may be obtained is through the program self-assessment and program enhancement. There is, however, no requirement that students provide feedback as part of meeting this

requirement, only that "student progress" be measured. Therefore, the current study

will focus on perceptions of the student body as they impact the student rating of

overall program quality rating. Perceptions of the student body will be evaluated,

based on the constructs of demographic data, program mission, faculty, policies and

procedures, program administration, scholarly activity, peers, resources,

competencies, training, and experiences of diversity.

Institutional and Program Climate

An important consideration for rating the academic setting is the climate or

atmosphere of the institution. Gaining perspective on the overall environmental

influences helps to highlight the overlap and interactive nature of the student's

experience of graduate school. Reid and Radhakrishnan (2003) identified three

different climates operative within academic programs: the general climate, the racial

climate, and the academic climate. It is important to review this theory of academic

programs here in order to gain greater perspective because it highlights the overlap

and interactive nature of the student's experience of graduate school. The

environment of the academic program, or "general climate", as stated by Reid and

Radhakrishnan (2003), is an important component to student perceptions of a quality

educational experience. Students are immersed both in the overt and in the covert

expectations and values of their academic programs. Student judgments are made

based on their experiences as they move through the program (Reid &

Radhakrishnan, 2003). If the climate of the program is not supportive or otherwise

serves to "alienate" the student, rather than embracing the student, and making him or

her feel as though he or she is an important member of the program, the student is more likely to withdraw from the institution (Cooke, et. al., 1995).

The "racial climate" of the school involves the experiences of racial minority students on their academic campus. An important component of this is the way in which the academic program shows support for issues of diversity. The student's individual experiences of racism also play a role in the racial climate (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). The racial climate is important in other areas such as diversity on campus, gender, and administration and procedural decisions determined by the academic program.

The "academic climate" consists of the perceptions of students based on experiences with their faculty, peers, and academic mentoring. The way that instructors treat students impact student perceptions of their educational experience. Engaging in mentoring with faculty is also important for student perception of the academic climate. Being seen by classmates as a staid academic peer also impacts the student perception of academic climate (Reid & Radhakrishnan, 2003). According to Cooke, et al. (1995), the academic climate is an important component for student retention, specifically around the areas of school satisfaction, including having the expectations for their graduate experiences met.

<div align="center">Student Perceptions</div>

Demographics

Gender, year of study, age and socioeconomic status are identified in the literature as important components to student perceptions of their graduate program

experiences. There are differences between the ways in which males and females

perceive their academic environments and differences between ways in which African

American, Asian American, Latino, and White students experience graduate school.

Gender also appears to have an impact on the overall experiences students

have in their academic programs; men feel more comfortable and perceive programs

in a more positive way than their female counterparts (Ellis, 2001). The professors'

gender also impacts the perceptions of male and female students and their opinions

about their academic programs. Basow & Silberg (1987) highlighted ways in which

students' perceptions of professors often correlate with stereotypical gender role

expectations. Overall, female professors get lower ratings by students on their

interaction with students. One hypothesis introduced by Basow & Silberg (1987) is

that the role of professor has been a traditionally male occupation and female

professors do not fit this conventional mold. Another hypothesis is that students'

perceptions are correct and that female professors are less available to their students

than male professors (Basow & Silberg, 1987).

Overall, African-American males and females felt that greater attention should

be paid to obtaining various student views particularly about culturally sensitive

topics, although African-American females were more likely to pursue this in a

classroom with their professors than were African-American males. African-

American females, more than white females, also tended to report a greater sense of

being outside of the academic community. White females reported a greater interest

in having a sense of belonging among peers and faculty, but did not report a sense of

being outside the academic community. White females reported a sense of loss of

academic possibilities with faculty because of their female status. In comparison with white females, African-American females, African-American males, and white males reported greater satisfaction with advisors and faculty in their academic programs. Both African-American males and white males have fewer concerns about the faculty and the classes than do African-American females and white females (Ellis, 2001).

In a study done by Bishop-Clark and Lynch (1998) evaluated students' perceptions of older students and younger students; older students were 25 years of age or older and younger students were under the age of 25; the study found that 93% of the students surveyed did not feel that professors showed greater favor either to younger or to older students. They found that 48% of those students 25 and older had a tendency to view professors as friends, versus 66% of those students 24 years of age and younger who also thought older students tended to treat professors as their friends.

Freshmen were more likely than seniors to agree that business agreements with students were ethical. Partnerships, such as having a student act as a babysitter, work in a business partnership, or have a student as a client were seen as "neutral" by students overall. Group interactions between instructor and student were viewed as being more ethically appropriate by students (Ei & Bowen, 2002).

When comparing male students with female students, the experiences of men in their academic programs were more positive. Men reported feeling comfortable engaging in classroom discussions and reported minimal confrontations with professors. They also experienced more educational challenges in discussions with professors and with other peers (Ellis, 2001).

Overall, women, versus men, tend to be much more likely to perceive situations and circumstances as unethical (Ei & Bowen, 2002; Bowman & Hatley, 1995). More specifically, women view such instances as a student borrowing money from a professor or engaging in small gestures for a professor to be inappropriate (Ei & Bowen, 2002; Bowman & Hatley, 1995). Women also tend to view professors' social activities on a one-on-one basis with students such as, meeting for coffee or lunch to be ethically inappropriate, whereas men perceived this as "neutral" more frequently (Ei & Bowen, 2002). Additionally, women identified other social behaviors such as professors talking about students or about faculty to other students or faculty, identifying students as "friends" or citing professors drinking alcohol to the point of intoxication with students as unethical (Bowman & Hatley, 1995; Ei & Bowen, 2002).

Bowman and Hatley (1995) pointed out the perceived lack of female mentors and role-models available to female students. The ethical perceptions of females about what is and what is not appropriate behavior seems to be decreasing the likelihood of these positive female relationships occurring, because of this female sensitivity to unethical relationships. The relationships being sought by female students cross into the shades of gray in ethics and make it even less likely that mentorships will form.

Program Mission

A noticeable lack of information in the research is that of student perceptions of the missions of academic programs. A review of the literature and subsequent lack

of information available supported the need for continued research in this area. An

important component of the Program Mission in the attitudes and overall satisfaction

of the student graduate school experience had been reviewed by Cooke et al. (1995).

They report that students, who feel their expectations for the experience, including the

level of involvement with the program and career and preparation for future career,

are met adequately, are more likely to stay enrolled and successfully complete the

graduate program. With this in mind,, the program mission, as provided to potential

graduate students who are seeking a program which is a good fit for their academic

and career goals, identifies and describes the values, and to a degree, the commitment

of the program and program faculty. If the mission and the reality are not correlated,

the student is more likely to terminate that program. A review of the mission

statement for the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Graduate Psychology

Program states:

"The mission of the Department of Psychology at PCOM is to prepare highly

skilled, compassionate psychologists and master's level psychological specialists to

provide empirically based, active, focused, and collaborative doctoral level

assessments and treatments with sensitivity to cultural and ethnic diversity and the

underserved. Grounded in the cognitive behavioral tradition, the graduate programs in

psychology train practitioner-scholars to offer assessment, therapeutic interventions,

consultation, and follow-up services, and to engage in scholarly activities in the field

of clinical psychology (Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine, pg 6, 2007)."

It would therefore be important to identify the levels of satisfaction that students in

this program have with their expectations for their academic experience, as was presented according to the program mission and the program follow through.

There is a great deal of individual interpretation that goes into understanding and internalizing the meaning of a university's mission statement; this, therefore, presents challenges and potential discrepancies between the individual expectations and program integrity. Such individual perceptions can be vast and go beyond the scope of the program to accommodate all of an individual student's expectations. Effort are needed on the part of the program administration and by the individual student to be a good consumer and make informed decisions about his or her program of study, and the institution takes responsibility to be direct and informative and to challenge students who are potential candidates for their program around their individual goals and to determine how the program mission will help each student to accomplish such goals. Although such dialogue may present some challenges, it is essential to ensuring a good fit between student and program.

Faculty

Faculties in academia are the direct link to the learning experience. The relationships that students have with their professors have an impact on overall program satisfaction, on the academic achievement of the student, and on the rates of retention that programs hold. Programs that place a great deal of emphasis on publication and faculty productivity for increased pay, promotions, or on receiving tenure seem to create less motivation for faculty to focus on the additional roles of instructor and advisor (Guiffrida, 2005; Sandler & Russell, 2005). In one study (Ellis,

2001), students' perceptions of positive advising and mentoring led to greater reported satisfaction in their doctoral work.

Guiffrida (2005) identified four key characteristics that make a professor "student-centered." These include acting as mentors (contacts, advice, and leading by example), as academic coaches (tutoring, encouragement), as advocates for students (pleading case and defending them to others), and as counselors (listening to academic and personal problems, supporting them, advice); these characteristics will help faculty to increase student perceptions of their investment in them.

Students seek advisors who show concern for the student's future careers and can listen and provide advice and guidance about the complete experience, both academic and personal, that the student is coping with throughout his or her degree. Professors who open up their personal cache of contacts and share their own experiences of getting into the profession, as well as of graduate school experiences are perceived more positively by their students. Regularly scheduled meetings with advisors and the professor's initiating conversations about student concerns enhance the advising experience for students (Guiffrida, 2005). In addition, a review of the literature shows that students are more responsive to those professors that they perceive as being invested in their students' welfare. Professors who are perceived as student-focused or student-centered by their students provide advising and guidance beyond what is expected and will, in turn, get more out of their students (Guiffrida, 2005).

According to Ellis (2001) complete immersion into the doctoral program is key to students' perceptions of how satisfied they are with their doctoral studies. This

immersion played a great part to the mentoring and advisement that the student

received. Even if there is advising and mentoring relationships preset, the quality of

these relationships is the key. The chemistry between the advisor and the student were

seen by students as important. Ellis (2001) identified four reasons why student-

advisor relationships fail: personality, different research interests, inability to

communicate adequately because of cultural differences, and advisors who appeared

unsupportive through racist or sexist behaviors, which hinder the student's progress

toward graduation.

Ellis's study (2001) revealed that doctoral students who perceived their

advisors to be of a higher quality believed these advisors to be more able to meet

program expectations in a timely manner. They also felt better prepared to take

comprehensive examinations than students who either did not acknowledge their

advisors, or sought alternate mentors outside of their school program. These well

mentored students also perceived that they were more heavily invested in research

and had a greater opportunity to engage in research projects. They also perceived a

greater opportunity to teach and, through presenting, to get actively involved in

conventions and conferences. Students with more positive mentoring opportunities

were authoring with faculty more often and also became more actively involved in

their doctoral program's social activities.

Those professors more willing to move class discussions beyond the

information found within the textbook and engaging students in spontaneous

discussions that enhanced evaluation of different ideas and thoughts were endorsed

more positively by students. Actively seeking involvement from the students to

participate in such discussions was also endorsed positively by the students (Ellis, 2001).

Student-centered approaches to a teacher highlight many of the shades of gray discussed earlier around the line between student perceived quality relationships with professors and ethical concerns that professional boundaries are maintained (Bowman & Hatley, 1995). The need to understand and overcome the obstacles to maintaining professional boundaries while mentoring and advising students effectively is necessary in light of the evidence that mentoring and advising is seen by students as one of the weakest, yet most important components of graduate student's academic experiences (Ellis, 2001).

Maintaining a professional boundary between adequately meeting the students' needs both as a mentor and advisor becomes an important point that has remained controversial in the literature. The driving force behind this controversy is the increasing research pointing to the benefit of a more personal relationship between students and advisor and the incidences of ethically inappropriate dual relationships, particularly sexual, occurring between faculty and student (Ei & Bowen, 2002; Bowman & Hatley, 1995). Several psychological entities such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics, Ethics Committee of the American Counseling Association (ACA), and the APA have established ethical guidelines for faculty and administration to follow when setting expectations for department faculty (American Association of University Professors, 2001; American Counseling Association, 2005; APA,).

The concern regarding dual relationships becomes more apparent when viewed from the perspective of the student. There is a clear imbalance in authority and power between a student and a professor or administrator. At the doctoral level, defying this power and authority could be quite costly both academically and financially. It is the responsibility of the administration to ensure that the faculty members representing the program are mindful of their roles as instructors and mentors and not cross the boundary into unethical behavior (Ei & Bowen, 2002). Policy and procedure that is clear and puts the weight of the responsibility on faculty may be needed.

The actions and behaviors of faculty within a classroom setting are important to students' quality rating, as well. Students are more likely than program faculty to find it unethical for professors to discuss prejudiced comments when they are meeting for student reviews with other faculty members, particularly if the professor had not discussed the behavior with the student first (Bowman & Hatley, 1995). As Bowman & Hatley (1995) point out, this circumstance in itself presents a conundrum for the student. The essence of a graduate program in psychology requires that students open themselves up and be vulnerable by exploring their own worldly views and identities but at the same time, if the students divulges a held belief or view that is considered unsuitable he or she may get into a bind with the department.

Policies and Procedures

Policies and procedures are an integral part of the educational experience. Policy guides the actions of faculty and students and procedures provide the method

used to achieve policy fulfillment. Because students are also expected to follow and abide by such policies and procedures it seems fair to expect that students have input about how these policies should be written and how the procedures are executed. There is evidence that student involvement in creating policy and procedure can have a positive impact on student morale as well as student perceptions of a quality educational experience (Ei & Bowen, 2002; Bowman & Hatley, 1995). This is accomplished by understanding what students want and expect from faculty around mentoring relationships, friendships, and what is socially appropriate (Bowman & Hatley, 1995).

One of the most highly researched areas of policies and procedures is focused on instructor-student relationships (Ei & Bowen, 2002; Bowman & Hatley, 1995). Ei and Bowen (2002) point out the need to evaluate the role of student autonomy in good decision making regarding instructor-student relationships, and that faculty guide these boundaries. The general consensus from Ei and Bowen (2002) is that "these principles support an approach to policy development in which students should be given a voice in decisions that affect them (pg. 179)." Students should be encouraged to grow and expand their own personal values in a setting where they are being educated in their career choice.

In a study conducted by Ei and Bowen (2002), 480 undergraduate students were asked to give their opinions about instructor-student relationships along five types of potential relationships. Although the students' opinions varied across relationship styles and students' perceptions of appropriateness, these led to important implications in creating program policy. Student opinion and perceptions are an

important component in creating policy, particularly because the students are going to be following and abiding by such policies during their educational experiences. Further, beyond undergraduate education, during graduate programs, students are not only studying to become colleagues in their fields of study, but are being trained to become policy makers and equals with their instructors. It is an important opportunity to encourage students' participation in creating their own educational experiences.

As Ei and Bowen (2002) point out, general relationship policies may be presumptive and policies which address a variety of settings and circumstances for instructor-student relationships may be more appropriate for student perceptions of a quality program and a quality educational experience. Alternately, Ei and Bowen (2002) also found that students responded in a positive way to ideas about having a general relational policy in place. They propose that in order to maintain an environment for personal student growth, faculty be educated and held to standards of good ethics and support the students in making good relational decisions. Ei and Bowen, as well as Richardson (1999), also recommend that additional policy be created by administration that requires faculty to continue professional development around establishing appropriate boundaries with their students.

Guiffrida (2005) also highlights the need to provide faculty with training that addresses both multicultural issues and boundaries with students. Research shows that student expectations of faculty support vary by culture. One example of this is the increased retention rate of African-American students with faculty who use what is referred to as "other mothering." Guiffrida is quick to point out that the use of styles such as other mothering may be in stark contrast to traditional policies and

procedures for faculty-student relationships. One recommendation from Guiffrida is that multicultural services and student affairs provide additional student support programs and services to increase retention and student perception of quality academic experience. These additional services may provide a more individualized and customized educational experience.

Notably, the involvement of students in creating and identifying policy and procedure cannot be understated; however, respecting the limitations and expectations placed on the program by governing bodies must also be highlighted. Institutions often have their own regulating bodies and must abide by higher ethical and business standards and must, at times, follow policy or procedure which may be in contrast with the wishes of the student body. Such discrepancies require the administration and student body to work closely together in order to overcome such obstacles. Additionally, the collaboration between the administration and students on issues that impact both the institution and the student offer a positive learning opportunity for graduate students, who may seek to obtain a career in administration themselves.

Program Administration

The leaders of academic programs are expected to have quality working relationships with the instructors in their educational program. Instructors are encouraged to have an open relationship with the program administrators. Administrators hold the final responsibility to determine the most appropriate course of action and keep their students well-being in the forefront. Richardson (1999) has highlighted some of the intricacies of the role of "administrator." He described the

role of the Department Chair as requiring problem-solving abilities in technical situations and in "technical situations" and "adaptive situations (pg. 78)."

Richardson (1999) refers to "technical situations" as those situations that have well established ways of dealing with a situation. These solutions may be clearly documented and could have been easily perceived during the creation of standards, expectations, and program discrepancy violations. This makes the solution more clear cut and understandable and makes the problem-solving on the part of the Chair much more obvious and simple.

An "adaptive situation" is defined as an unclear solution with an unclear result. The problem itself may or may not be obvious yet the solution remains complicated and shaded in grey. Richardson (1999) describes adaptive situations as a "true leadership (pg. 78)," because the ambiguity in such tribulations may challenge and tax established ideas and expectations that do not coincide. The educational setting itself is a highly adaptive environment. Having to change expectations and guidelines can be uncomfortable. This falls on the administration and requires that administration is able to help instructors and students become accustomed to the novel outcome (Richardson, 1999).

Administration is correlated with various constructs assessed under program quality. This concept of technical versus adaptive situations filters into program mission, faculty, policy, department procedures, resources, experiences with diversity, and many other areas not discussed in the context of this research. One example of this is the atmosphere of the department.

The program Chair sets the tone for the atmosphere of the department. Faculty members who are clearly invested and interested in their students' research, in their teaching interests, and in their future aspirations in the field are reported to be highly valued by their students (Ellis, 2001). The Chair also sets the tone for program diversity. Because the Chair has a main role in setting policy and procedure he or she also plays a huge role in program diversity. Campus programming that focuses on meeting the individual needs of the student body based on age, race, sex, and ethnicity will most likely help individual students and advance the academic experience (Reid and Radhakrishnan, 2003).

Scholarly Activity

One of the most important and sought-after curriculum vitae boosts in graduate school is securing research projects and publications with faculty. An important finding by Ellis (2001) was that doctoral students came into educational programs expecting greater opportunities to participate in faculty research and publication projects than they actually experienced. When students were invited to participate in faculty projects they often found that their roles were to complete tasks that faculty themselves did not want to do and that students were deemed unproductive to faculty academic goals. Students seeking participation in research opportunities with faculty often found that the projects were not in line with their own areas of interest and did not relate to their dissertation topics. An alternative view that may be held by faculty is that engaging in entry level research tasks is a vital role in gaining the experience and the understanding of scholarly research and professional

authorship, which cannot be accomplished until one has a complete recognition of the labor intensive process that is required for maintaining quality and integrity in his or her professional publications; this shows a stark contrast with the opinions held by students.

In addition to participating in faculty research and publication projects, graduate students also reported instances of discrepancies between student perceptions of deserved credit and faculty perceptions of credit for completed projects. One finding by Sandler and Russell (2005) is that faculty who have already reached the most senior or tenured positions were often more likely to give credit to their students, versus faculty who were still considered "junior" or pursuing tenure. This is a clear issue not only for the doctoral student but also for the administration and those creating policy and procedure. Additional procedures and policies aimed at faculty scholarly activity and the inclusion of doctoral students who are given appropriate credit for their work would help to ensure that professors and faculty who are striving to make tenure also have an investment in including doctoral students in their work.

In addition to a lack of opportunity, there is also the issue regarding the power differential between faculty and students. One issue that arises from this power differential is highlighted by Sandler and Russell (2005), who found that students are much less likely to give themselves credit and are much more likely to give their professors credit for research projects and publications, but professors were much more likely to give themselves credit and less likely to give their students credit. Findings also suggest that graduate students are not likely to report circumstances

such as these discrepancies for fear of garnishing bad will from professors and

administration.

Peers

An important component to completing a doctoral degree is the support and

camaraderie students find in their cohort. Many students who are completing a

doctoral degree have a variety of life and family situations. Ellis (2001) found that

students who are full time, those who are single and students who worked at the

school to obtain assistantship are more likely to become invested in peer

relationships. Additional findings suggested that part-time students, students who are

working professionals in the field, and those students who are married or had young

children were much less likely to spend time with their peer group.

Demographic data such as gender and race also play a part in how students

view their peer group. Ellis (2001) also noted that African-American students often

sought out African-American classmates, particularly at primarily white institutions,

because they reported feeling compelled to support one another. These students also

reported that the sense of support was heightened when there were few African-

American students within the program. In addition, African-American women

reported a greater sense of suspicion towards their white female counterparts. Another

area of concern reported by Ellis (2001) is a lack of concern with building rapport and

working relationships between cohorts or educational peers and faculty members.

Resources

Technology continues to advance. Programs that have access to, and are capable of, keeping up with changing technology provide greater service to their students. The ease and availability of finding literature, particularly with the greater availability of electronic literature and research, save students both time and frustration. There are many additional services provided by graduate programs which students consider when determining the quality of their educational experience; these include: student services, student facilities, availability of program materials including textbooks, the location and safety of the program, and the overall environment of the program setting.

The Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine APA Self-Study Committee (2006) identified 12 student resources deemed important to the quality of study in their graduate program. This committee identified technological resources such as computer facilities, the audiovisual systems available to the department, and the quality of classroom teleconferencing. The committee also identified the library and other institutional services for their students, the allotted space for the psychology department, student perception of the quality of the student lounge, students' perceptions of classroom space, student services, including the cafeteria and the bookstore, and the overall atmosphere of the College, including the academic environment and campus safety, which includes access to secure parking.

Competencies

Arguably, one of the most important components of a doctoral education is the ability of the student to prepare for a career in their fields. The entire educational curriculum is based on producing competent and well-educated students. Competency in the field of psychology requires both "book smarts" and the ability to apply this knowledge in a real-world setting. Continuing professional education and staying current in the field requires an ongoing commitment to education in the field of psychology.

In order to protect the integrity of doctoral psychology programs academic class performance is held at a high-level. Additional abilities such s professionalism and intuition are much more ambiguous and require finesse and real-world experience. The Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine doctoral program in clinical psychology APA Self-Study Committee has broken competency down into several key areas: reflective practice and self-assessment; scientific knowledge and methods; relationships; ethical legal standards and policy; individual-cultural diversity; interdisciplinary systems; assessment, diagnosis, and case conceptualization; intervention; consultation; research and evaluation; supervision-teaching; and management-administration (2006). In addition to these areas of assessment, academic programs also require multi-step comprehensive examinations in order to progress successfully through the program to become a doctoral candidate.

An area of interest that requires more research is the accountability that faculty and administration owe to their students when becoming competent professionals. In one study conducted by Ellis (2001), students who were acting as

teaching assistants reported that the faculty did not adequately prepare them for their roles. Students reported feeling neglected and lacked skill with basic and advanced course requirements that they expected to receive from their faculty. This is one example of how adequate instruction plays an important part in student competency.

Experiences in Diversity

Student perceptions of experiences working with diverse populations include field experiences and didactic training. These perceptions are also shaped by the interactions that students have with diverse faculty. Exposure to diversity and learning the nuances of various groups is enhanced by faculty, who are willing to explore and share their own growth experiences, personal challenges, and triumphs both in the field and in their professional journeys.

Statistics show that African-American doctoral students remain a minority within doctoral programs. This is a matter of concern for a variety of reasons. One is that this lack of African-American graduate students will perpetuate a continued lack of African-American professors which, in turn, will decrease the exposure to diverse populations for graduate students in the future. This is also true for female graduate students of all races (Ellis, 2001).

Exposure to a variety of diverse populations during graduate school prepares doctoral students for successful treatment interaction with these populations as professionals. Lack of diverse peers and of diverse faculty places graduate students at a loss when it comes to learning the intricacies of valuing and identifying individual differences. The Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine APA Self-Study

Committee (2006) utilized the diversity questionnaire originally created by

Ponterotto, Alexander, and Grieger in 1995.

This diversity questionnaire asks students to answer "yes" or "no" if they have

or have not had exposure to various populations during practicum or internship

experiences in the program. In addition to asking about specific populations,, the

questionnaire also asks about attitudes and self-reflection regarding diversity.

Specific situations, areas and populations identified in the questionnaire included

sexuality, sexual identity, age, religion, gender, HIV and AIDS, socioeconomic status

including low, middle, and high status, disability, underserved populations, and

various community settings (Ponterotto et al., 1995).

Overall Quality Rating

Ellis (2001) conducted a study with 11 Black male graduate students, 10

Black female graduate students, 10 White male graduate students, and 11 White

female graduate students who received their doctoral degrees within three years prior

to the study. Currently enrolled graduate students were also polled. Six Black males,

seven Black females, six White males and six White females who were enrolled in

the program were also in the study. These students were polled, in equal numbers,

from humanities and behavioral sciences, natural and physical sciences, engineering,

and the professional schools. All Black male and female and White male and female

graduate students who had at least 15 credits post-master's degree or 75 credits post-

bachelor degree were obtained.

The students were asked a series of questions about mentoring, faculty advising, research experiences and interactions with their peers and faculty, amount of teaching, classroom climate perceptions, assistantships and fellowships received, and academic publishing. The students were encouraged to elaborate on any of the above areas. They were also asked about experiences involving race or gender when these issues were first mentioned by the student

Overall, Ellis (2001) found that campus quality rating varies, based on several areas. Gender and race have a direct impact on students' perceptions of overall quality and satisfaction. Black males who had graduated from their academic programs reported the greatest level of satisfaction. Black females who were still enrolled in their academic programs reported the least satisfaction. Satisfaction ratings also varied based on graduation status. Students who were actively enrolled in their academic programs reported decreased satisfaction ratings and graduated students reported greater satisfaction rates.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH QUESTION AND RELATED HYPOTHESES

Research Question and Hypotheses

Research Question

Which constructs (demographics, faculty, administration, scholarly activity, student body, competencies, or length of time in the program) will be the most influential variables in students' perceptions of the quality and satisfaction with the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Doctor of Psychology program? Overall quality was determined based on rankings of "poor, fair, good, very good, and excellent" in two areas: overall quality of the program in preparing the student to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and the overall quality of the program in the student in cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to clinical psychology.

Statement of the Hypotheses

Based on current research and the implication of the findings in the literature, the following six hypotheses are proposed: 1) The students' perceptions of the program faculty will be the most important factor in the overall quality rating of the doctoral program; 2) The greater the quality ranking of the program administration as perceived by the students, the greater the overall quality of the experience; 3) The greater the perceived opportunity for involvement with faculty in scholarly activities, the greater will be the perceived experience of quality and satisfaction of the student; 4) As female students acknowledge a positive relationship with faculty as mentors, so

will the overall rating of quality also be raised, as opposed to their male counterparts whose overall rating of program quality will not be impacted; 5) As the students' perceptions of opportunities for meaningful interactions with peers, of the quality of the interactions among the students, of the degree of social support exhibited among the students, and of the level of support students receive from fellow students increases, the overall quality rating of the program will increase; 6) There will be statistically significant differences in overall program quality rating between those students who are satisfying academic requirements for graduation versus those students who are not meeting academic requirements for graduation.

Hypothesis 1

The students' perceptions of the program faculty will be the most important factor in the overall quality rating of the doctoral program. Specifically, these include: the degree of expertise, quality of teaching effectiveness, degree of interest, quality of role models, depth of clinical knowledge, availability, promptness in returning phone calls and papers and assignments, approachability, attitudes towards sensitivity about individual and cultural diversity.

Justification of Hypothesis 1

A great majority of doctoral students' coursework occurs in the classroom or in one-to-one or small group activities with faculty. Therefore it is clear that student relationships with faculty would be of the utmost importance to the overall perceived quality of the educational experience of the student. Although policies and

procedures and adherence to the program mission are important to the overall academic climate, the faculty is responsible for implementing and following these policies and procedures which the students experience from day-to-day. Faculty holds an important role in the general climate, racial climate, and academic climate.

Individual faculty interactions with students, both in and out of the classroom, can "make or break" the educational experience. How the faculty carry themselves in the classroom and how they invite students to participate in the educational experience either will hinder or will encourage the student's investment in the program. Faculty ability to adjust to the individual needs of their students yet continue to keep the best interests of the student body as a whole requires great professionalism and skill. Professors and faculty who can integrate student needs with appropriate professional boundaries and also provide a sense to the students that student needs are of primary importance create the most inviting academic environment.

Professors and other faculty who have established rapport with their students and who have trustworthy professional relationships with their students allow students to be open in the classroom and learn about themselves as they become professionals in the field of psychology. Faculty and professors who are unable to handle student missteps effectively or who chastise students in the midst of the educational process may produce the decreased sense of investment in self-change and growth from the student. This becomes particularly important when handling issues of diversity and when challenging students in the classroom.

Hypothesis 2

The greater the quality ranking of the program administration as perceived by the student, the greater the overall quality of the experience. These include: specifically, the factors of the interest of the program administration in hearing student concerns, the interest of the program administration in resolving student concerns, the approachability of the program administration, and the extent to which the program administration is open to feedback.

Justification of Hypothesis 2

The administration holds an important role in the educational experience. It is the responsibility of the administration to provide clear and easy to understand guidelines both for faculty and for students. Through encouragement and discouragement, administration shapes and molds the culture and environment of the educational program setting, including what occurs in the racial climate, the academic climate and the general climate of the program. Program shaping becomes extremely important particularly around issues of gender or race and around diversity as a whole. Although the Department Chair plays an important role as the interim between program operations and overall institution administration, overall administrative support is a necessary component to be sure that student needs and the best interest of the student is in the forefront.

It is up to the administration to ensure that faculty and all institutional staff remains cognizant of their roles to serve students in the students' best interest. This includes encouraging staff and faculty to meet student needs at the individual level

yet continue to serve the greatest good of the academic community. It also includes encouraging and supporting faculty and staff to remain student-centered and supportive of faculty and staff's role in implementing program mission, policies, and procedure on a day-to-day basis as representatives of the institution and the administration that governs it.

The role of administration is important because administration that remains involved with students and remains hands-on with students will understand the obstacles students face in completion of their doctoral degree. Administrators who can recognize some of these obstacles and problem-solve ways to decrease them while increasing the resilience of the students are much more likely to be able to ensure that program representatives remain student-focused and that faculty provide the most appropriate faculty student relationships previously highlighted. Administration that remain in touch with and are involved with their students will also be more likely to create policies and procedures that reflect the needs of the students and include opinions of students themselves when creating such policies and procedures.

The function of the administrating body is also important in maintaining current policies and procedures, while also being able to problem solve and elucidate ambiguous situations as they arise. This requires an ability to remain open-minded and divergent in thought while respecting current policy and procedure. If the outcome requires adjustment to policy and procedure it is important that the administration be able to support students and faculty through this transition.

Hypothesis 3

The greater the perceived opportunity for involvement with faculty in scholarly activities, the greater is the perceived experience of quality and satisfaction of the student.

Justification of Hypothesis 3

As previously discussed under "academic climate", student perceptions are heavily influenced, based on their sense of positive interaction with their faculty. Studies addressing student perceptions of faculty have found that student perceptions of involvement in projects and publications with faculty have not been in line with their expectations. Particular issues that have come up are due to the inability of students to publish with faculty and students' sense that faculty have alternate priorities above the students; an additional factor is students' perception of exacerbated credit for the professor when the work was actually being completed by the student. Students who felt they had a quality mentoring and working relationship with professors were less likely to perceive their faculty negatively. Students who felt professors put students first rather than their own professional endeavors or their needs to fulfill institutional employment requirements were more likely to endorse higher quality program ratings.

In addition to the lack of student acknowledgment by professors, students also spoke to their disappointment with their roles in such research and publication projects. Students often cited the fact that their roles in work with professors had no educational basis, but seemed to be work that the professor simply did not want to

complete himself or herself. These concerns often go unacknowledged by faculty and administration and become a source of frustration for the student; however, students may fear negative repercussions from the faculty or administration for pointing out such student concerns.

Hypothesis 4

If female students acknowledge a positive relationship with faculty as mentors, the overall rating of quality will also be raised; this is not necessarily the case with their male counterparts' relationships with faculty whose overall rating of program quality will not be impacted.

Justification of Hypothesis 4

Minority students, including females, rank their experiences in doctoral education differently from their male counterparts. This is particularly true for African-American students and female students. Overall, female students tend to be more skeptical in the classroom and in interactions with their professors; overall, male students tend to view these interactions as more neutral. Both African-American men and women tend to seek out same race students as a form of cohesion and self-affirmation, particularly in primarily white institutions.

Female students also discussed a perpetuated cycle involving the lack of female mentors in their degree programs; this makes it less likely for female students to become integrated into the academic program. This lack of integration into the academic program leads to a sense of being an "outsider" within the academic

community. This, in turn, makes it less likely for female students to find mentors because of their sense of disconnection and this also decrease the likelihood that these women will themselves become mentors to other female students.

Hypothesis 5

As the students' perceptions of opportunities for meaningful interactions with peers, as the quality of the interactions among the students, as the degree of social support exhibited among the students, and as the level of support students receive from fellow students increases, the overall quality rating of the program will increase.

Justification of Hypothesis 5

Many students who are completing a doctoral degree have a variety of life and family situations. An important component to completing a doctoral degree is the support and camaraderie that students find in their cohort, with whom they spend a great deal of time. This time spent between students and their cohort often rivals the time spent with their families and friends. The level of support and friendship found between classmates will ease the burden of the time requirement to complete the program and necessary time spent in class or on campus.

Hypothesis 6

There will be statistically significant differences in overall program quality rating between those students who are satisfying academic requirements for

graduation, versus those students who are not meeting academic requirements for graduation.

Justification of Hypothesis 6

Those students who are anticipating a timely graduation based on their year of enrollment are more likely to be satisfied with overall program quality, as compared with those students who have fallen behind their entry classes. Those students who are not on track to graduate with their enrollment class are hypothesized to report feeling less satisfied with their overall educational experiences than those who have maintained the pace of the program toward graduation.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Diagnostic Procedure

This research study is an analysis of pre-existing data from the Philadelphia

College of Osteopathic Medicine. All students identified as "currently enrolled" in the

Doctor of Psychology Program at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine

during the 2008-2009 academic year were identified as participants of this study. An

announcement and link to the survey was sent by electronic mail to each student on

December 17, 2008 with requests stating that they be completed by January 9, 2009.

The survey was conducted with the assurance that there would be no identifying

information provided to the program. The survey was conducted through the Survey

Monkey engine on the Internet. Exclusion criteria for this survey were those students

identified as not enrolled because they failed out of the program, withdrew from the

program, or graduated from the program.

Inclusion Criteria

All students identified as "currently enrolled" in the doctor of psychology

program at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine during the 2008-

2009 academic year were identified as participants of this study.

Sample

The sample consisted of 108 Doctor of Psychology students identified as

being currently enrolled in the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine,

Doctor of Psychology program. The students had a mean age of 32 years old with

22.2% of respondents being male and 77.8% of respondents being female. Of the

108 students who responded, 7.4% identified themselves as African-

American/Black, 79.6% identified as Caucasian, 2.8% identified as

Hispanic/Latino, and 3.7% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander. Of the remaining

students, 2.8% reported being Multiethnic and 3.7% identified themselves as

"Other."

The students who participated in the survey included those from the

incoming class of 2000 (2.8%), 2001 (3.7%), 2002 (2.8%), 2003 (3.7%), 2004

(10.2%), 2005 (13.9%), 2006 (21.3%), 2007 (22.2%), and 2008 (19.4%). All

students from the Philadelphia campus (80.6%), the Harrisburg campus (17.6%),

and the East Stroudsburg campus (1.9%) were encouraged to participate in the

study, with the percentage of those participants in the study notated in

parenthesis. Eighty-eight percent of students responding identified themselves as

being members of a professional society; 77.7% of respondents were members of

the American Psychological Association; 56% were members of the

Pennsylvania Psychological Association, and 33.33% were member of the

Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapy.

Instruments and Variables

Dependent Variable

2008-2009 PCOM Clinical Psy.D. Student Survey

The survey is in the form of an un-validated self-report, 5-point likert scale in

a correlational and between-subjects design. The survey requested honest opinions

and feedback from the students, with assurance that their identities would be kept

anonymous to faculty and administration. The survey was used to elicit feedback

from students in preparation for the re-accreditation of the American Psychological

Association. The survey collected demographic information including: gender, age,

ethnicity, those subject to Americans with Disabilities Act, Foreign National or

Citizenship status, year of study, program site location, if the student is an author or

co-author of papers at professional meetings or professional/scientific journals, and

membership in professional societies.

The Likert scale ranged from: (a) 1=Poor, (b) 2=Fair, (c) 3=Good, (d) 4=Very

Good, (e) 5=Excellent. Sections A through K of the survey were broken down into

subsections labeled: Demographic Data, Student Professional Activities Since

Enrollment in the Program, Full Time Core Faculty As A Whole, Scholarly Activity,

Student Body, General, Preparation As A Clinical Psychologist, Survey of Obstacles

to Dissertation Completion, Diversity Questionnaire, and Comments. Section A and

Section B elicit demographic information about the student completing the survey

and professional membership and activities during the course of the student's

education. Section C elicits student perceptions of program faculty. This includes 7

questions asking about students' perceptions of the psychology professors and their

attitudes about education, their availability to the students, the faculty as role-models,

and the degree of respect and courtesy they show to students. Student perspectives of

program administration are evaluated with five questions in section D. These

questions range from overall assessment of leadership to the student's opinion about

the openness and approachability of the administration. Section E has two questions

to gauge student perception of faculty-student collaborations and the quality of the faculty as role models for the students.

Section F evaluates student perceptions of their academic peers referred to as student body. There are seven questions assessing attitudes and the value of interaction between students. Additional questions assess collaboration and feelings of support between students. Overall quality ratings of the program with regard to the student feeling prepared to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist, being prepared to utilize the cognitive-behavioral approach, preparation to manage individual and culturally diverse clients, mentoring, and program facilities are assessed in section G with 9 questions total. These questions address program facilities, student services, and overall campus environment.

Section H, labeled preparation as a clinical psychologist, is further broken down into 12 competency areas identified as: reflective practice and self-assessment, scientific knowledge and methods, relationships, ethical legal standards and policy, individual-cultural diversity, interdisciplinary systems, assessment, diagnosis and case conceptualization, intervention, consultation, research and evaluation, supervision-teaching, and management-administration.

These 12 foundational competencies are evaluated based on student perceptions of the Doctor of Psychology program's ability to prepare the student for work as a clinical psychologist. In the current study, student perceptions of their abilities and their opinions and perceptions of their learning experience are sought. Therefore, there is no accounting for or measurement of the skill set that the students actually possess. These 12 competencies are closely linked to the program and the

institution mission statements. The foundational competencies also evaluate student perceptions of their abilities beyond didactic training. They assess interpersonal skills, professionalism, and intuition. Section I is entitled Survey of Obstacles to Dissertation Completion and evaluates the student's rating of whether or not each step was "not an overwhelming obstacle, small obstacle, somewhat of an obstacle, an obstacle, or a very significant obstacle." All potential obstacles such as choosing a topic, availability of the Chair, timeliness of feedback from the Chair, time restraints and obligations both inside and outside of school, motivation level, statistics and access to study participants were assessed.

The next component of the survey is the Diversity Questionnaire by Ponterotto et al. (1995), found in Section J. The instructions request the student to provide feedback on his or her clinical experiences with both individually??? and culturally diverse clients during practicum and internship experiences. Part one of this questionnaire asked for yes/no responses to 33 questions. Part two used a 5-point likert scale with 3 questions asking about overall level of experience with diverse clients, overall level of interest in diverse clients, and overall level of commitment to diverse clients. The final portion of the survey, Section K, asks for comments. There is blank space provided for write-in comments on program strengths, areas in need of improvement, and suggestions. The survey in its entirety is located in the Appendix.

Independent Variables

The independent variables include: demographic information, student professional activities since enrollment in the program, full time core faculty as a

whole, program administration, scholarly activity, student body, and overall

preparation as a clinical psychologist.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

Statistical Analysis

Research Question

A multiple regression was performed using the independent variables of student perceptions of faculty as role models, availability of faculty, promptness of faculty in returning phone calls and returning papers and assignments, approachability of the faculty, program administration investment in resolving student concerns, approachability of the program administration, and the extent to which the program administration is open to feedback, as well as students' perceptions of opportunity for involvement with faculty in scholarly activities, male student versus female student perceptions of faculty as mentors, and opportunities for meaningful interactions with peers as predictors against the dependent variables of overall quality rankings of "poor, fair, good, very good, and excellent."

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine the degree of differences between the overall quality of the program in preparing the student ultimately to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and the degree of differences between the overall quality of the program in preparing the student in the cognitive-behavioral empirically supported approach to clinical psychology with the factors of program faculty as role models, faculty availability, faculty promptness in returning phone calls, papers, and e-mails, as well as respect and courteousness toward students, the investment of the program administration in resolving student concerns, approachability of program administration, extent to which the program administration is open to feedback, perceived opportunity for involvement with

faculty in scholarly activities, gender differences in overall quality of faculty as mentors, and opportunities for meaningful interactions with peers. A probability level of .01 was used for statistical significance of the findings with the Pearson Correlation and Coefficient of Determination.

A multiple analysis of the variance (MANOVA) was completed using the variance of years in the program beyond 5 years versus those students who are maintaining an academic pace to graduate in 5 years as the independent variables; the overall rating of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and for preparation in a cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approach to clinical psychology are used as dependent variables.

Results

Overall findings indicate that greater student perceptions of program faculty in the areas of being a role models, in availability to meet with students, in returning student phone calls, student e-mails, and papers, as well as being courteous and respectful towards students correlated moderately high with overall perceptions of program quality in preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist; findings also indicated overall quality ratings in preparing students to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches. It was also found that student perceptions of program administration's investment in resolving student concerns, student perceptions that administration was able to be approached and was also open to student feedback had a moderately high correlation with preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist as well as overall quality

ratings in preparing students to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches. Student perceptions of the quality of mentoring they receive from program faculty also showed a moderately high correlation with the overall student rating of preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist, as well as overall quality ratings in preparing students to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches. Again, it was found that preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist as well as overall quality ratings in preparing students to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches was also highly correlated with students' overall quality ratings of the quality of their interactions with their peers in the doctoral program.

No significance was found between the quality rating of males and females with overall rating of quality, based on the quality of mentoring perceived by the students. There was also no significance between overall program ratings in preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist as well as overall quality ratings in preparing students to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches, based on the year of enrollment in the program.

The students had a mean age of 32 years old with 22.2% of respondents being male and 77.8% of respondents being female. Of the 108 students who responded, 7.4% identified themselves as African-American/Black, 79.6% identified as Caucasian, 2.8% identified as Hispanic/Latino, and 3.7% identified as Asian/Pacific Islander. Of the remaining students, 2.8% reported being Multiethnic and 3.7% identified themselves as "Other."

The students who participated in the survey included those from the incoming class of 2000 (2.8%), 2001 (3.7%), 2002 (2.8%), 2003 (3.7%), 2004 (10.2%), 2005 (13.9%), 2006 (21.3%), 2007 (22.2%), and 2008 (19.4%). All students from the Philadelphia campus (80.6%), the Harrisburg campus (17.6%), and the East Stroudsburg campus (1.9%) were encouraged to participate in the study, with the percentage of those participants in the study notated in parenthesis. Eighty-eight percent of students responding identified themselves as being a member of a professional society; 77.7% of respondents were members of the American Psychological Association; 56% were members of the Pennsylvania Psychological Association, and 33.33% were member of the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapy.

The overall mean and standard deviation was calculated for each factor. The overall quality rating of core faculty as role models was found to be 4.07 with a standard deviation of 1.02; availability of the core faculty to meet with students was found to have a mean of 3.90 with a standard deviation of 1.01. Faculty returning phone calls to students had a mean of 3.76 and a standard deviation of 1.21 and faculty returning e-mails had a mean of 3.80 and a standard deviation of 1.19. Faculty returning papers had a mean of 3.77 with a standard deviation of 1.10. Faculty being courteous to students had a mean of 4.16 and a standard deviation of .95, and respect for students had a mean of 4.11 with a standard deviation of 1.08.

The quality rating for administration investment in resolving student concerns showed a mean of 3.98 with a standard deviation of 1.07 and approachability of program administration had a mean of 4.03 and a standard deviation of 1.09. Program

administration's openness to student feedback yielded a mean of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 1.18. Student perceptions of the quality of faculty interest in collaborating with students on professional projects had a mean of 3.97 with a standard deviation of 1.03. Student perceptions of the quality of mentoring received by program faculty had a mean of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 1.16. Student rating of the quality of peer relationships had a mean of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 1.02.

The overall quality rating of student perceptions of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist had a mean of 4.16 with a standard deviation of .95; a mean of 4.28 and a standard deviation of .96 were found for student ratings of overall preparation in utilizing cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to treatment.

Student Perception of Program Faculty

This study suggests that student perceptions of program faculty underscore positive perceptions of overall quality ratings of doctoral programs. The relationships that students have with their professors do have an association with overall program satisfaction. The results of this study did indicate moderately high correlations between the students' perceptions of the program faculty and the overall quality ratings of the doctoral program. As shown in table 1A and table 1B, all factors, quality of core faculty as role models, availability of core faculty to meet, returning phone calls, e-mails, and papers, and being courteous towards students, correlated moderately high and showed statistical significance at the .01 level. Specifically, 45%

of the variability in responses to the quality of preparation as a doctoral level clinical psychologist are associated with differences in the perceptions of students around the quality of the core faculty ($r=.67$, $R^2=45\%$). Additionally, 42% of variability in responses to overall quality of preparation as a doctoral level clinical psychologist is attributable to differences in the availability of core faculty to meet with students ($r=.61$, $R^2=37\%$) and this same factor accounted for 32% of the variance on the overall quality rating of preparation in cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches($r=.60$, $R^2=36\%$).

Thirty-seven percent of the variability in responses to the quality of preparation as a doctoral level clinical psychologist ($r=.61$, $R^2=37\%$) and 36% of variability in response to this question accounts for overall ratings on preparation in cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches ($r=.60$, $R^2=36\%$); these were associated with differences in faculty returning phone calls. Similarly, returning e-mails also showed to be accounting for 38% of the variability on the overall rating in preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist ($r=.62$, $R^2=38\%$); it also accounted for 37% of the variability in ratings of preparation in using cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches ($r=.61$, $R^2=37\%$). Student ratings of their perceptions of faculty returning papers in a timely manner accounted for 42% of the variability in the overall rating of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and in overall ratings of preparation in cognitive-behavioral empirically-based approaches ($r=.65$, $R^2=42\%$, respectively).

The student perception rating of faculty being courteous towards students accounted for 45% of the variability in responses to overall quality of preparation to practice as

a doctoral level clinical psychologist (r=.67, R^2=45%) and accounted for 41% of the

variability in the overall rating of preparation in using the cognitive-behavioral

empirically-supported approach to clinical psychology (r=.64, R^2=41%). Finally,

students perceptions of faculty as having respect for them accounted for 52% of the

variability in the overall quality program rating of preparation to practice doctoral

level clinical psychology (r=.72, R^2=52%) and accounted for 49% of the variability

in the overall quality rating of students on preparation in using cognitive-behavioral

empirically-supported approaches (r=.70, R^2=49%).

Table 1A.

Preparation to Practice As a Clinical Psychologist

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Quality of Core Faculty as Role Models	.67	45%	Significant
Availability of Core Faculty to Meet	.64	41%	Significant
Returning Phone Calls	.61	37%	Significant
Returning e-mails	.62	38%	Significant
Returning Papers	.65	42%	Significant
Courteousness Toward Students	.67	45%	Significant
Respect for Students	.72	52%	Significant

Table 1B.

Preparation for Using Cognitive-Behavioral Empirically-Supported Approaches

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Quality of Core Faculty as Role Models	.65	42%	Significant
Availability of Core Faculty to Meet	.57	32%	Significant
Returning Phone Calls	.60	36%	Significant
Returning e-mails	.61	37%	Significant
Returning Papers	.65	42%	Significant
Courteousness Toward Students	.64	41%	Significant
Respect for Students	.70	49%	Significant

In predicting overall preparation to practice as a doctoral level psychologist a multiple regression analysis was conducted. All variables that were significantly correlated with the criterion were entered into the analysis as predictors; the criterion was preparation to practice as a doctoral level psychologist. The obtained ANOVA (F (7) = 21.09, p<.001) revealed that the regression equation was significant and was a better than chance predictor of the criterion. Quality of core faculty as role models (.037), faculty returning papers in a timely manner (.025), and faculty showing respect for students (.009) (F=21.09) were significant predictors of the criterion evidencing a multiple correlation coefficient of .77. These three variables accounted for almost 60% of the variability in the quality of the program in preparing students to practice as doctorial level psychologists. The factors of faculty availability to meet with core faculty, of returning phone calls, of returning e-mails, and of faculty being courteous to students were not found to be significant predictors in the overall preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist.

A separate multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict quality of the program in preparing students to practice the empirically-supported cognitive behavioral approach to practice. Once again, all items that significantly correlated with the criterion were entered into the analysis. The ANOVA results (f(7)= 19.512. P<.001) revealed that the regression equation was significant and was a better than chance predictor of the criterion. Quality of the core faculty as role models (.034), faculty returning papers in a timely manner (.005), and showing respect for students (.010) were significant predictors in the regression evaluation and demonstrated a multiple correlation p of .76. These predictors accounted for 58% of the variability

on the criterion. Factors not showing significance included the availability of faculty to meet with students, faculty returning phone calls or e-mails, and faculty being courteous to students.

Student Perceptions of Program Administration

This study posited the idea that the greater the quality ranking of the program administration as perceived by the student, the greater the overall quality of the program as preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches. The results of this study did indicate moderately high correlations between the students' perceptions of the program administration and the overall quality rating of the doctoral program at the .01 level, which is outlined in tables 2A and 2B.

Specifically, students' perceptions of administration's investment in resolving student concerns accounted for 53% of variability in responses to their overall rating of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist ($r=.72$, $R^2=53\%$) and 45% of variability in overall rating of preparation to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches ($r=.67$, $R^2=45\%$). About 46% of the variability in ratings of quality of program in preparing students for the practice of doctoral level clinical psychology and preparation for the use of cognitive-behavioral empirically-based approaches is 46% ($r=.68$, $R^{2=46\%}$). Student perceptions of the administration being open to feedback accounted for 40% of variability in their overall rating of preparation to practice as a clinical psychologist ($r=.63$, $R^2=40\%$) and 35% of the

variability in overall ratings of preparation to utilize a cognitive-behavioral

empirically-based approach (r=.59, R^2=35%).

Table 2A.

Preparation to Practice As a Clinical Psychologist

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Investment in Resolving Student Concerns	.72	53%	Significant
Approachability of Program Administration	.68	46%	Significant
Administrations Openness to Feedback	.63	40%	Significant

Table 2B.

Preparation for Using Cognitive-Behavioral Empirically-Supported Approaches

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Investment in Resolving Student Concerns	.67	45%	Significant
Approachability of Program Administration	.68	46%	Significant
Administrations Openness to Feedback	.59	35%	Significant

Student Perceptions of Scholarly Activity

This study posits the idea that students who felt that they had quality

mentoring and quality working relationships with professors were less likely to

perceive their faculty negatively, hence increasing their positive perceptions

regarding scholarly activity. The results of this study did indicate a significant

correlation between the students' perceptions of the interest of faculty in

collaborating with students on writing projects and on professional presentations and

the overall quality rating of the doctoral program in the areas of preparation to

practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist ($r=.62$, $R^2=38\%$) and of preparation

to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to clinical

psychology($r=.58$, $R^2=34\%$) as indicated in tables 3A and 3B. This indicates that 38%

of the variability in the responses to the quality of preparation to practice as a doctoral

level clinical psychologist is attributable to differences in perceptions about the

quality of opportunities to work with professors on writing projects and professional

presentations ($r=.62$, $R^2=38\%$). It also indicates that 34% of the variability in the

student ratings of the quality of the program around preparation to utilize cognitive-

behavioral empirically-based approaches are accounted for by the quality rating of

opportunities to work with professors on writing projects and professional

presentations ($r=.58$, $R^2=34\%$).

Gender Perceptions of Overall Program Quality

The results of this study did not indicate significant differences between

male and female students' perceptions of the overall quality rating of the doctoral

program based on their endorsed rating of the overall quality of mentoring they are

receiving during training. The results of this study did not indicate significant

differences between male and female students' ranking of overall program quality.

A multiple analysis of the variance (MANOVA) was completed using the variance

of males versus females as the independent variables and the overall rating of

quality of relationships with faculty as mentors. Box's test of the covariance

matrices of the dependent variables was not significant, indicating that the

covariance matrices are equal across groups. The overall Wilk's Lambda test of

Multivariate Significance was not significant. There is no difference between males

and females.

Table 3A.

Preparation to Practice As a Clinical Psychologist

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Interest of Faculty in Collaborating with Students	.62	38%	Significant

Table 3B.

Preparation for Using Cognitive-Behavioral Empirically-Supported Approaches

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Interest of Faculty in Collaborating with Students	.58	34%	Significant

Student Perception of Meaningful Peer Interactions

The results of this study did indicate moderately high correlations between

the students' perceptions of the opportunity for meaningful interactions with

classmates and the overall quality rating of the doctoral program around both

overall quality of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist

and preparation to implement cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported

approaches. It was found that 31% of variability in the overall rating of

preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist is attributable to

the differences in perceptions around the quality of opportunities for meaningful

interactions with peers ($r=.56$, $R^2=31\%$). Additionally, 26% of all variability in

the overall rating of preparation to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-

supported approaches is attributable to differences in the perception of students

to opportunities for meaningful interactions with their peers ($r=.51$, $R^2=26\%$).

Tables 4A and 4B show the overall findings.

Table 4A.

Preparation to Practice As a Clinical Psychologist

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Opportunities for Meaningful Interactions with Peers	.56	31%	Significant

Table 4B.

Preparation for Using Cognitive-Behavioral Empirically-Supported Approaches

	Pearson Correlation	Coefficient of Determination	Significant at .01
Opportunities for Meaningful Interactions with Peers	.51	26%	Significant

Student Perceptions Based on Timely Program Completion

The results of this study did not indicate significant differences between the

students' perceptions of overall program quality and the students' progress toward

timely program completion. A multiple analysis of the variance (MANOVA) was

completed using the variance of years in the program beyond 5 years versus those students who are maintaining academic pace to graduate in 5 years as the independent variables and the overall rating of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and for preparation in a cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approach to clinical psychology as dependent variables. Box's test (Box's $M = 3.29$, $p = .38$) of the covariance matrices of the dependent variables was not significant, indicating that the covariance matrices are equal across groups. The overall Wilks' Lambda test of Multivariate Significance was not significant (Wilks' $= .993$, $F (2, 104) = .34$, $p = .712$). A note of caution, however, is that there are a small number of students identified as being beyond the fifth year.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

This study found the following results: (a) moderately high correlations were found between the variables of quality of core faculty as role models, availability of faculty to meet with students, faculty returning phone calls, e-mails and student papers, being courteous to students and being respectful to students with overall student ratings both of program quality in the program preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and of preparation in utilizing cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to treatment; (b) program administration's investment in resolving student concerns, approachability of program administration, and the administration's openness to feed back from students also showed moderately high correlations with overall student ratings both of program quality in the program preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and preparation in utilizing cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to treatment; (c) the quality of the mentoring relationship with faculty as perceived by the student showed a moderately high correlation with overall student ratings of both program quality in the program preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and with preparation in utilizing cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to treatment; (d) the overall student ratings of program quality in the program preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and of preparation in utilizing cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to treatment also showed a moderately high correlation with the students' perceptions of the quality of their interactions with their

peers; (e) no significant differences occurred between male student and female student perceptions of mentoring relationships with faculty; (f) no significant differences occurred between students who were beyond their fifth year of enrollment in the program and those students who were maintaining their academic pace toward graduation in overall student ratings of program quality in the program preparing students to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and of preparation in utilizing cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches to treatment.

Significance of the Findings

For this study, doctoral students from the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Psychology Program were given a self-assessment measure for APA accreditation. All students identified as "currently enrolled" in the Doctor of Psychology program during the 2008-2009 academic year were identified as participants of this study. The survey is in the form of an un-validated self-report, 5-point likert scale in a correlational and between-subjects design.

The survey was broken down into eight subsections, which addressed student perceptions of the program mission statement, program faculty, policy and procedure, program administration, scholarly activity, student perception of their academic peers, available program resources, and the students' perceptions of their overall preparation to be clinical psychologists. Finally, the overall feedback from the student regarding their perceptions of the quality of the program was also elicited. Additional information was obtained from each student regarding his or her clinical experiences with culturally diverse clients during their practicum and internship placements.

Student Perception of Program Faculty

This study suggests that student perceptions of program faculty underscore positive perceptions of overall quality ratings of doctoral programs. The relationships that students have with their professors exert an impact on overall program satisfaction. In one study (Ellis, 2001), students' perceptions of positive advising and mentoring led to greater reported satisfaction in their doctoral work. Regularly scheduled meetings with advisors during which the professor initiates conversations about student concerns enhance the advising experience for students (Guiffrida, 2005). In addition, review of the literature shows that students are more responsive to these professors that they perceive as being invested in their students. Professors who are perceived as student-focused or student-centered by their students and who provide advising and guidance beyond that which is expected in traditional terms will, in turn, get more out of their students (Guiffrida, 2005).

The results of this study did indicate significant correlations between the students' perceptions of the program faculty and the overall quality rating of the doctoral program. The factors that were correlated with overall student quality program ratings of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist included quality of the core faculty as role models, availability of the faculty to meet with the students, returning phone calls to the students, returning e-mails to the students, returning papers to the students, and showing courteousness and respect to students.

As hypothesized, the active role of faculty plays an important role in the overall satisfaction perceived by the students who are enrolled in and work with the

faculty of that program. Evidence from this study shows that it is important to students that their professors model professionalism for them and that they are available to the student beyond the classroom when the students seek to have time with their professors. Students show an increased perception of overall quality in the program when they have professors and faculty who are diligent and responsive to students, particularly around returning phone calls and e-mails and returning student work in a timely manner. Findings of the current study also show that the greater amount of courtesy and respect given to students by professors, the greater do the students perceive their doctoral program experiences to be.

Student Perceptions of Program Administration

This study posited the idea that the greater the quality ranking of the program administration as perceived by the student, the greater the overall quality of the experience. Richardson (1999) has highlighted some of the intricacies of the role of "administrator. He described the role of the Department Chair as requiring problem-solving abilities in technical situations and in "technical situations" and "adaptive situations (pg. 78)." Reid and Radhakrishnan (2003) suggest that campus programming that has a focus on meeting the individual needs of the student body based on age, race, sex, and ethnicity will most likely help individual students and academic experience.

The results of this study did indicate significant correlations between the students' perceptions of the program administration and the overall quality rating of the doctoral program. As hypothesized, it is the program administration's

willingness to value the students who have enrolled in the program; they are responsible to guide these students, allowing them to feel that they have an important role in providing feedback to the administration and that they are able to take an active role in helping to shape the program to benefit their own educational experiences. This is important because of the investment of time and money that students are giving toward completion of their degrees and providing them with an ongoing positive working relationship to build their skills as a professional in the field of psychology.

Student Perceptions of Scholarly Activity

Ellis (2001) reports that doctoral students came into educational programs expecting greater opportunities to participate in faculty research and publication projects than those with which they actually were provided. When students were able to engage in such projects with faculty, the students reported feeling that their roles were menial and not conducive to their professional development. This study posits that those students who felt that they had quality mentoring and quality working relationships with professors were less likely to perceive their faculty negatively, hence increasing their positive perceptions regarding the scholarly activity.

The results of this study did indicate a significant correlation between the students' perceptions of scholarly activity with their faculty and the overall quality rating of the doctoral program. These results support findings from the literature indicating that students feel that the opportunities to engage in scholarly works with

faculty are important components of their overall preparation for careers as doctors of psychology; this also increases satisfaction in their academic experiences.

Gender Perceptions of Overall Program Quality

The results of this study did not indicate significant differences between male and female students' perceptions of the overall quality rating of the doctoral program based on their overall quality rating of faculty as mentors. This is in conflict with the findings from the literature which indicated that gender has an impact on the overall experiences that students have in their academic programs with men feeling more comfortable, perceiving programs in a more positive way than their female counterparts (Ellis, 2001). Bowman and Hatley (1995) pointed out the perceived lack of female mentors and role-models available to female students. The ethical perceptions of females, including what is and what is not appropriate behavior for them seems to decrease the likelihood of these positive female relationships occurring because of female sensitivity to unethical relationships. The relationships being sought by female students cross into the shades of gray, ethically, and make it even less likely that mentorships will form.

These well mentored students also perceived that they were more seriously invested in research and had more opportunity to engage in research projects. These students also perceived greater opportunities to teach and also to get actively involved through presenting at conventions and conferences. Students with more positive mentoring opportunities were authoring with faculty more often and became more actively involved in their doctoral program's social activities. The current study did

not withhold what the research indicated, i.e. that there was no difference noted between mentorship and the overall quality rating of preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist.

Student Perception of Meaningful Peer Interactions

The results of this study did indicate significant correlations between the students' perceptions of the opportunity for meaningful interactions with classmates and the overall quality rating of the doctoral program. An important component to completing a doctoral degree is the support and camaraderie that students find in their cohort. Research indicates that many students who are completing a doctoral degree have a variety of life and family situations. Ellis (2001) found that students who are full time, those who are single and students who worked at the school to obtain assistantship are more likely to become invested in peer relationships. Another area of concern reported by Ellis (2001) is a lack of concern with building rapport and working relationships between cohorts or educational peers and faculty members.

Student Perceptions Based on Timely Program Completion

The results of this study did not indicate significant differences between the students' perceptions of overall program quality and the students' progress toward timely program completion. Ellis's study (2001) revealed that doctoral students who perceived they had quality advisors also felt they were more able to meet program expectations in a timely manner, were better prepared to take comprehensive examinations than students who either did not acknowledge their

advisors or sought alternate mentors outside of their school program. These program milestones are important in progressing through the program to timely completion of the doctoral degree. Such milestones that are not successfully achieved can cause a student to fall behind and subsequently remain in the program beyond their scheduled graduation year.

Relationship to Previous Work

As indicated previously, there is deficit of information in research related to student perceptions of what it is that constitutes a quality doctoral psychology program. This is despite the amount of time and financial commitment that is required by students to engage in such an undertaking. Several studies previously conducted focused on student perceptions of their experiences in an academic program, though not specifically in a doctoral program. There are multiple factors such as race, religion, gender, location, and personal ability that may impact how a student determines whether or not to pursue a degree (Menon, 2008). The current findings that gender does not have an overall level of significance when measuring the student perception of the quality of mentoring relationships with faculty is in contrast to the findings in the literature. According to Bowman and Hatley (1995), there is a perceived lack of female mentors and role-models available to female students. Female students tend to be more rigid about violating ethic boundaries, which makes relationships with their professors less viable for female students. The relationships being sought by female students cross into the shades of gray, ethically, and make it

even less likely that mentorships will form. Findings from the current study do not support such claims.

The findings from this study support the literature. Programs that place a great deal of emphasis on publication and faculty productivity for increased pay, promotions, or to make tenure, seemed to created less motivation for faculty to focus on the additional roles of instructor and advisor (Guiffrida, 2005; Sandler & Russell, 2005). In one study (Ellis, 2001), students' perceptions of positive advising and mentoring led to a greater amount of reported satisfaction in their doctoral work. Such findings in the research are of importance to the current study because of the finding that core faculty's being responsive to and having a positive relationship with students, in addition to faculty who provide positive advising and mentoring showed an overall more positive experience in the doctoral program. Guiffrida (2005) identified four key characteristics that make a professor "student-centered". These include: acting as mentors (contacts, advice, and leading by example), academic coaches (tutoring, encouragement), advocates for students (pleading case and defending them to others), and as counselors (listening to academic and personal problems, supporting them, advice). Such characteristics will help faculty to increase student perceptions of their investment in them. The current study supports such claims. Regularly scheduled meetings with advisors and the professor initiating conversations about student concerns enhance the advising experience for students (Guiffrida, 2005). In addition, review of the literature shows that students are more responsive to these professors whom they perceive as being invested in their students' welfare.

Additional findings in the current study found that there was a significant correlation between the administration and overall quality program ratings. Specifically, the department chair is an important, identifiable member of administration that students will often seek out. The program Chair sets the tone for the atmosphere of the department. Faculty members who are clearly invested and interested in their students' research, teaching interests, and future aspirations in the field reported that they felt that they experienced a greater sense of value from these members of the program faculty (Ellis, 2001). The Chair also sets the tone for program diversity. Because the Chair holds a main role in setting policy and procedure he or she also plays a huge role in program diversity. Campus programming that focuses on meeting the individual needs of the student body based on age, race, sex, and ethnicity will most likely help individual students, facilitating the academic experience (Reid and Radhakrishnan, 2003). Findings from the current study support the important role that program administration has as a liaison between policy making and the tone of the program, providing an educational and supportive environment for the students that they serve, specifically around being responsive to students, as was noted in the current study; this involves resolving student concerns, being open to feedback, and having students feel that they can approach administration.

An important component to completing a doctoral degree is the support and camaraderie students find in their cohort. As indicated in the current study, the more clearly students feel that they have quality relationships and chances for meaningful interactions with their peers, the more satisfied they are with the overall program

quality. Many students who are completing a doctoral degree have a variety of life and family situations. Ellis (2001) found that students who are full time, those who are single and students who worked at the school to obtain assistantship are more likely to become invested in peer relationships.

The current study did not show any significant differences on overall program satisfaction based on student academic standing with progress toward graduation, which is in contrast to the information found in the literature. Ellis's study (2001) revealed that doctoral students who perceived they had quality advisors also felt they were more able to meet program expectations in a timely manner, were better prepared to take comprehensive examinations than students who either did not acknowledge their advisors or who sought alternate mentors outside of their school program. These program milestones are important in progressing through the program to timely completion of the doctoral degree. Such milestones, if not successfully achieved, can cause a student to fall behind and subsequently remain in the program beyond their scheduled graduation year.

Limitations of the Study

The current study is based on self-report from the graduate students in the department of psychology at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine. The focus is on getting feedback on personal experiences and points of view of the students. There may be some personal variables which motivated some students to participate in the survey yet others chose not to participate in the survey. There are

multiple variables which impact the overall results of this study, making it difficult to determine pure results.

An additional limitation may be the use of electronic mail in order to announce the survey and encourage students to participate. Graduate students in the Department of Psychology at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine are expected to check their electronic mail regularly in order to gain access to department announcements as well as ongoing communication with faculty, staff and peers; however, no written communication announcing the survey or encouraging students to participate had been utilized. Therefore limitation may be found in not obtaining survey data from those students who had not checked their electronic mail during the period of time when the survey was announced. This electronic announcement also provided students with the method of participation in gaining access to the survey via a link to find the survey online. This may have hindered some students from accessing or even being knowledgeable that the survey was going on. Additionally, any technological difficulties that students had been experiencing during the course of the survey may have proved an obstacle to gaining access to the Internet; this would also eliminate checking their electronic mail and subsequently eliminate participating in the study.

An additional limitation is that the current study is assessing only perceptions of the students in the graduate program at the Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine and was not broadened or generalized to any other academic program. This study is an initial study that would hopefully be brought into other academic institutions in order to gain perceptions of their students and enhance their academic

programming by way of enhancing the experiences of student education and improving academic practices on behalf of the student body they serve.

Although ethnicity was a factor gathered as part of the survey used for re-accreditation, much of the research that has been done is based primarily on race. The difference between a student's identified ethnicity and biological race may have some implications for the outcome of this study because of the differences between the biological basis for race and the values and sociological factors associated with ethnicity. Ethnicity requires a more subjective experience of identifying oneself beyond physical or biological characteristics; subsequent experiences in the academic sector may be impacted, based on such experiences or self-identity. Although this is a possible limitation to the current study, it is anticipated that this is not likely to have skewed the results beyond the statistical significance noted; there will be benefits, however, from ongoing research that notes both the racial and ethnic differences in the academic setting.

Contributions to the Field

The results of the current study are of great importance not only to the ongoing support and advocacy of students who are enrolling in costly and time consuming educational programs, but also for programs that are dedicated to ensuring both the educational integrity and positive experiences of their students. There is a deficit of information in the literature around student perceptions of their educational experiences. The current study provided support for the theory that factors associated with faculty, administration, scholarly opportunities with faculty, and meaningful

interactions with peers are viable issues for doctoral programs to consider as

curriculum and program mission is shaped to meet student needs.

The additional findings of non-significance related to the gender differences in

perceptions of quality mentoring relationships and non-significant differences in

overall program quality ratings, based on whether or not the student is beyond his or

her fifth year in the program or is remaining on target to graduate within the outline

of the five year course curriculum, provide additionally important information.

Although the literature indicates that female students perceive fewer opportunities for

mentor relationships with faculty, the current study did not find this to be true.

Future Directions

Based on the findings in the current study, there are several areas that require

ongoing assessment. Specifically, non-significant findings between gender and

mentor relationships with faculty was a surprising find based on review of the

literature which indicated that there were a great many differing perceptions between

male student and female students. Further research is required to determine those

specific factors that act as buffers to such negative perceptions by women as opposed

to those by men. The significant findings from this study which support the literature

also provide insights into ongoing areas of future assessment. It will be important for

research to continue in order to assess the needs of doctoral students so that the most

effective and beneficial academic experience may be provided to benefit students.

Program administrations, who are invested in their students, will find a wealth of

information by conducting ongoing assessments of their own programs based on the

findings of the current study. Additionally, a faculty member who is available and open to meeting with and mentoring students provides educational and real-life education for students striving to be professionals in the field.

Additional study around the dynamics with diversity among students based on gender and ethnicity is beyond the scope of the current study; however, based on the literature, this would be an important study for the future. Meeting the needs of students from various ethnic backgrounds, as discussed by Guiffrida (2005), and the idea of "othermothering" as a method of academics with African American students, is beneficial to both students and faculty that serve them.

Summary and Conclusion

There is a great lack of research dedicated to understanding student perspectives of their academic experiences. Students invest a great deal of time and money in seeking a doctoral degree. Programs invested in providing quality educational and professional opportunities to their students would be best served to have an understanding of that which students view as being the most important factors associated with a quality learning experience. The current study found that there is a significant correlation between overall preparation to practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist and preparation to utilize cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approaches; this correlation extends to factors associated with faculty being perceived as role models by students, in being available to meet with students, in returning student phone calls, e-mails, and papers, in being courteous toward students, and in showing student's respect. Additional associated factors impacting

overall quality of the program included administration being invested in resolving student concerns, administration being approachable, and being open to student feedback. Faculty being interested in collaborating with students on scholarly activities was also highly correlated with overall program quality. Students also correlated, highly, the quality of their peer relationships with fellow students to the overall quality rating of the program.

There was no significance found between male and female students regarding their perceived quality of mentoring by their professors, despite the literature indicating that females would be more likely to perceive fewer mentoring opportunities available to them. Significant differences were not found between the overall program quality rating based on students who have been in the program beyond five years and those students who have been in the program for fewer than five years. Based on the literature, programs providing support via mentoring, positive faculty relationships, and overall preparation for competencies, would be more likely to yield positive perceptions by students. Based on such research, it was hypothesized that students who were making timely progress through the program would provide a higher rate of overall satisfaction with the program than those students who were in the program beyond five years. This was not the finding in the current study, although it was noted that a small number of students surveyed were beyond their fifth year in the program.

Overall, the current findings provided support for several of the identified factors of this study, although there is a great deal to be studied beyond this study. There is a great need for researching student perceptions and needs in order to

maintain ongoing academic integrity both in the classroom and in the lives of the students who are dedicating time and finances to the experience. The immeasurable interactions and personal variables that are unable to be accounted for in a study such as this provide a multitude of potential future exploration. The literature review and subsequent findings of this study brings the necessity of such research to light and provides direction for future study to benefit students and academic programs.

References

American Association of University Professors (2001). *Statement of Professional*

Ethics, 9th Edition, Committee on Professional Ethics. Washington, D.C.

American Counseling Association (2005). Code of ethics.

American Psychological Association (2008). Guidelines and principles for

accreditation of programs in professional psychology. *Committee on*

Accreditation. Office of Program Consultation and Accreditation; Washington,

D.C.

Basow, Susan A. & Silberg, Nancy T (1987). Student evaluations of college

professors: are female and male professors rated differently? *Journal of*

Educational Psychology, 79, 308-314.

Bishop-Clark, Cathy & Lynch, Jean (1998). Comparing teacher and student responses

to the mixed-age college classroom. *Community College Review, 25,* 21-35.

Block, Sandra (2007). Cost of higher education gets more pricey. *USA Today.*

Bowman, Vicki E. & Hatley, Lesa D. (1995). Faculty-student relationships: the dual

role controversy. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34,* 232-243.

Carter, Michael (2005). *What is the cost of college tuition?* College Financial Aid

Guide. http://ezinearticles.com/?expert=Michael_Carter. Retrieved 03/29/2009.

Cooke, D. K., Sims, R. L., & Peyrefitte, J. (1995). The relationship between graduate

student attitudes and attrition. *The Journal of Psychology, 129,* pg. 677-685.

Davidson, Alex (2007). Economics 101. *Forbes, 180,* 144-149.

DiTomasso, Robert (1999). *2005-2006 PCOM Clinical Psy.D. Student Survey for APA Re-Accreditation.* Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Psychological Department Self-Study Committee; Philadelphia, PA.

Ei, Sue & Bowen, Anne (2002). College students' perceptions of student-instructor relationships. *Ethics & Behavior, 12,* 177-190.

Ellis, Evelynn M. (2001). The impact of race ad gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with doctoral study, and commitment to degree completion. *The Western Journal of Black Studies, 25,* 30-45.

Guiffrida, Douglas (2005). Othermothering as a framework for understanding African-American students' definitions of student-centered faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76,* 701-723.

Higher Education Opportunity Act, Public Law 110-315 (August 14, 2008), United States Government.

Menon, Maria E. (2008). The economic benefits of higher education in Cyprus: the expectations of prospective students. *International Journal of Educational Development, 28,* 259-267.

Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine Department of Psychology (2007). Psy.D. Clinical Student Handbook.

Ponterotto, Alexander, & Greiger (1995). A multicultural competency checklist for counseling psychology programs. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23, 11-20.

Reid, Landon, D. & Radhakrishnan, Phanikiran (2003). Race matters: the relation

between race and general campus climate. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic

Minority Psychology, 9,* 263-275.

Richardson, Steven M. (1999). Civility, leadership, and the classroom. *New

Directions for Teaching and Learning, 77,* 77-86.

Sandler, Jeffrey C. & Russell, Brenda L. (2005). Faculty-student collaborations:

ethics and satisfaction in authorship credit. *Ethics & Behavior, 15,* 65-80.*

Appendix

2008-2009 PCOM Clinical Psy.D. Student Survey

December 17, 2008

Dear PCOM Psy.D. Clinical Psychology Student:

In our continuing pursuit of maintaining excellence in doctoral training, the Psy.D. program will be reviewed for re-accreditation in Clinical Psychology by the American Psychological Association. As you may know, I am primarily responsible for coordinating this process. I cannot emphasize enough how important APA accreditation is as a hallmark of program quality and for the careers of our graduates. I am happy to report to you that the process is progressing well. The Self-Study Committee has been meeting for several hours a week over the past year. The next major step in this process entails on-going detailed documentation of supplemental information regarding some facets of the training program. One critical aspect of this documentation involves the opinions and perceptions of our student body.

With this need in mind, the Self-Study Committee is currently conducting a formal survey of our students. The data compiled from this survey will be aggregated and analyzed and directly reported to APA as an integral part of the materials supporting our program's merit in maintaining the distinction of accreditation. While the survey materials are somewhat lengthy, kindly understand that the information being requested is critical to the accreditation process. I do realize how busy you are with work, school, family, and related responsibilities.

The survey will take about 10 minutes for you to complete. Please take a few moments to complete the survey by clicking here: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=91AK6_2bgUANk9cD0_2bBXnUug_3d_ 3d. Your responses will be anonymous to APA and will be reported in the aggregate.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter of importance to our program. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Kindly complete the survey as soon as possible but **no later than January 9, 2009**.

Sincerely,

Robert A. DiTomasso, Ph.D., ABPP
Professor and Chairman
Chairman, APA Self-Study Committee

**2008-09 PCOM Clinical Psy.D. Student Survey
for APA Re-accreditation
(DiTomasso, 1999)**

<u>**General Directions:**</u>

Please read and answer each item carefully and objectively. Your honest opinions are greatly appreciated. There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses will remain completely confidential.

<u>**Section A: Demographic Data:**</u>

Name: _____

Please check (√) the appropriate response or complete the necessary information, where indicated:

Gender: _____ male _____ female
Age: _____ years
Ethnicity:
      _____ African-American/Black
      _____ Caucasian
      _____ Hispanic/Latino
      _____ Asian/Pacific Islander
      _____ Multiethnic
      _____ Other

Subject to Americans with Disabilities Act: _____yes _____no

Foreign National (individuals who are not US Citizens or Permanent Residents):
      _____yes _____no

Year of Study:
      _____ (incoming Class of 2000)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2001)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2002)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2003)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2004)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2005)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2006)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2007)
      _____ (incoming Class of 2008)

Site:
      _____ Philadelphia
      _____ Harrisburg
      _____ East Stroudsburg

Section B: Student Professional Activities Since Enrollment in the Program

Member of professional societies: _____yes   _____no

       Are you currently a member of: APA   ____ yes   ____ no

                                     PPA   ____ yes   ____ no

                                     ABCT   ____ yes   ____ no

                                     Other (specify)_____

Author/co-author of papers at professional meetings: _____yes   _____no

Author/co-author of articles in professional/scientific journals: _____yes _____no

Directions for Sections C-G:

Using the 5-point Likert scale provided below, based upon your experience as a doctoral student in clinical psychology at PCOM, please select the most accurate and appropriate rating for each item listed below.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Section C: Full Time Core Faculty As A Whole

1. The perceived quality of the core faculty as <u>role models</u>
   for you 1   2   3   4   5

2. The general availability of faculty to meet with you 1   2   3   4   5

3. Faculty promptness in returning phone calls to you
   within three days 1   2   3   4   5

4. Faculty promptness in returning emails to you
   within three days 1   2   3   4   5

5. Degree of courteousness displayed by faculty
   toward students 1   2   3   4   5

6. Degree of respect shown by faculty toward students 1   2   3   4   5

7. Promptness in returning papers and assignments to you . . 1   2   3   4   5

Section D: Program Administration
(refers to Chairman, Vice-Chair, Director of Doctoral Program, and Programs Coordinator)

1. Quality of the administrative leadership of the

Psy.D. program 1   2   3   4   5

2. The investment of the program administration in resolving
     student concerns. 1   2   3   4   5

3. The approachability of the program administration 1   2   3   4   5

4. The extent to which the program administration is
     open to feedback 1   2   3   4   5

5. The administrative commitment to individual and cultural
     diversity 1   2   3   4   5

Section E: Scholarly Activity

1. The interest of the faculty in collaborating with students
     on writing projects and professional presentations 1   2   3   4   5

2. The quality of the faculty as role models for scholarly
     activity 1   2   3   4   5

Section F: Student Body

1. The opportunities for meaningful interactions with
     your peers 1   2   3   4   5

2. Your current level of interest in scholarly activities
     (writing, research, professional presentations) 1   2   3   4   5

3. The likelihood that you will pursue some scholarly activities
     (writing, research, professional presentations) in the future. .1   2   3   4   5

4. The likelihood that you will practice clinical psychology
     after graduation 1   2   3   4   5

5. The likelihood that you will provide services to
     individually and culturally diverse clients 1   2   3   4   5

6. The emphasis of the program on issues of individual
     and cultural diversity 1   2   3   4   5

7. Opportunities for meaningful interactions with more
     advanced students 1   2   3   4   5

Section G: General

1. Overall quality of program in preparing you to ultimately

    practice as a doctoral level clinical psychologist 1   2   3   4   5

2. Overall quality of program in preparing you in the
cognitive-behavioral empirically-supported approach
to clinical psychology 1   2   3   4   5

3. Overall quality of program in preparing you to provide
services to individually and culturally diverse clients 1   2   3   4   5

4. Your overall level of <u>experience</u> in working with culturally
and individually diverse clients................................1   2   3   4   5

5. Your overall level of <u>interest</u> in working with culturally
and individually diverse clients..............................1   2   3   4   5

6. Your overall level of <u>commitment</u> in working with culturally
and individually diverse clients..............................1   2   3   4   5

7. Overall quality of mentoring you are receiving during
your training at PCOM..1   2   3   4   5

8. Quality of the cafeteria 1   2   3   4   5

9. The importance of keeping the cafeteria open until 8pm. . . . 1   2   3   4   5

Section H: Preparation As a Clinical Psychologist

Professional Preparation in Foundational & Functional Competencies in Clinical Psychology

Please rate <u>the extent to which you believe the Psy.D. program is preparing you or has the potential to prepare you</u> in the following areas by circling the appropriate rating.

Reflective Practice and Self-Assessment

1. Practicing within the boundaries of your competence........1   2   3   4   5

2. Committing to life-long learning.............................1   2   3   4   5

3. Engaging in scholarly activities..............................1   2   3   4   5

4. Thinking critically...1   2   3   4   5

5. Committing to the development of the profession...........1   2   3   4   5

6. Overall reflective practice and self-assessment..............1   2   3   4   5

Scientific Knowledge and Methods

1.   Understanding research and research methodology...........1   2   3   4   5

2.   Showing respect for scientifically-derived knowledge......1   2   3   4   5

3.   Understanding techniques of data collection/analysis........1   2   3   4   5

4.   Understanding/respecting biological bases of behavior......1   2   3   4   5

5.   Understanding/respecting cognitive-affective bases of
     behavior...1   2   3   4   5

6.   Understanding/respecting life-span human development...1   2   3   4   5

7.   Overall understanding/respect for scientific knowledge
     and methods...1   2   3   4   5

Relationships

1.   Capacity to relate effectively and meaningfully with
     clients...1   2   3   4   5

2.   Ability to form effective working alliances.................1   2   3   4   5

3.   Overall professional relationship abilities..................1   2   3   4   5

Ethical Legal Standards and Policy

1.   Application of ethical concepts...............................1   2   3   4   5

2.   Awareness of legal issues regarding professional
     activities..1   2   3   4   5

3.   Adherence to important relevant policies...................1   2   3   4   5

4.   Overall knowledge of ethical/legal standards.............1   2   3   4   5

5.   Learning the importance of advocacy activities............1   2   3   4   5

Individual-Cultural Diversity

1.   Awareness and sensitivity in working professionally
     with clients representing various cultural backgrounds
     and characteristics..1   2   3   4   5

2.   Overall awareness and sensitivity to diversity issues.......1   2   3   4   5

Interdisciplinary Systems

1. Identification & involvement with one's colleagues
   and peers...1   2   3   4   5

2. Knowledge of key issues and concepts in related
   disciplines...1   2   3   4   5

3. Ability to interact with professionals in related
   disciplines...1   2   3   4   5

Assessment, Diagnosis and Case Conceptualization

1. Assessment and diagnosis of problems associated with
   individuals, groups, and organizations.........................1   2   3   4   5

2. Overall assessment, diagnosis, and case conceptualization...1   2   3   4   5

Intervention

1. Understanding empirically-supported interventions............1   2   3   4   5

2. Applying empirically-supported interventions......................1   2   3   4   5

Consultation

1. Providing expert guidance or professional
   assistance in response to a client's needs or goals...............1   2   3   4   5

2. Providing client-centered consultation and consultee-centered
   consultation...1   2   3   4   5

3. Conducting consultation with other healthcare specialists
   (e.g., physicians)..1   2   3   4   5

4. Overall consultative skills...1   2   3   4   5

Research and Evaluation

1. Generating scholarly products that contribute to
   the professional knowledge base................................1   2   3   4   5

2. Evaluating the effectiveness of various professional
   activities..1   2   3   4   5

Supervision-teaching

1. Supervising and training the professional knowledge base....1   2   3   4   5

Management-Administration

1. Managing the practice of mental health services..................1   2   3   4   5

2. Administering health programs, organizations or agencies......1   2   3   4   5

Section I: Survey of Obstacles to Dissertation Completion (to be completed ONLY by students who are currently taking or have completed Research III)

Please indicate if any of the following have been an obstacle to progress with your dissertation.

	Not an Obstacle	Small Obstacle	Obstacle of Some Significance	A Very Significant Obstacle	An Overwhelming Obstacle
Choosing a dissertation topic. 1		2	3	4	5
Chairperson's availability to meet with me. 1		2	3	4	5
Timeliness and sufficiency of chairperson's feedback............1		2	3	4	5
Ability to make time to work on dissertation due to other program requirements. 1		2	3	4	5
Ability to make time to work on dissertation due to external responsibilities (i.e., family commitments, work obligations, etc). 1		2	3	4	5
Ability to obtain access to study participants. 1		2	3	4	5
Ability to remain motivated. 1		2	3	4	5
Writing ability. 1		2	3	4	5
The research methods and statistical analyses for my study. 1		2	3	4	5

Section J: Diversity Questionnaire
(Ponterotto, Alexander, & Grieger, 1995)

1. Are you currently completing or have you completed a practicum or internship through PCOM?
_____yes   _____no

If yes, complete the remainder of Section J. If no, skip to Section K.

2. Breadth of training environment and settings. 1   2   3   4   5

3. Quality of field supervision. 1   2   3   4   5

4. Satisfaction with practicum placement process. 1   2   3   4   5
        If selected "good," "fair," or "poor," please explain:_____

Instructions: This questionnaire is designed to obtain information about your clinical experiences with individually and culturally diverse clients during your practicum and/or internship while at PCOM. Please answer each question carefully and select the response which describes your experiences during the course of **your practicum and/or internship.**

1. I have worked with clients of a different ethnic background than my own . . . . yes   no

2. I have considered issues pertaining to ethnicity with my clients . . . . yes   no

3. I received on-site supervision pertaining to ethnicity and culture of my clients during
    my own training . . . . yes   no

4. I have worked with clients facing difficulties in heterosexual relationships . . . . yes   no

5. I have worked with clients facing difficulties in gay or lesbian relationships . . . . yes   no

6. I have worked with clients who identified themselves as gay or lesbian . . . . yes   no

7. I have considered issues related to sexual orientation with my clients . . . . yes   no

8. I received on-site supervision pertaining to the sexual identity of my clients during
    my own training . . . . yes   no
9. I have considered age-related issues with my clients . . . . yes   no

10. I have received on-site supervision pertaining to the age of my clients during my
     own training . . . . yes   no

11. I have worked with Christian clients . . . . yes   no

12. I have worked with clients of religious faith different from my own . . . .   yes   no

13. I have considered religious issues with my clients .. . .   yes   no

14. I received on-site supervision pertaining to the religious values of my clients during
    my own training . . . .   yes   no

15. I have considered gender–related issues with my clients . . . .   yes   no

16. I received on-site supervision pertaining to the gender of my clients during my
    own training . . . .   yes   no

17. I have worked with HIV-positive clients . . . .   yes   no

18. I have worked with clients who have AIDS . . . .   yes   no

19. I have considered HIV and AIDS related issues with my clients . . . .   yes   no

20. I have received on-site supervision pertaining to HIV and AIDS-related issues
    during my own training . . . .   yes   no

21. I have worked with clients from a different socioeconomic background than
    my own . . . .   yes   no

22. I have worked with economically disadvantaged clients . . . .   yes   no

23. I have worked with middle-class clients . . . .   yes   no

24. I have worked with affluent clients . . . .   yes   no

25. I have worked with clients receiving public assistance . . . .   yes   no

26. I have worked with clients who have private health insurance plans . . . .   yes   no

27. I have considered class-or economic related issues with my clients . . . .   yes   no

28. I received on-site supervision pertaining to economic resources of my clients
    during my own training . . . .   yes   no

29. I have received on-site supervision pertaining to urban/suburban/rural living
    situations . . . .   yes   no
30. I have worked with physically challenged clients . . . .   yes   no

31. I have received on-site supervision pertaining to physically challenged clients . . . . . .   yes   no

32. I have worked with underserved clients.: . . . .   yes   no

33. I have received on-site supervision pertaining to underserved clients . . . .   yes   no

Section K: Comments

Program Strengths:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Areas in Need of Improvement:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Suggestions:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____