

A COMPARISON OF EMPLOYABILITY OF Ph.D.'S AND Ed.D.'S IN
COLLEGE TEACHING VERSUS Ph.D.'S IN AN ACADEMIC AREA

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

B. L. Timney
Major Professor

Laurance P. Mahon, Jr.
Minor Professor

R. T. Honey
Committee Member

Jim Bezdak
Committee Member

Dwaine Kingery
Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulous
Dean of the Graduate School

217

Gonzalez, Diana, A Comparison of Employability of Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching versus Ph.D.'s in an Academic Area. Doctor of Philosophy (College Teaching--Mathematics), May, 1972, 158 pp., 20 tables, bibliography, 89 titles.

The purpose of this study was to determine the opportunities available for employment to Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching by revealing the attitudes/preferences of employing agents--deans and departmental chairmen--toward Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching versus Ph.D.'s in an academic area. The problem led to the development of eleven specific questions which were investigated in the study.

The data were obtained through the use of questionnaires aimed at revealing degree preference of employing agents. The subjects were requested to indicate their preference for a particular type of degree when filling a vacancy existing in an academic department. The subjects consisted of 700 employing agents in five academic fields. Three hundred institutions, divided into five categories, were included in the sample. The findings were based on a useable return of 476 instruments (68 per cent). A cross-validation study, using forty-one North Texas State University doctoral graduates in the five academic areas, attempted to compare the preferences of employing agents with the perceptions of

doctoral graduates with respect to conditions existing at their particular institutions. The findings were based on a useable return of twenty-six instruments (63.4 per cent).

The principal findings of the study were:

1. The employing agents sampled preferred Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching. However, Ph.D.'s in College Teaching were preferred over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.
2. Competence in a foreign language was not particularly stressed by employing agents.
3. Employing agents preferred 24-35 semester hours in the major field above the master's.
4. For the most part, employing agents preferred prospective teachers without professional learning theory and methodology courses.
5. Employing agents preferred prospective teachers with 2-3 years of teaching experience.
6. The starting salary for Ed.D.'s in College Teaching is less than that for Ph.D.'s in College Teaching, which is less than that for Ph.D.'s in an academic area.
7. Academic Ph.D.'s have a better opportunity for first academic promotion. Similarly, Ph.D.'s in College Teaching seem to attain first academic promotion faster than Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.
8. Employing agents preferred Ph.D.'s in an academic area from a less well-known institution over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in

College Teaching from an institution with an excellent reputation.

9. Employing agents generally agree that College Teaching graduates are employable only according to the needs of a department or institution.

10. The preferences of employing agents for type of doctoral degree, as perceived by the North Texas State University doctoral graduates coincided with the results obtained by sampling employing agents in higher education.

A COMPARISON OF EMPLOYABILITY OF Ph.D.'S AND Ed.D.'S IN
COLLEGE TEACHING VERSUS Ph.D.'S IN AN ACADEMIC AREA

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Diana Gonzalez

Denton, Texas

May, 1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Questions	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations of the Study	
Basic Assumptions	
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	14
Historical Background of the Earned Research Doctorates	
Rationale for Earned Research Doctorates	
The Doctoral Degree as a Means to Employment	
III. PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY	47
Development of the Questionnaire	
Identification of the Population Surveyed	
Administration of the Questionnaire	
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	57
V. SUBJECTIVE COMMENTS OF THE RESPONDENTS	110
Employing Agents	
Doctoral Students	
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	130
Summary	
Findings	
Conclusions	
Implications	
Recommendations for Future Research	
APPENDICES	139
BIBLIOGRAPHY	152

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
I. Response of Employing Agents to the Questionnaire by Type of Institution.	54
II. Response of North Texas State University Doctoral Graduates to the Questionnaire By Type of Degree	56
III. Degree Preference of Employing Agents Compared According to Academic Area	59
IV. Degree Preference of Employing Agents as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates Compared According to Academic Area	60
V. Degree Preference of Employing Agents Compared According to Type of School	62
VI. Degree Preference of Employing Agents as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates Compared According to Type of School	64
VII. Number of Foreign Languages Preferred by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School	66
VIII. Number of Foreign Languages Preferred by Employing Agents as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates According to Academic Area and Group of School	68
IX. Number of Semester Hours in the Major Field Above the Master's Preferred by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School	70
X. Number of Semester Hours in the Major Field Above the Master's Preferred by Employing Agents as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates According to Academic Area and Group of School	73

	Page
XI. Number of Professional Methods Courses Preferred by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School	76
XII. Number of Professional Methods Courses Preferred by Employing Agents as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates According to Academic Area and Group of School	79
XIII. Number of Years of Teaching Experience Prior to Initial Appointment after Completion of Doctoral Degree Preferred by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School	82
XIV. Number of Years of Teaching Experience Prior to Initial Appointment after Completion of Doctoral Degree Preferred by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates.	85
XV. Starting Salary for Doctoral Graduates Quoted by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School.	87
XVI. Starting Salary for Doctoral Graduates According to Academic Area and Group of School as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates.	91
XVII. Number of Years in Service for First Academic Promotion for Doctoral Graduates Quoted by Employing Agents According to Academic Area and Group of School	95
XVIII. Number of Years in Service for First Academic Promotion for Doctoral Graduates According to Academic Area and Group of School as Perceived by North Texas Doctoral Graduates	99

XIX. Degree Preference of Employing Agents
with Respect to Reputation of
Institution Conferring the Doctoral
Degree Compared According to
Academic Area and Group of School 104

XX. Degree Preference of Employing Agents
with Respect to Reputation of
Institution Conferring the Doctoral
Degree Compared According to
Academic Area and Group of School
as Perceived by North Texas
Doctoral Graduates. 107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Two hundred and fifty students are graduated each year from American colleges and universities with either a Doctor of Philosophy or a Doctor of Education degree in College Teaching with emphasis in a particular academic area (5). How successful have these graduates been in securing positions at institutions of higher education when they are competing for the same position with graduates whose Doctor of Philosophy degrees are in that particular academic area? If the rate of employment for Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching lags significantly behind that for Ph.D.'s in a particular academic area due to the fact that employing agents prefer to hire Ph.D.'s whose degrees are in an academic area over Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching, then we might be misleading our Ph.D. and Ed.D. candidates in College Teaching into believing that upon graduation they can successfully compete with other Ph.D.'s for the positions they seek. The literature in this field lacks specific facts and descriptive information regarding the hiring practices of employing agents.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was a comparison of employability of Doctors of Philosophy and Doctors of Education in College Teaching versus Doctors of Philosophy in an academic area.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the opportunities available for employment to Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching by revealing the attitudes and preferences of employing agents toward Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching versus Ph.D.'s in an academic area as exhibited by their hiring practices.

Questions

To carry out the purpose of this study, the following questions were formulated:

1. Do employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching? If so, for which of the academic areas used in the study is this true?
2. Do employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in College Teaching over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching? If so, for which of the academic areas used in the study is this true?
3. What type of school is more likely to prefer a Ph.D. in an academic area:
 - (a) Is it a junior college, a four-year college with enrollment under 5000, a four-year college with enrollment over 5000, a four-year college with a

graduate school and enrollment under 5000, or is it a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment over 5000?

- (b) Is there any difference between schools of different geographic regions?
- (c) Is it a state-supported or a private school?

4. What type of school is more likely to prefer a

Ph.D. in College Teaching over an Ed.D. in College Teaching:

- (a) Is it a junior college, a four-year college with enrollment under 5000, a four-year college with enrollment over 5000, a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment under 5000, or is it a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment over 5000?
- (b) Is there any difference between schools of different geographic locations?
- (c) Is it a state-supported or a private school?

5. In what academic areas is competence in a foreign language(s) preferred by employing agents?

6. What is the number of semester hours in the major field above the Master's preferred by employing agents?

7. Do employing agents prefer prospective teachers to have had learning theory and methodology courses?

8. How many years of teaching experience do employing agents prefer prospective teachers to have had for initial appointment after graduation?

9. Providing that the candidates' qualifications are basically the same, is the starting salary the same for Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching as it is for Ph.D.'s in an academic area?

10. Which degree-holder has a better opportunity for promotion.

11. Do employing agents prefer a Ph.D./Ed.D. in College Teaching from an institution with an excellent reputation over a Ph.D. in an academic area from a less well-known institution, if all other qualifications are held constant?

Background and Significance of the Study

As American society becomes more complex, progress in every national endeavor becomes increasingly dependent upon the advancement of research and the training of specialized personnel--unique functions performed historically by universities in the course of their graduate programs. Certain forces in our society and economy which have produced the startling growth in graduate enrollments in the past few decades will continue and even intensify in the future. The inherent complexity of our society and economy, and our interdependence with the rest of the world will continue to grow. Out of this vast process of technological, economic, and social change the demand for better information, greater understanding, and sounder judgment will produce a greater demand for greater numbers of individuals educated to the highest levels our society can attain, in addition to the simultaneous need for larger numbers of individuals educated at lower levels, for elementary and secondary school teaching and many other professions.

This year applications to graduate schools are up slightly over 1970 totals even though it is now clear that

the long climb up the ladder to the Ph.D. no longer guarantees secure footing at the top (7, p. 52). Economic recovery will provide some new jobs for these specialists, but not enough of them. Says New York University Chancellor Allan Cartter: "We have created a graduate-education and research establishment in American universities that is about 30 per cent to 50 per cent larger than we shall effectively use in the 1970's and 1980's (7, p. 55)."

This impressive but top-heavy creation is primarily due to Sputnik, which blasted off when the class of 1971 was in second grade. Thanks to the threat of Soviet dominance in science and technology, the nation's doctorate programs were vastly expanded. In 1957, about 9000 Ph.D.'s in all fields were granted in the United States. In 1971, there were more than 30,000 and unless the machinery slows down, 60,000 will be turned out annually by 1980 (7, p. 58).

All this may provide an admirable addition to the sum total of human knowledge and much personal satisfaction as well. But as far as jobs go, big numbers spell big trouble. Industrial and Government research work has been drastically cut back, and colleges and universities simply cannot begin to accommodate the new Ph.D.'s or even the old ones, for that matter. The Cooperative College Registry in Washington, D. C., a placement service for teachers, receives ten applications for every available job (9).

At the present time, colleges and universities graduating Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching are producing a group of professionals who not only are supposed to be proficient in their respective academic areas, but also 1) have had numerous learning theory courses which should make them more attuned to their students' problems in the classroom, and 2) are familiar with research designs which they could ultimately use for the betterment of their instruction. Yet, once these graduates are placed on the labor market, where they must compete with Ph.D.'s in academic areas, is it realistic to believe that the Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching have an equal opportunity for employment? Due to the vast number of graduates American colleges and universities are turning out, it is vital to appraise the situation and determine if potential candidates in College Teaching should be advised to pursue a different line of study. Unfortunately, no research has been designed specifically to determine the particular role that type of doctoral degree plays in the hiring practices of employing agents.

In a policy-capturing model relating to faculty selection in nine junior colleges, McBride (10) found that quality of recommendation, religion, and mathematics grade-point average had the greatest overall influence on employing agents. Extra-curricular activities and honors in college, and membership in professional organizations were found to have the least influence. Goforth (6) designed a study to

determine the desirable characteristics of actual and prospective college teachers as perceived by presidents and deans of selected liberal arts colleges. His two major conclusions were 1) when considered collectively, the presidents and deans expressed much concern over pedagogy. It would seem that these top administrators place much more emphasis upon the function of a teacher and teaching than they do upon research or publications. 2) The Master's degree in a particular academic area is essential for liberal arts college teachers. The doctor's degree is not absolutely necessary, although it is evident that promotion in rank and increases in salary are dependent upon continuous successful work toward that degree.

Wood (13) revealed that research, writing, and creative work were minor professional activities of respondent Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching. Research was not an ultimate objective of the respondent doctors of education. Very few Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching were employed as researchers in colleges and universities ten years after the degree had been conferred. Only in the category of magazines and journal articles was there any extensive publishing which was based on the dissertation research. Even though the Ed.D. continues to attract more individuals seeking a doctorate in the field of education than the Ph.D. degree, Ph.D.'s had out-published Ed.D.'s during the ten years following reception of the doctorate (8).

The review of the literature has shown that although there is a limited amount of information concerning the selection of faculty members in general, no research has specifically dealt with the attitudes/preferences of employing agents toward Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.

Definition of Terms

1. Differentiative attitude: Position indicating an action or feeling which reveals an unequal categorical difference in the treatment made between persons equal in training, background, and experience. For this study, a differentiative attitude toward Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching was expressed when employing agents categorically preferred for employment Ph.D. candidates in an academic area over Ph.D./Ed.D. candidates in College Teaching. In particular, a differentiative attitude prevailed if the latter's qualifications were not even considered, due to the nature of his degree.

2. Employing agents:

Administrative agent. Academic Dean or his equivalent (Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Provost for Academic Affairs, etc.) in an institution of higher education who is directly involved in the employment decision-making process.

Departmental chairman. Head of an academic department in an institution of higher education who is directly involved in the employment decision-making process.

3. Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees in College Teaching:
Degrees similar to those described in Appendix A.

4. Ph.D. degree in an academic area: Degree similar
to that described in Appendix B.

Limitations of the Study

Questionnaires were sent to 700 college, university, and junior college employing agents throughout the United States whose institutions were listed in the 1970-71 edition of the Directory of Higher Education. This study was limited to the examination of questions concerning the possible expression of differentiative attitudes toward Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching by employing agents in institutions of higher education. The lack of research in this area justified the exploratory nature of the study. While this study also attempted to cross-validate the preferences and attitudes of employing agents with the perceptions of teaching staff members regarding the hiring process, this study was limited by the fact that Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching are not employed 1) in all institutions participating in the study, and 2) in all academic areas used in the study. Therefore, this study was limited to revealing conditions expected or predicted to exist by the attitudes of employing agents in the participating institutions, and those experienced by College Teaching graduates at possibly different institutions from those used in the study. This study was subject to the various limitations

associated with data collected by mailed questionnaires, such as the failure of a respondent to answer all items.

While the specific findings of this study were limited to the responses of the employing agents of randomly selected institutions and North Texas State University doctoral graduates in the selected fields used for this study, it was believed that the results would be of interest to graduate students contemplating enrolling in a Ph.D./Ed.D. program in College Teaching and to future researchers who might wish to extend the knowledge in this area.

Basic Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the necessary data could be secured through the survey instrument and a review of the literature.

2. It was assumed that all responses received from the various colleges, universities, and junior colleges reflected the actual preferences of the employing agents concerned.

3. It was assumed that all responses received from the North Texas doctoral graduates used in the study reflected the conditions which actually exist in their various institutions.

4. It was assumed that the employing agents and North Texas doctoral graduates used in the study would provide an adequate cross-validation of conditions prevailing in American junior colleges, colleges, and universities.

5. It was assumed that a return of four hundred employing agents would provide an adequate representative sample of the population.

6. It was assumed that a return of twenty-five North Texas doctoral graduates would provide an adequate representative sample of the population.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter II is a presentation of the related research. The methods and procedures for the collection of the data are described in detail in Chapter III. The quantitative findings are presented and analyzed with respect to the questions posed in the study in Chapter IV. The subjective comments of the respondents are presented in Chapter V. Chapter VI is devoted to the summary of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Berwald, Helen D., "Attitudes Toward Women College Teachers in Institutions of Higher Education Accredited by the North Central Association," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., 1962.
2. Brown, David G., Academic Labor Markets: A Report Submitted to the Office of Manpower, Automation, Training, Department of Labor, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina, 1965.
3. _____, The Market for College Teachers, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1965.
4. Caplow, Theodore and Reece McGee, The Academic Marketplace, New York, Basic Books, 1959.
5. Chase, John L., Doctoral Study: A Report to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1970.
6. Goforth, John, The Career Decisions of College Teachers, Atlanta, Georgia, Southern Regional Educational Board, 1969.
7. "Graduates and Jobs: A Grave New World," Time, XCVIII (May, 1971), 49-59.
8. Hoffman, Lindsey, Doctorate Production in United States Universities, 1929-1967, Washington, National Education Association, 1965.
9. Maul, Ray, Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1963-64 and 1964-65, Washington, Research Division, National Education Association, 1965.
10. McBride, Lewis B., "The Literature of Higher Education, 1965," The Educational Record, V (Winter, 1966), 18-49.

11. Simpson, L. A., "A Study of Employing Agents' Attitudes Toward Academic Women in Higher Education," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, Phila., Penn., 1969.
12. Wilson, Logan, The Academic Man, A Study in the Sociology of a Profession, London, Oxford University Press, 1942.
13. Wood, Carvel W., "An Investigation of Three Assumptions Upon Which Doctoral Dissertations in Education are Based," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1967.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In recent years many individuals and groups have studied the need for and the supply of teachers for American colleges and universities. These analyses of a momentous social problem have produced both differing bodies of facts and widely varying and sometimes conflicting conclusions. Unfortunately, few if any analyses have undertaken the task of contrasting the preparation of college teachers by type of doctoral degree conferred.

There are two major types of doctoral degrees: earned doctorates and honorary doctorates. Earned doctorates are further divided into two distinct types -- the research degree and the professional or practitioner degree. The distinguishing feature of the research degree is that it normally requires a lengthy scholarly dissertation which is usually designed to make a substantial contribution to the existing body of knowledge in its field. The two most important earned research doctorates are the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Education (40).

Historical Background of the Earned Research Doctorates

The term doctor is derived from the Latin "docere", which means "to teach". Its essential and earliest meaning

is simply "one who teaches" (67). Later, however, the word came to be used for persons who did not practice the art of teaching. The term doctor was applied by the early Romans to those who gave public lectures on philosophical subjects. It was one of the titles used in the early church for teachers in the catechetical schools, who were called "doctores audientium". Some of the most learned teachers were termed doctors of the church, "doctores ecclesiae" (34, 40, 59, 71).

The beginning of the twelfth century inspired a widespread desire for instruction. To meet the demand, many teachers set themselves up to provide tutelage. Any teacher who gathered a number of students around him was called a doctor or a master. To teach at or near the cathedral schools in Northern Europe and England, the "licentia docendi", the license to teach, was granted on evidence that the applicant had knowledge of the subjects which he proposed to teach (60). This evidence usually was in the form of a recommendation from the doctor (teacher) under whom the applicant had studied. In Italy and elsewhere in Southern Europe, academic, scholastic, or pedagogical guilds were formed which adopted regulations governing the admission of new doctors or masters into their ranks. The rules included stipulations concerning training and examinations. The teaching license was awarded only after the requirements had been met. It was through such supervision that the original teaching license became the prototype of the university degree.

It was, in a fashion, the first doctor's degree, since it established a man as a "doctor" on the basis of a set pattern of training and accomplishments (48, 53, 60, 67).

By the years from about 1130 to 1160, two centers of instruction had attained size, prestige, and organization to be termed universities in approximately the modern sense of the word. These schools, in Paris and in Bologna, were acknowledged by reputation and general consent to be "studia generalia", that is, schools of far more than local significance. Because of this recognized excellence, a doctor of Paris or Bologna was authorized to instruct in any center. He was granted the "jus ubicunque docenti", the right to teach anywhere (60). Most of the universities founded after the three earliest (Paris, Bologna, Oxford) were certified as universities by a papal or imperial bull. Such an edict also granted the privilege of conferring the "jus ubicunque docenti". Although the guilds had made "doctors" of students, the first university doctorates were probably the Doctor of Civil Law and the Doctor of Canon Law awarded by Bologna in the twelfth century for the completion of its courses of study in law (41, 51, 59).

At this time, the titles master and doctor were used interchangeably for graduates in the various fields, each indicating that the holder was qualified to give instruction to students (41, 60, 67). Gradually, the doctor's degree moved into a position of superiority to the master's degree, the

master of arts in many schools becoming prerequisite to a doctorate in the other fields. In a number of universities, an advanced curriculum in the faculty of arts was inaugurated, its name being changed to the faculty of philosophy. A doctor of Philosophy degree began to be awarded, sometimes being combined with the master of arts, especially in the German universities. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, the doctorate or mastership had become a highly-significant acknowledgement of intellectual nobility. The title of doctor thus began to take on a broader connotation than that of teacher. It came to signify a learned man in a given field of endeavor. By the advent of the sixteenth century, doctorates were being awarded or recognized in civil law, canon law, both laws, theology, medicine, arts, philosophy, mathematics, logic, rhetoric, grammar, surgery, music, and even astrology. As time progressed, educational authorities came to recognize the desirability for the university professor to be a research investigator as well as a teacher. Original work became a part of university training (51, 60, 67).

Although baccalaureate degrees have been conferred in the United States for more than three centuries, the Ph.D. as an American earned degree is only a century old (51, 53). Prior to 1861, young Americans desiring the most advanced training in formal scholarship went to the major European universities -- usually German -- to secure their Ph.D. degrees.

The first Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees earned in the United States were awarded in 1861 to three persons by Yale University (34, 41). The degree was based largely on the German pattern, and required a two-year course of study beyond the bachelor's degree. The course comprised a year of residence, language examinations in Greek and Latin, a thesis presenting the results of an original investigation, and a final examination. Thirteen American institutions began to grant the Ph.D. as an earned degree before 1880 and have continued to do so up to the present time. Standards for the Ph.D. developed only gradually during the nineteenth century, and many institutions which conferred it as an earned degree lacked the staff and library or laboratory facilities essential for intensive graduate work. In some institutions the work for the doctorate was done wholly or in part by correspondence (7, 10, 25, 51, 59, 72).

The only other earned doctorate of the research type which has secured wide recognition and use by a large number of leading American universities is the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.). Credit for the establishment of this relatively new degree belongs to the Harvard University Graduate School of Education, which was organized in 1920 and immediately provided for the new doctorate--it conferred its first Ed.D. degrees on a class of five men in 1921 (67). The first Ph.D. in Education appears to have been given by Clark University in 1892 (67). In 1891, however, New York University's

School of Pedagogy, organized in 1890, conferred the degree of Doctor of Pedagogy (Ped.D.), which required advanced courses and a dissertation. In 1922, the University Council approved a change of name to the School of Education, and under a new dean, it was given the right to present candidates for the Ph.D. because of the increasing popularity of that degree in university circles. In 1934, it was authorized for the first time to also confer the Ed.D. The Ped.D. is no longer conferred as an earned degree in the United States. In 1968, at least fifty-seven institutions were conferring both the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. in the field of education. In such cases the emphasis tended to be greater on professional aspects for the Ed.D., on research aspects for the Ph.D. In practice, however, the distinctions between the two degrees are shadowy or nonexistent. Holders of the Ed.D. degree are often found doing pure research while those with the Ph.D. degree are teaching or doing administrative work. In some cases the chief difference seems to be determined by whether a candidate has a reading knowledge of one or more foreign languages (12, 14, 29, 35, 48, 69).

Rationale for Earned Research Doctorates

Reputedly, the most important doctorate of the research type in American institutions of higher education is the Doctor of Philosophy (40). It is now the universally recognized badge of advanced scholarship, although it no longer has any implication of "philosophy" in the literal sense.

As the Doctor of Philosophy program has evolved over the years it has come to embody additional requirements which add up to the demonstration of general scholarly competence in the individual's chosen field. A total of three to five years of study beyond the bachelor's degree is ordinarily spent in the attainment of the Doctor of Philosophy. Sometimes a master's degree is taken along the way, sometimes not. The curriculum most often involves required residence on the university campus, demonstration of competence in one or more foreign languages, one or two years of graduate-level course work in the chosen field of specialization, graduate course work in one or more cognate or minor fields, sometimes the passing of general qualifying examinations, and almost invariably the passing of comprehensive examinations in the individual's chosen field of specialization. Only after the doctoral student completes these general requirements is he usually "admitted to candidacy" and thereby formally authorized to undertake the second phase, that of writing the doctoral dissertation (52, 58, 65).

Much has been written about the Ph.D., mostly in criticism. The fear of the Ph.D. octopus dates back to William James, who, in 1903, criticized the practice of universities restricting professorial appointments to Ph.D. holders. His proposals for reform were that graduate schools should "give the doctorate as a matter of course, just as they give the bachelor's degree, for a due amount of time

spent in patient labor in a special department of learning, whether the man be a brilliantly gifted individual or not"; that universities should look for faculty of substance rather than for those with doctoral titles, and that highly qualified students should set the example of refusing to take a higher degree in order to freely follow their more immediate intellectual aims (50, p. 345). Jacques Barzun argued that "as long as college catalogues are printed with degrees following names, and people believe that all Ph.D.'s are created equal, these letters will exercise a baneful influence on American higher education (9, p. 67)." He suggested giving doctoral students their degree immediately after the orals with a passable essay or thesis. Later the students could submit his published writings for a second Ph.D. with honors (10).

At the core of the never-ending dispute on the merits of the Ph.D. program is the argument as to whether the Ph.D. is a degree that exists primarily to train research scholars in the traditional arts or sciences or whether it should also encompass the preparation of college teachers and advanced professionals in general. The purist argues for the former. As Prior points out, the Ph.D. program possesses a clear logic and propriety when it is centered on the production of the learned scholar "with emphasis on depth of knowledge and on the cultivation of those tools and habits of mind which enable a man to go beyond what he has learned

and to exercise independence in the understanding of his chosen branch of knowledge and in advancing it (52, p. 178).
If these structures limit the Ph.D. program, many current Ph.D. programs are probably misnamed. Hollis points out that "almost every graduate faculty in the nation has an able and articulate contingent who follow the lead of Abraham Flexner and Norman Foerster in declaring that the Ph.D. degree should not be given for work in home economics, library science, physical education, speech, and a score of other fields that are semiprofessional or even more narrowly vocational in nature (66, p. 425)."

On the other hand, since college and university teaching is the major goal of Ph.D. recipients in all but a few fields where governmental and industrial service draw a large share of the graduates (16, p. 104), is one safe in assuming that the Ph.D. is a degree which prepares for careers as teachers and as professionals as well as for scholarship? It is given in virtually all fields of learning within our universities and clearly will continue to be so offered. Carmichael (16, p. 136) exemplifies the separatist approach in arguing for parallel but equal Doctor of Philosophy programs, one abbreviated Ph.D. for research and one abbreviated D.Phil. for careers as teachers. The arguments for a doctoral program minimizing the research dissertation frequently rely upon statistical evidence that most Ph.D.'s publish little after they have exhausted the mine of their dissertation.

For instance, Jernegan (76, p. 136) estimated that only one-quarter of history Ph.D.'s are consistent producers.

Most faculty and administrators wholeheartedly agree with Schmitt (66, p. 136) that teaching and research must go together, although in different mixtures and patterns for different individuals. Jencks and Riesman (51, p. 238) argue that the teaching-research dilemma is a false one, the real problem being to marry the two enterprises. Is the American Ph.D. program broad enough to build into it the necessary elements to make it suitable for the preparation of teachers and professionals as well as of research scholars? Many departments are now requiring supervised teaching experience for all their doctoral students and this is all to the good if it does not serve as a means of providing cheap instruction for the undergraduate. If formal courses in education are thought desirable, the department has the option of requiring students to take them. A department has the right to broaden the concept of the dissertation to include expository as well as research treatments of a topic. Therefore, the real question at this point is whether the faculties of the individual departments will face up to the multivariate careers of the products of their doctoral programs and build in the necessary flexibility.

The Ed.D. is the only other earned research doctorate that has received extensive recognition. This degree represents professional preparation for positions of leadership in elementary, secondary, and higher education on both

the practical and theoretical levels. Original research is considered a necessary part of this preparation. Degrees are awarded in administration, agricultural education, art education, business education, elementary education, educational administration, guidance and counseling, educational psychology, home economics education, health education, higher education, college teaching, music education, physical education, religious education, science education, speech education, secondary education, and other specialties (67).

Theoretically, the Ed.D. is a parallel degree to the Ph.D., has similar requirements, and is grouped with the Ph.D. in graduate school statistics. The Doctor of Education (Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education) usually takes from three to five years of study beyond the bachelor's level. A master's degree may or may not be taken as an intermediate step. The curriculum usually involves one academic year in residence, one or two years of advanced course work in education and in an academic area(s) of specialization, qualifying examinations over the basic required education courses, a comprehensive examination over the specialized academic area(s), knowledge of a foreign language(s) if required in the candidate's degree plan, a research project, and a thesis based on it, and a final examination. The Ph.D. program in education usually differs from the curriculum for the Ed.D. in that for the former, on the average, one of the

following requirements must also be satisfied: foreign language competency, advanced statistical course work, or computer programming (25, 70).

Unfortunately, whether correctly or not, students and faculty alike regard the Ed.D. as an inferior Ph.D. and will opt for the latter if given the choice, settling for the former only when that is the only possible doctoral award. The reasons credited for establishing the alternate doctorate in education are various. For one, a Doctor of Education program administered by the school of education allows the admission of students considered as competent and promising by the faculty in education but whose academic qualifications are such that they cannot be admitted by the graduate school controlling the Ph.D. program. This is the case at Teachers College, Columbia University, where Ed.D. applicants can be admitted directly by the college instead of through the Graduate School of Columbia University as is the case for Ph.D. students (41, 75).

A second reason for the two tracks is as a means of circumventing the foreign language requirement of the graduate school. In a study of the doctorate in education by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education cited by Eells (41, p. 141), most institutions giving this degree had no language requirement in contrast to the parallel Ph.D. programs on the same campus. The third common function of the Ed.D. is to provide a wider range of

independent projects than is possible under the traditional Ph.D. requirements of a dissertation based upon original research. In the AACTE study, a number of universities reported that they accepted, in lieu of the dissertation for the Ed.D., a field study or some other extensive terminal project.

The fourth use of the Ed.D. is to provide a doctorate in a subject-matter field for students who pass the comprehensive examinations for the Ph.D., but who submit an expository dissertation on some aspect of teaching that subject rather than a research dissertation on the subject itself. For example, at the University of Michigan, where students working in the School of Education normally elect the Ph.D., the Ed.D. is more commonly taken by students in English, mathematics, and music who take a few hours of professional education courses and write a pedagogical thesis.

A fifth objective that can be accomplished with the Ed.D. degree is the reduction of the time required to earn the doctorate. The real saving of time in the Ed.D. program lies in the fact that a student coming back to graduate school from employment in a public school system can often meet the Ed.D. requirements more quickly than he can meet superficially equivalent requirements for the Ph.D. Therefore, one can readily see that all of the above reasons could contribute to making the Ed.D. a second class Ph.D. and to the generally low status that the Doctor of Education degree has in the academic world (3, 10, 17, 35, 59, 71, 72).

What is the solution? On the one hand, administrators argue that the Ed.D./Ph.D. in College Teaching, for instance, lacks depth/breadth in academic area of specialization and that little if anything is to be gained by completing professional education courses (learning theory, psychology of learning, etc.). On the other hand, students (in particular, first and second year undergraduates) bemoan the fact that there is little if any communication between themselves and their professors; they are especially aware of the absence and/or unavailability of that professor who is involved with a new research project or major publication. Ironically, administrators balk at doctorates in education, yet it has been shown that these have high interests in people and want to be close to them and can easily establish lines of communication between their students and themselves. The education doctorate participates heavily in individual student conferences, public service within and without their institutions, and the use of laboratory and individual instruction techniques to a much greater degree than his academic area counterpart (67, p. 15).

The Doctoral Degree as a Means to Employment

The United States' reaction to Russia's tremendous scientific achievement evidenced by the launching of Sputnik was a reassessment of the nation's manpower needs for researchers, developers, and teachers. At the time, manpower estimates predicted that by 1970 there would be a drastic

shortage of all types of highly trained specialists. In the 1960's, both government and college officials continued to estimate needs for greater and greater productivity from the graduate schools. Federal aid for "centers of excellence" and for graduate students induced comprehensive state colleges to embark upon advanced graduate work. Federal funds stimulated, but state funds largely underwrote, the numerous new doctorate institutions that came to exist in the 1960's. Some were former teachers colleges, some state colleges, and a few were small universities. Consequently, we have now reached the point where every six years the number of Ph.D.'s produced doubles; about one per cent of the babies born twenty-seven years ago gets a Ph.D. Projections indicate that by 1980 the annual award rate will be somewhere between 60,000 and 70,000 (18, 19, 20, 21, 22).

Unfortunately, the shortage of Ph.D.'s that characterized the past thirty years is over and probably won't be experienced again. In early years the rising level of Federal R&D expenditures permitted the rapid absorption of new doctoral graduates, particularly in the sciences, in defense-related industry, or Government programs. Universities which used to employ 50 per cent of the new Ph.D.'s, now employ 35-40 per cent, and by the end of this decade, only 25 per cent or less of the new doctorates will enter college teaching (1, 24, 36, 46, 61).

There are three basic factors that contribute to the demand for new faculty: replacement, expansion of higher

education, and improvement of the quality of faculty. As far as the first factor is concerned--the lifetime of a student in the university is four years; the lifetime of a faculty member is forty. This factor of ten produces the effect of faculty pileup. When the doctoral production rises to the minimum number of six per cent of the adult population, we can retain the present retirement policies if Ph.D.'s teach every class of every grade down through kindergarten. Of course, this leaves minimum employment possibilities for the bachelor's recipients as well as the master's. The second factor, the expansion factor, depends on the size of the college age group, and this group is growing at a smaller rate, and will shrink by more than 2.75 million in the 1980 to 1988 period. At the peak of expansion, 1964 and 1965, we needed to hire five teachers for every one that died or retired--that is, one as a replacement and four to meet growing enrollments. For the 1970-77 period this ratio will probably drop to 3:1; in the 1978-85 period it promises to be less than 2:1 (21, p. 128). It is somewhat ironic that roughly the same date in history produced, through Sputnik, the stimulant to Ph.D. production and at the same time, through the Pill, the depressant to population production. Another factor affecting the expansion rate is the college enrollment and retention rate. The enrollment rate which yearly increased ten per cent in the 60's, will slow down to 2-3 per cent in the 70's. It is doubtful that a greater percentage of high

school graduates will enter college or that a new influx of non-whites will significantly affect college enrollment. It is also unlikely that many of those who enter a junior college will end up in a senior institution. Whereas expansion accounted for three-fourths of all teachers hired in the last decade, the demand for college teachers will steadily decline in the future. The third factor, the improvement of the quality of faculty, remains relatively constant; it accounts for a very limited amount of new teachers (15, 22, 37, 78).

Consequently, what direction is the doctoral degree going to take in a decade where a glutted market exists or will likely develop? Logically, it should be in the direction of effecting a change in the preparation of college teachers (i.e., by more adequately preparing Ph.D.'s for teaching careers and/or improving the status of the Doctorate in Education by convincing administrators that education doctoral candidates are adequately prepared and probably better suited to teach first and second year undergraduates) because up to the present time there has been little if any attention given to the strategies of effective transmittal of learning to the range and quantity of college students we now have with us.

Presently, public anger is being aimed at higher education due to the consequences of a wide gulf between what the public thinks it is paying for and what faculty

members think they are paid to do. People pay taxes and tuition to provide undergraduate education for their sons and daughters; the academic profession assumes that it is paid to do research and advance knowledge. Indeed, the reward system pays most to those who care least about undergraduate teaching. Specifically designed to train researchers, the Ph.D. degree is so narrow and specialized that even industrial research directors complain of its inflexibility. The research Ph.D. degree is inappropriate for most college teaching jobs in this country, especially at the lower division level. More and more research specialists unprepared for teaching will be inundating state colleges, liberal arts colleges, and two-year community colleges where Ph.D. training is irrelevant to the realities of most classrooms. Subject matter mastery, manifested in degrees, advanced work, in the very occasional scholarly article, counts heavily in the evaluation of competence. The inadequacy of graduate study as a preparation for teaching has arisen from: 1) the false assumption that every Ph.D. candidate is both potentially and by inclination one of those future "high priests of learning" whose life will be devoted exclusively to the advancement of knowledge; 2) the failure to realize that, to the college teacher by vocation, even the most exciting research is primarily a way of preserving and increasing the vitality of his teaching and the intensity of his intellectual life; and 3) the failure to create Ph.D. programs sufficiently meaningful to serve the interests of both groups (34, p. 344).

Students on any campus can be heard to say, almost daily: "He sure knows his subject, but he can't teach." The prevailing belief seems to be that when instructors are employed, they are qualified to step right in to the job. They are considered qualified when they have met the credential requirements, have appropriate degrees, and perhaps have some experience teaching somewhere. New instructors are hired as if they are finished products, wanting only some classroom exposure, perhaps some tips on do's and don'ts from an old hand. Many present college teachers consider teaching as an art, and, therefore, preparation other than disciplinary specialization, plus a little acquaintance with a few other fields, is useless. You either have the art or you don't. For those who don't, a conspiracy of the genes has denied them. The Aristotelian reasoning upon occasion seems to run: "I am a college teacher; I am successful; I had no preparation especially designed for teaching; therefore, others do not need particular preparation to teach in college (if they are similar to me)." One professor said recently, "A sincere attempt to teach must come as a consequence of a desire to impart knowledge to others; such a desire is innate and requires only interest in the field of study to promulgate it." The President's Commission on Higher Education reports that "college teaching is the only major learned profession for which there does not exist a well-defined program of preparation directed toward developing the skills which it is

essential for the practitioner to possess (51, p. 27)."

Over ten years ago Earl McGrath, the former Federal Commissioner of Education, wrote and spoke often about the need for a college teaching profession whose members possess appropriate teacher-training degrees (56, p. 223). As we look toward the next decade, it would be tragic, if not disastrous, for the surplus products of our research-oriented graduate schools to end up teaching in the junior and community colleges. These are institutions which require the highest caliber of teaching, attracting as they do students with a very wide range of interests and abilities. The open-door, four-year colleges are just as vulnerable. Unless teaching as a profession for the doctorate-holder becomes as accepted and as honored a mode of life as research, and is rewarded appropriately, it seems improbable that undergraduate education will be improved and even probable that junior college education will be impaired.

In preparing a Ph.D. for his research job or the research portion of his job, we ground him well in the substance of his discipline and make certain that he has acquired some mastery of the tools required to conduct research in that discipline. Rare is the scholar who would question the wisdom of training in research techniques and statistics for a potential researcher. A knowledge of his subject alone, even if it could be acquired without an understanding of the most effective procedures for conducting research in

that discipline, would be of little use to the potential researcher. But what about the prospective college teacher? We have also grounded him in the substance of his discipline, but we have done little to provide him with the teaching skills that will enable him to perform his function most effectively. In both cases, we provide him with mastery of his subject, but only the researcher is given preparation in the methodological tools of his work. The prospective college teacher is provided no comparable tools for that function.

Is this a contradiction? Some would insist that the teacher who is without understanding of the skills required in teaching is as ill-prepared as the researcher without knowledge of research procedures peculiar to his subject. Why is it that graduate programs have not included preparation in the skills of teaching? Some administrators insist that such preparation is not needed--that one who knows his subject can teach it. The evidence to the contrary is overwhelming. In a recent survey of college presidents, 77.9 per cent stated that holders of the doctor's degree were "uninformed about the nature of undergraduate instruction (18, p. 13)."

Both doctoral candidates and graduate faculties have resisted courses in teaching methods offered by schools of education, which they consider to be unscholarly, without substance, and of little value. Many agree with Everett Walters when he states that, regrettably, graduate faculties are not interested in training teaching assistants (77, p. 319).

A similar complaint is voiced by John Weiss: "Perhaps the most serious defects in undergraduate teaching stem ultimately from the refusal of the national guilds of scholars to consider teaching their major professional responsibility (74, p. 213)." President Bruce Dearing of the State University of New York at Binghamton is quoted from Current Issues in Higher Education, 1965: "As a group, college teachers have been loftily contemptuous of courses in education and absurdly vain about their innocence of any formal instruction in curriculum design, testing techniques, and formal classroom procedures." He notes a characteristic inflexibility in the resistance to new techniques and technologies and deplores the "mystique of amateurism" that surrounds college teaching (69, p. 78).

Since few graduate professors outside education are going to require their graduate students to take such courses, a solution must be sought elsewhere. Surely there must be college teachers in almost all disciplines who are sufficiently interested in the art of teaching to devote the time and energy required to develop understanding of the subject. It must start with a person who is vitally interested in the enterprise. If he is already teaching, this may mean concerted independent study, just as many scholars have done as quantitative methods increasingly became required research tools in their disciplines. When a faculty or department decides that it should prepare its

Ph.D. candidates for teaching, it will take steps to ensure that this preparation is a part of the graduate student's program. The first ingredient is a course either in the student's own department, or in some other of that department's choosing, which is designed to prepare the individual for teaching his specialty. As part of the curriculum they may include a course in learning theory, taken either in psychology or education, and perhaps a course in logic and semantics or the nature of knowledge in the philosophy department. In addition to formalized preparation, the individual might participate, during his own experience as a graduate teaching assistant or instructor, in a seminar in the art of teaching his discipline, under the direction of a master teacher in his department. Thus, his own experience as a novice in college teaching, combined with formal examination of the art of teaching, will further enhance the potential college teacher's skill.

The demand for improved college training is growing (11, 18, 19, 20, 21, 38, 56, 69, 70). During the past ten years the lay press has spent thousands of type columns of scathing attacks upon the public schools, some would say to good cause. There are evidences that a similar campaign against poor college teaching is underway in the public, especially more literate, press. While there is every reason to believe that the academic community will not, and probably cannot, move quickly enough to improve college teaching to

meet this attack, it can, if it moves soon, reduce it. On the other hand, even though we want to avoid such attacks, our basic purpose is to bring about improved teaching. A systematic procedure, as described here, is one way to approach it.

A parallel suggestion is to acknowledge the worth of the Doctorate in Education and thereby improve its status in the academic community; since this is an established earned research type of doctoral degree, it would seem more sensible to do this than to introduce an entirely new program such as the D.A. or the Candidate's Degree. Programs leading to the Ph.D./Ed.D. in College Teaching, for instance, should be designed for those who will assume roles of responsibility, leadership, and technical expertise in higher education, and should include exhaustive training for high competence in teaching, counseling, and other areas of specialization in which elevated levels of competence are desirable and obtainable. Both general and specialized knowledge should be required, with the candidate able to demonstrate broad ability in his profession as well as within his academic area of specialty, but with major emphasis upon the specialized field. Research and statistical skills appropriate to the needs of college teachers should be acquired at the pre-M.A. level. In addition, lengthy periods of closely supervised on-the-job internship and residency should be undertaken concurrently with advanced course work, and taught in large

measure by successful practitioners, wherein the candidate's competence in reality situations might be accurately adjudged by persons senior to him in experience and expertise.

Many things must be done to improve the image, status, and competence of modern educational practitioners. Among those things is straightening out the muddle of doctoral training which seems to be largely inappropriate and in thousands of cases grossly unfair to the practicing educator. We also need to eradicate the image held by subject field instructors that education courses are associated with nonsense learning, repetition, and learning to run an obsolete movie projector. The fashion of deprecating education courses may be partly due to the close association with elementary and secondary schools, but for whatever reasons and however well- or ill-deserved, schools of education are the best sources to provide some of the technical and theoretical knowledge that will help provide teaching competence (2, 5, 15, 36, 39, 43, 78).

Summary

This chapter has traced the development of the doctorate (Ph.D. and Ed.D.) from its inception to the present time. It has given the raison d'être for each degree and at the same time described the pros and cons, advantages and disadvantages of each. Since we are entering a period when the doctoral production rate has begun to exceed the demand and since the majority of doctoral

graduates look to the colleges and universities for employment, and since the range of differences and the rate of attrition among students is widening, we seem justified in exacting a higher employment fee by way of academic training, performance, and capability from those who would call themselves college teachers.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, Richard P., The Outlook from the University: The Sciences and the Humanities, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
2. Adkins, Edwin P., "The Federal Government and Higher Education," The Educational Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 423-27.
3. Albright, A. D. and John E. Barrows, Preparing College Teachers: A Project Report, Lexington, Kentucky, The University of Kentucky, 1959.
4. American Association of Junior Colleges, Preparing Two-Year College Teachers for the 70's, Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.
5. Arden, Eugene, "Faculty as Teachers," The Educational Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 447-52.
6. Arlt, Gustave, "The First Ph.D.'s Under Title IV," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (Winter, 1963), 241-49.
7. Atkinson, Carroll, Pro and Con of the Ph.D., Boston, Meador Publishing Co., 1945.
8. Barzun, Jacques, Teacher in America, Boston, Little, Brown, 1945.
9. _____, The American University, New York, Harper and Row, 1968.
10. Berelson, Bernard, Graduate Education in the United States, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960.
11. Blegen, Theodore C., "How Can Graduate Schools Increase the Supply of College Teachers?" Journal of Higher Education, XXX (March, 1959), 127-33.
12. Brickman, William W. and Stanley Lehrer (eds.), A Century of Higher Education, New York, Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962.
13. Brown, David G., The Market for College Teachers, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

14. Brown, Laurence D. and J. Marlowe Slater, The Doctorate in Education, Washington, The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.
15. Cardozier, V. R., "Preparing College Teachers," Improving College and University Teaching, XVI (Spring, 1968), 131-33.
16. Carmichael, Oliver C., Graduate Education: A Critique and a Program, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1961.
17. Cartter, Allan M., An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education, New York, Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1966.
18. _____, "A New Look at the Supply of College Teachers," Educational Record, IV (Summer, 1965), 267-77.
19. _____, "Future Faculty: Needs and Resources," Improving College Teaching, Lee, Calvin T., ed., Washington, American Council on Education, 1967, 113-35.
20. _____, Graduate Education in a Decade of Radical Change, Berkeley, California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.
21. _____, The After-Effects of Putting the Blind Eye to the Telescope, Chicago, American Association of Higher Education, 1970.
22. _____, "The Supply and Demand of College Teachers," Journal of Human Resources, I (October, 1966), 22-38.
23. Cartter, Allan M. and Robert Farrell, "Higher Education in the Last Third of the Century," Educational Record, IV (Summer, 1965), 119-28.
24. Case, Chester H., Beyond Evaluation: The Quality Control Model of Evaluation and the Developmental Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1971.
25. Christie, Dan E., The Development of Doctoral Programs by the Small Liberal Arts College, Brunswick, Maine, Bowdoin College, 1967.
26. Commission on the Training and Utilization of Advanced Students of Mathematics, "Report on the Training of Teachers in Mathematics," American Mathematical Monthly, LVII (May, 1965), 260-65.

27. Cordasco, Francesco, Daniel Coit and the Protean Ph.D., Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1960.
28. Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, The Doctor's Degree in Professional Fields: Joint Statements by the Association of Graduate Schools and the Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1966.
29. _____, The Doctor of Philosophy Degree, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1964.
30. _____, New Doctor of Philosophy Programs, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1965.
31. _____, The Ph.D. in Transition, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1967.
32. _____, The Preparation of Junior College Teachers, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1967.
33. _____, Teachers for Junior Colleges, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1966.
34. Counelis, James Steve, editor, To Be A Phoenix: The Education Professoriate, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.
35. Deener, David R. New Directions for the Ph.D., Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
36. Dunham, E. Alden, Rx for Higher Education: Doctor of Arts Degree, Chicago, American Association of Higher Education, 1970.
37. Dunham, Ralph E., Teaching Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1966.
38. Dunlop, Richard S., "Not Enough Doctors in the Schoolhouse," Journal of Secondary Education, LVIII (February, 1968), 65-69.

39. Eells, Walter C., Degrees in Higher Education, Washington, The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
40. Eells, Walter C. and Harold A. Haswell, Academic Degrees, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1960.
41. Garrison, Roger H., Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, Washington, The American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
42. Glass, John F. and Judith Glass, "Improving Graduate Education," The Educational Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 439-46.
43. Glenny, Lyman, Doctoral Planning for the 1970's, Berkeley, California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.
44. Haggerty, Melvin E., "The Professional Training of College Teachers," The North Central Association Quarterly, II (Summer, 1927), 108-23.
45. Hansen, Harold P., The Ph.D. Surplus -- Realities and Illusions, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
46. Heiss, Ann M., The Preparation of College and University Teachers, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, University of California, 1968.
47. Hofstadter, Richard and Wilson Smith, American Higher Education: A Documentary History, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
48. Hollis, Ernest V., Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs, Washington, American Council on Education, 1945.
49. James, William, Ph.D. Octopus -- In Memories and Studies, New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1917.
50. Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution, Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968.

51. Lady, R. Andrew, "Honoris Causa, An Examination of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (October, 1967), 197-205.
52. Malden, Henry, On the Origin of Universities and Academic Degrees, London, John Taylor, 1835.
53. Mathematical Association of America, Qualifications for a College Faculty in Mathematics, Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics, Berkeley, University of California, 1967.
54. McGrath, Earl J., The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.
55. _____, The Quantity and Quality of College Teachers, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.
56. "M.A.?, M.Phil.?, D.A.?, C.D.?, Ph.D.?: Intermediate Graduate Degrees," Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Languages Association, I (Summer, 1967), 1-39.
57. National Academy of Sciences, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities, 1958-66, Washington, National Academy of Sciences, 1967.
58. Pfnister, Allan O., The Academic Origins of College Faculties: Sources of Advanced Degrees, The Doctorate, Vol. II, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.
59. Rashdall, Hastings, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 2nd. ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1936.
60. Reitz, J. Wayne, The Outlook from the Federal Government, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
61. Report of the Committee on Policies in Graduate Education, "Doctor's and Master's -- Good and Bad," The Association of Graduate Schools, New York, 1957.
62. Robertson, Neville and Jack K. Syster, The Doctorate in Education, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1971.

63. Rogers, James A., Staffing American Colleges and Universities, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1967.
64. Rosenberg, Ralph P., "The First American Doctor of Philosophy Degree," Ventures, VI (Winter, 1966), 31-37.
65. Schmitt, Hans A., "Teaching and Research: Companions or Adversaries?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXVI (March, 1965), 419-27.
66. Schweitzer, George K., The Doctorate, Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas, 1965.
67. Simon, Kenneth A. and Marie G. Fullam, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1976-77, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1967.
68. Skilling, Hugh H., Do You Teach? Views on College Teaching, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
69. Skinner, B. F., The Technology of Teaching, New York, Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968.
70. Spolding, Willard and Leslie Wilbur, Approaches to Preparing Prospective College Teachers, Sacramento, California, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1968.
71. Spurr, Stephen H., Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
72. Storr, Richard J., The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
73. Torrey, George N. and Richard P. Finn, "Let's Stop Apologizing for Degrees in Education," School and Community, LVI (March, 1970), 35-52.
74. Wahlquist, John T., Innovations in the Preparation of College Teachers, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1970.

75. Walters, Everett, editor, Graduate Education Today, Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.
76. Whaley, W. Gordon, "American Academic Degrees," The Educational Record, LVII (Summer, 1966), 525-37.
77. Wolfe, Dael, America's Resources of Specialized Talent: A Current Appraisal and a Look Ahead, Washington, President's Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, 1954.
78. Wortham, Mary, "The Case for a Doctor of Arts Degree: A View from Junior College Faculty," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LIII (December, 1967), 372-89.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the opportunities available for employment to Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching by revealing the attitudes/preferences of employing agents toward Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching versus Ph.D.'s in an academic area as exhibited by their hiring practices. In keeping with the purpose of the study, an attempt was made to cross-validate these attitudes/preferences of employing agents with the perceptions of North Texas State University doctoral graduates with regard to the hiring process. In an effort to accomplish the stated purpose of this study, the following procedures and methodology were employed.

Development of the Questionnaire

Recent professional periodicals, books, and related studies were reviewed to compile a comprehensive list of concepts believed vital in determining hiring practices of employing agents. A questionnaire, containing twelve items embodying these concepts and specifically designed to answer the questions which had been posed for this study and any additional questions which a jury of bona fide employing agents suggested to be appropriate, was developed.

A questionnaire was used to collect the data for this study because of the wide geographical area which had to be covered in order to sample preferences of employing agents.

After completion of the questionnaire, the next step was the selection of a panel of five judges to test the validity of the items contained in the research instrument. In order to avoid contaminating the population for the major aspect of the study, employing agents from institutions which had been eliminated from consideration in the study were chosen. This panel consisted of three departmental chairmen (Biology, English, and History), one dean from a College of Business Administration, and one academic dean. The academic dean was from a privately controlled junior college; one departmental chairman (Biology) was from a four-year state-supported school whose enrollment was under 5000; the other two departmental chairmen (English and History) and the dean of the College of Business Administration were from four-year state-supported schools which had graduate schools and enrollments over 5000. The questionnaire, with an accompanying letter, was taken to each of the five judges. The judges were informed as to the nature of the questionnaire and were asked to participate in establishing the validity of the items in the questionnaire. Each of the judges agreed to participate. A questionnaire was left with each judge in order to give him time to review it and was picked up at an arranged time. At this time, each judge thoroughly discussed

each item as to its appropriateness and/or clarity. The judges were encouraged to suggest additional items which might be included in the questionnaire. Any change in the questionnaire had to be deemed necessary by at least three of the five judges. The panel of judges agreed that each item was both appropriate and clear and that no additional questions were thought to be necessary. Outside of minor grammatical changes, the only significant change made was that of substituting the academic area Accounting for Business Administration because the other academic areas used in the study are specific departments in their various colleges while Business Administration is itself a college and not a department. Accounting was suggested because it is a fairly common field, offered by nearly all types of schools.

In establishing reliability, questionnaires were sent to twenty employing agents whose institutions were eliminated from consideration in the study. Five of these employing agents were departmental chairmen from four-year schools with enrollments over 5000. Two were administrative agents from four-year schools with enrollments under 5000. Four were administrative agents from junior colleges. Five were departmental chairmen from four-year schools having graduate programs and enrollments over 5000. The last four were administrative agents from four-year schools having graduate programs and enrollments under 5000. The employing agents were asked to respond to each item and return the stamped,

self-addressed questionnaire. After at least twelve questionnaires had been answered and returned and approximately two weeks after the initial mailing, the questionnaire was mailed to those employing agents who had returned the questionnaire the first time. The respondents were again requested to complete the questionnaire. Eighty-five per cent of the respondents (17) returned the questionnaire both times. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, each of the respondents' answers to the items was tabulated in an effort to show the consistency of their replies. The instrument was considered reliable if there was a .80 correlation between first questionnaire response and second questionnaire response. A .941 coefficient of correlation was actually obtained.

After the validity and reliability of the instrument were established, the instrument was revised for the North Texas State University doctoral graduates. A panel of five North Texas doctoral graduates--two had degrees in an academic area and three had degrees in College Teaching--was used to check the validity of the instrument. The questionnaire, with an accompanying letter, was submitted to each judge to check the appropriateness and/or clarity of each item. Three of the five judges were required to agree in order to make an item change in the questionnaire. The panel agreed that each item was both appropriate and clear. No changes or additional questions were thought to be necessary.

In order to establish the reliability of the instrument, a questionnaire, with an accompanying letter, was sent to twenty North Texas doctoral graduates--six were in academic areas, eight were Ed.D.'s in College Teaching, and six were Ph.D.'s in College Teaching. The doctoral graduates were asked to respond to each item and return the stamped, self-addressed questionnaire. After at least twelve questionnaires had been answered and returned and approximately two weeks after the initial mailing, the questionnaire was mailed to those doctoral graduates who had returned the questionnaire the first time. The respondents were again requested to complete the questionnaire. Sixty-five per cent of the respondents (13) answered the questionnaire both times. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, each of the respondents' answers to the items was tabulated in an effort to show the consistency of their replies. The instrument was considered reliable if there was a .80 correlation between first questionnaire response and second questionnaire response. A .964 coefficient of correlation was actually obtained.

Once the validity and reliability of both instruments were established, minor grammatical changes were made, and the questionnaires were reprinted. In order to reduce the bulk and weight of the final questionnaires for mailing, offset printed forms with reduced size type were constructed and the back covers of the questionnaires were designed so as to contain the postage and return-address (see Appendix C).

Identification of the Population Surveyed

To insure comprehensive representation of institutions of all sizes and geographic locations, seven hundred employing agents whose institutions were listed by the fifty states in the 1970-71 edition of the Directory of Higher Education were included in the survey. Five samples of institutions were used. The first list was a national sample of junior colleges. The second list was a national sample of four-year colleges without graduate programs and with enrollments under 5000. The third list was a national sample of four-year colleges without graduate programs and with enrollments over 5000. The fourth list was a national sample of four-year colleges having graduate schools and enrollments under 5000. The fifth list was a national sample of four-year colleges with graduate schools and enrollments over 5000. A random sample of one hundred institutions from the first list and fifty institutions from each of the four other lists were chosen by use of a table of random digits. In the first, second, and fourth lists the questionnaire was mailed to an administrative agent. In the third and fifth lists the questionnaire was mailed to the chairmen of the following departments: Accounting, Biology, English, History, and Mathematics.

For the cross-validation study, forty-one North Texas State University doctoral graduates who had obtained their degrees in the period between January, 1966, and August, 1971,

were included in the study. Nineteen were doctoral graduates in the five academic areas used in the study (one in Accounting, fifteen in Biology, one in English, two in History). Twenty-two were College Teaching graduates (eighteen were Ed.D.'s and four were Ph.D.'s) whose area of specialization was one of the five academic areas used in the study (two in Biology, seven in Business Administration, four in English, three in History, and six in mathematics).

Administration of the Questionnaire

On October 12, 1971, the questionnaires were mailed to seven hundred employing agents and forty-one North Texas doctoral graduates. A letter explaining the nature of the study was on the front cover of each mailed questionnaire. The back cover of the questionnaire was stamped and contained the return-address. The employing agents and doctoral graduates were requested to respond to each item either by filling in pertinent information or by checking the appropriate response(s). Space was provided following each item in the event specific items warranted elaboration. Item thirteen was an optional question provided for comments on employability of College Teaching graduates in general. Approximately three weeks after the first mailing, a follow-up letter was mailed to non-respondents renewing the appeal to join with their colleagues in returning the completed questionnaire. A second copy of the questionnaire, which included postage and return-address, was sent.

On November 21, 1971, approximately six weeks after the initial mailing, four hundred eighty-seven total returns, or 69.6 per cent, had been received from the employing agents. The number of questionnaires returned, by type of institutions, is depicted in Table I.

TABLE I
RESPONSE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE
BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Type of Institution	Number	Questionnaires Returned	%
Junior Colleges	100	58	58.0
Four-Year Colleges With Enrollments Under 5000	50	49	98.0
Four-Year Colleges With Enrollments Over 5000	250	126	50.4
Four-Year Colleges With Graduate Programs and Enrollments Under 5000	50	40	80.0
Four-Year Colleges With Graduate Programs and Enrollments Over 5000	250	214	85.6
Total	700	487	69.6

Eleven of the four hundred eighty-seven returns received were not useable for a variety of reasons. Two of the returns were not useable because the employing agents had never dealt with Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching and felt they were not able to offer meaningful opinions. Seven of the returns were not useable because the employing agents stated they would not hire Ed.D.'s/Ph.D.'s in College Teaching at their institutions and refused to complete the questionnaire. One reply indicated the employing agent did not have time to complete the questionnaire, while still another indicated that replies to questionnaires were limited to government agencies only. Therefore, the total number of returns to be treated statistically in this study was four hundred seventy-six.

Twenty-six returns, or 63.4 per cent, had been received from the North Texas doctoral graduates by the closing date. The number of questionnaires returned, by type of degree, is depicted in Table II.

TABLE II

RESPONSE OF NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY DOCTORAL
GRADUATES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE BY TYPE OF DEGREE

Type of Degree	Number	Questionnaires Returned	%
Ph.D. in an Academic Area	19	9	47.4
Ph.D. in College Teaching	4	3	75.0
Ed.D. in College Teaching	18	14	77.8
Total	41	26	63.4

All of the returns received from the North Texas doctoral graduates were useable.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The principal data for this study were obtained from questionnaires constructed by the author and mailed to 1) employing agents at randomly selected institutions of higher education, and 2) North Texas State University doctoral graduates. Chapter IV presents the descriptive statistical analysis of the questions raised in this study concerning the attitudes/preferences of employing agents toward Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching versus Ph.D.'s in an academic area.

Throughout the chapter, employing agents from Junior Colleges are referred to as JC, employing agents from four-year colleges with enrollments under 5000 are referred to as 4YR-Under 5000, employing agents from four-year colleges with enrollments over 5000 are referred to as 4YR-Over 5000, employing agents from four-year colleges with graduate schools and enrollments under 5000 are referred to as Grad-Under 5000, and employing agents from four-year colleges with graduate schools and enrollments over 5000 are referred to as Grad-Over 5000.

With respect to geographical categorization of the five groups, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey,

New York, and Pennsylvania are referred to as the Middle States. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont are referred to as the New England States. Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming are referred to as the North Central States. Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington are referred to as the Northwest States. Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia are referred to as the Southern States. California and Hawaii are referred to as the Western States.

Major Findings

Question 1: Do employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching? If so, for which of the academic areas used in the study is this true?

Table III reveals that employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching for all academic areas.

Question 2: Do employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in College Teaching over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching? If so, for which of the academic areas used in the study is this true?

Table III reveals that employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in College Teaching over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching for all academic areas.

TABLE III
DEGREE PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS
COMPARED ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area %	Ph.D. in College Teaching %	Ed.D. in College Teaching %	Other %	No Preference %
Accounting (n=205)	49	10	2	20	19
Biology (n=206)	68	9	2	7	14
English (n=205)	65	10	4	7	14
History (n=208)	66	10	3	7	13
Mathematics (n=217)	63	11	4	6	16
Total (n=1041)	62	10	3	9	15

N=476

Although it is evident from Table III that employing agents prefer an academic Ph.D. for all the subject fields used in the study, a large percentage either had no preference or expressed a preference for a different type of degree--M.B.A., C.P.A., D.A., etc.

With respect to the North Texas State University doctoral graduates' perceptions of the hiring process, Table IV reveals that employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching for all academic areas. They also perceive employing agents as preferring Ph.D.'s in College Teaching over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.

TABLE IV

DEGREE PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS AS PERCEIVED BY
NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES COMPARED
ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area %	Ph.D. in College Teaching %	Ed.D. in College Teaching %	Other %	No Preference %
Accounting (n=8)	50	13	37
Biology (n=7)	57	14	29
English (n=2)	50	50	..
History (n=4)	100
Mathematics (n=5)	40	40	20
Total	58	15	..	4	23

N=26

As noted in Table IV, approximately one-fourth of the North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as having no preference with regard to type of degree. Only in History was there a unanimous preference for an academic Ph.D.

Question 3: What type of school is more likely to prefer a Ph.D. in an academic area:

- a. Is it a junior college, a four-year college with enrollment under 5000, a four-year college with enrollment over 5000, a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment under 5000, or is it a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment over 5000?
- b. Is there any difference between schools of different geographic regions?
- c. Is it a state-supported or a private school?

3a. Table V reveals that although employing agents in the five groups of schools prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching, the smallest ratio of preference exists in junior colleges.

3b. Table V reveals that employing agents in all geographic regions prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.

3c. Table V reveals that employing agents in state-supported as well as private schools prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.

Question 4: What type of school is more likely to prefer a Ph.D. in College Teaching over an Ed.D. in College Teaching:

- a. Is it a junior college, a four-year college with enrollment under 5000, a four-year college with enrollment over 5000, a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment under 5000, or is it a four-year college with a graduate school and enrollment over 5000?
- b. Is there any difference between schools of different geographic regions?
- c. Is it a state-supported or a private school?

4a. Table V reveals that employing agents in the five groups of schools prefer a Ph.D. in College Teaching over an Ed.D. in College Teaching.

4b. Table V reveals that employing agents in all geographic regions prefer a Ph.D. in College Teaching over an Ed.D. in College Teaching.

4c. Table V reveals that employing agents in state-supported as well as private schools prefer a Ph.D. in College Teaching over an Ed.D. in College Teaching.

TABLE V

DEGREE PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS
COMPARED ACCORDING TO TYPE OF SCHOOL

Type of School	Ph.D. in Academic Area %	Ph.D. in College Teaching %	Ed.D. in College Teaching %	Other %	No Preference %
3 and 4a.					
JC (n=280)	19	12	7	22	40
4YR-Under 5000 (n=235)	72	11	4	4	9

TABLE V--Continued

Type of School	Ph.D. in Academic Area %	Ph.D. in College Teaching %	Ed.D. in College Teaching %	Other %	No Preference %
4YR-Over 5000 (n=125)	82	6	1	6	5
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=190)	69	16	. .	5	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=210)	91	2	. .	4	2
Total (n=1040)	62	10	3	9	16
3 and 4b.					
Middle States (n=140)	66	24	. .	7	3
New England States (n=61)	59	20	5	3	13
North Central States (n=452)	63	9	4	8	16
Northwest States (n=72)	76	10	14
Southern States (n=274)	58	7	5	11	19
Western States (n=41)	41	2	. .	41	16
Total (n=1041)	62	10	3	9	16
3 and 4c.					
State-Supported (n=551)	62	7	3	10	18
Private (n=489)	63	12	4	8	13
Total (n=1040)	62	10	3	9	16

N=476

Table V indicates that in junior colleges the single largest percentage of employing agents had no preference for type of degree. In the Western States the same percentage

of employing agents expressed a preference for a different type of degree as did for an academic Ph.D.

Table VI reveals that North Texas State University doctoral graduates perceive a preference for Ph.D.'s in an academic area a) in all groups of schools, b) in all geographic regions, and c) in state-supported as well as private schools. Table VI also reveals a preference for Ph.D.'s in College Teaching over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching for all types of schools.

TABLE VI

DEGREE PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS AS PERCEIVED BY
NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES COMPARED
ACCORDING TO TYPE OF SCHOOL

Type of School	Ph.D. in Academic Area %	Ph.D. in College Teaching %	Ed.D. in College Teaching %	Other %	No Preference %
3 and 4a.					
JC (n=3)	33	33	34
4YR-Under 5000 (n=6)	67	33
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=5)	40	20	..	40	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=11)	73	9	18
Total	62	8	..	8	22
3 and 4b.					
Middle States (n=1)	100

TABLE VI--Continued

Type of School	Ph.D. in Academic Area %	Ph.D. in College Teaching %	Ed.D. in College Teaching %	Other %	No Preference %
New England States (n=0)
North Central States (n=7)	43	29
Northwest States (n=0)
Southern States (n=17)	65	18	. .	12	5
Western States (n=1)	100
Total	62	19	. .	8	11
3 and 4c.					
State-Supported (n=17)	53	18	6	. .	23
Private (n=9)	67	11	22
Total	58	15	4	. .	23

N=26

As noted in Table VI, North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents in junior colleges and four-year colleges with graduate schools and enrollments under 5000 as being equally divided between an academic Ph.D. and a different type of degree. In the Middle States and the Western States there was a unanimous preference for an academic Ph.D.

Question 5: In which academic areas is competence in a foreign language(s) preferred by employing agents?

Table VII reveals that the single largest percentage of employing agents prefer prospective teachers without foreign language competency for all academic areas.

TABLE VII
NUMBER OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES PREFERRED BY
EMPLOYING AGENTS ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC
AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	Undecided %
Accounting				
JC (n=56)	82	• •	• •	18
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	62	11	2	25
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	85	15	• •	• •
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	53	16	8	23
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=43)	77	7	2	14
Total (n=204)	71	8	3	18
Biology				
JC (n=56)	54	14	14	18
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	43	28	17	12
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	56	20	16	8
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	55	24	13	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	33	25	29	13
Total (n=206)	47	22	18	13
English				
JC (n=56)	36	21	21	12
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	30	26	23	11
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	52	4	37	7
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	37	21	32	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=38)	63	21	8	8
Total (n=205)	47	20	23	10
History				
JC (n=56)	50	21	18	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	43	23	23	11
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	44	16	36	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	39	21	32	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=41)	66	15	2	17
Total (n=208)	49	14	26	11

TABLE VII--Continued

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	Undecided %
Mathematics				
JC (n=56)	64	14	4	18
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	48	30	9	13
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	43	39	14	14
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	38	34	11	17
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	38	27	17	18
Total (n=217)	46	28	10	16

N=476

Table VII indicates that although employing agents expressed a preference for zero foreign languages in all academic areas, the amount of preference was less than 50 per cent in all fields except Accounting.

Table VIII reveals that North Texas doctoral graduates perceive their employing agents as preferring zero foreign languages for all academic areas.

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES PREFERRED BY EMPLOYING
AGENTS AS PERCEIVED BY NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL
GRADUATES ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC
AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	Undecided %
Accounting				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	71	14	15	..
Total (n=8)	75	13	12	..
Biology				
JC (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=7)	57	43
English				
JC (n=1)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	100
History				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	75	25

TABLE VIII--Continued

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	Undecided %
Mathematics				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=5)	80	20

N=26

As noted in Table VIII, a large per cent of North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as being undecided with respect to the number of foreign languages preferred for Biology, History, and Mathematics.

Question 6: What is the number of semester hours in the major field above the master's preferred by employing agents?

Table IX reveals that for all academic areas the most preferred number of semester hours in the major field above the master's is 24-35.

TABLE IX

NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN THE MAJOR FIELD ABOVE THE MASTER'S PREFERRED BY EMPLOYING AGENTS ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	Less Than 24 %	24-35 %	36-47 %	48-59 %	60-71 %	72 and Above %
Accounting						
JC (n=56)	21	55	16	.	4	4
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	13	43	17	13	9	5
4YR-Over 5000 (n=21)	38	43	19	.	.	.
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	16	42	16	18	5	3
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=45)	29	47	18	4	.	2
Total (n=207)	22	47	16	7	4	4
Biology						
JC (n=56)	14	63	13	4	4	2
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	45	19	13	13	8
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	4	32	24	12	20	8
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	11	37	21	21	5	5
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=39)	3	33	23	20	15	6
Total (n=205)	7	44	19	13	10	7

TABLE IX--Continued

Academic Area	Less Than 24 %	24-35 %	36-47 %	48-59 %	60-71 %	72 and Above %
English						
JC (n=56)	14	59	16	4	4	3
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	6	38	23	13	11	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=26)	4	35	31	12	18	.
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	11	37	16	26	8	2
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	.	38	24	11	11	16
Total (n=204)	8	43	21	18	9	1
History						
JC (n=56)	14	55	20	4	4	3
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	4	40	21	15	11	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	.	40	20	12	20	8
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	11	37	16	26	8	2
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=41)	.	39	10	34	7	10
Total (n=206)	7	39	22	17	9	6
Mathematics						
JC (n=56)	14	63	13	4	4	2
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	9	38	21	13	11	8
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	4	43	21	21	11	.
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	11	37	16	26	8	2
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	2	38	15	25	19	1
Total (n=218)	8	43	17	17	10	5

N=476

Although employing agents expressed a preference for 24-35 semester hours in the major field above the master's, as indicated in Table IX, they tended to feel that competence and depth of preparation were not measured in terms of number of semester hours.

Table X reveals that North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as preferring 24-35 semester hours in the major field above the master's for all academic areas.

TABLE X

NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS IN THE MAJOR FIELD ABOVE THE MASTER'S PREFERRED BY
EMPLOYING AGENTS AS PERCEIVED BY NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES
ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	Less Than 24 %	24-35 %	36-47 %	48-59 %	60-71 %	72 and Above %
Accounting						
JC (n= 0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	..	43	29	..	14	..
Total (n=8)	14	50	25	..	12	..
Biology						
JC (n=2)	..	50
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	..	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)	50
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=7)	14	57	..	14	..	15

TABLE X--Continued

Academic Area	Less Than 24 %	24-35 %	36-47 %	48-59 %	60-71 %	72 and Above %
English						
JC (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	..	100
History						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	..	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	..	75	..	25
Mathematics						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50	..
Total (n=5)	..	80	20	..

N=26

As noted in Table X, a substantial per cent of the North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as preferring 48-59 semester hours in Biology and History.

Question 7: Do employing agents prefer prospective teachers to have had learning theory and methodology courses?

Table XI reveals that the single largest percentage of employing agents prefer prospective teachers who have not had any learning theory and methodology courses.

TABLE XI
 NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL METHODS COURSES PREFERRED BY EMPLOYING AGENTS
 ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 and Above %	Undecided %
Accounting						
JC (n=56)	36	14	14	7	21	8
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	23	13	21	17	6	20
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	30	5	30	10	.	25
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	32	11	13	8	5	31
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=43)	37	33	5	.	2	23
Total (n=204)	32	17	15	8	8	20
Biology						
JC (n=56)	32	14	14	7	25	8
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	28	13	17	15	9	18
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	44	16	12	.	4	24
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	34	11	32	8	5	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	38	23	5	3	1	30
Total (n=205)	34	16	16	7	10	17

TABLE XI--Continued

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 and Above %	Undecided %
English						
JC (n=56)	32	11	21	4	29	3
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	23	13	17	19	9	19
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	41	26	11	4	.	18
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	32	16	24	13	5	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	32	24	8	.	5	31
Total (n=206)	31	17	17	8	11	16
History						
JC (n=56)	32	11	21	4	29	3
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	28	11	17	17	9	18
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	32	8	16	16	.	28
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	32	16	24	13	5	10
Total (n=208)	32	15	17	9	10	17
Mathematics						
JC (n=56)	32	11	21	4	29	3
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	28	11	17	17	9	18
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	36	14	14	11	4	21
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	34	8	29	13	5	11
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=42)	44	21	11	2	4	18
Total (n=217)	34	16	16	10	10	14

N=476

Employing agents tend to express a preference against professional methods courses for several reasons: they are too theory-oriented and not applicable to actual situations; they detract from involvement in the academic area of specialization.

Table XII reveals that the single largest percentage of North Texas doctoral graduates perceive their employing agents as preferring prospective teachers who have had no learning theory and methodology courses.

TABLE XII
 NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL METHODS COURSES PREFERRED BY EMPLOYING AGENTS
 AS PERCEIVED BY NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES ACCORDING
 TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 and Above %	Undecided %
Accounting						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	71	29
Total (n=8)	75	25
Biology						
JC (n=2)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100
Total (n=7)	86	14

TABLE XII--Continued

Academic Area	0 %	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 and Above %	Undecided %
English						
JC (n=1)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	100
History						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	50	50
Mathematics						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100
Total (n=5)	100

N=26

In Accounting and History, one-fourth or more of the North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as being undecided with respect to the number of professional methods courses preferred.

Question 8: How many years of teaching experience do employing agents prefer prospective teachers to have for initial appointment after graduation?

Table XIII reveals that employing agents prefer prospective teachers to have had 2-3 years of teaching experience at the time of their appointment.

TABLE XIII
 NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO INITIAL APPOINTMENT AFTER
 COMPLETION OF DOCTORAL DEGREE PREFERRED BY EMPLOYING AGENTS ACCORDING
 TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	0-1 %	2-3 %	4-5 %	6-7 %	8 or More %	Undecided %
Accounting						
JC (n=56)	4	57	14	.	.	25
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	11	64	13	.	2	10
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	10	45	20	.	5	20
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	3	45	5	5	.	42
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=43)	42	42	2	.	.	14
Total (n=209)	14	51	12	1	1	21
Biology						
JC (n=56)	4	57	14	.	.	25
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	6	62	17	.	2	13
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	36	40	12	.	.	12
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	8	45	5	5	.	37
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	38	45	3	.	.	14
Total (n=206)	15	52	11	1	.	21

TABLE XIII--Continued

Academic Area	0-1 %	2-3 %	4-5 %	6-7 %	8 or More %	Undecided %
English						
JC (n=56)	4	57	14	. 2	. 4	25
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	6	57	19			12
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	19	59	11	. 11	. .	11
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	3	45	11	30
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	27	48	11	14
Total (n=205)	10	54	14	. 2	. 1	19
History						
JC (n=56)	4	57	14	. 2	. 2	25
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	6	55	23	4	. .	11
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	20	64	4	5	. .	8
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	3	45	16	31
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=42)	33	52	2	. 2	. .	13
Total (n=208)	12	54	13	. 2	. .	19
Mathematics						
JC (n=56)	7	50	18	. .	. 2	25
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	6	57	23	12
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	25	50	18	. 11	. .	7
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	3	45	11	30
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	25	42	11	22
Total (n=217)	12	49	16	. 2	. .	21

N=476

Employing agents are more interested in having their teachers develop their teaching styles on-the-job rather than in acquiring seasoned teachers.

Table XIV reveals that doctoral graduates believe employing agents prefer prospective teachers to have 2-3 years of teaching experience.

TABLE XIV

NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO INITIAL APPOINTMENT AFTER
COMPLETION OF DOCTORAL DEGREE PREFERRED BY EMPLOYING AGENTS ACCORDING
TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL AS PERCEIVED BY
NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES

Academic Area	0-1 %	2-3 %	4-5 %	6-7 %	8 or More %	Undecided %
Accounting						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	14	43	..	14	14	15
Total (n=8)	13	50	..	13	12	12
Biology						
JC (n=2)	..	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=7)	14	57	29

TABLE XIV--Continued

Academic Area	0-1 %	2-3 %	4-5 %	6-7 %	8 or More %	Undecided %
English						
JC (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	..	100
History						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	25	50	25
Mathematics						
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=5)	20	60	20

N=26

As noted in Table XIV, approximately one-fourth of the North Texas doctoral graduates in Accounting, Biology, and History perceive employing agents as being undecided with respect to number of years of teaching experience preferred.

Question 9: Providing that the candidates' qualifications are basically the same, is the starting salary the same for Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching as it is for Ph.D.'s in an academic area?

Table XV reveals that starting salary is lower for Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching than it is for Ph.D.'s in an academic area.

TABLE XV
STARTING SALARY FOR DOCTORAL GRADUATES QUOTED BY
EMPLOYING AGENTS ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC
AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area				
	6000- 7999 %	8000- 9999 %	10000- 11999 %	12000- 13999 %	14 & Above %
Accounting					
JC (n=56)	4	57	32	.	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	.	19	53	17	11
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	.	.	30	45	25
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	.	34	42	16	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=44)	.	.	20	41	39
Total (n=205)	1	26	36	20	17

TABLE XV--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area				
	6000- 7999	8000- 9999	10000- 11999	12000- 13999	14 & Above
	%	%	%	%	%
Biology					
JC (n=56)	4	57	29	4	6
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	. .	26	57	17	. .
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	. .	12	80	4	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	. .	34	55	11	. .
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=39)	3	8	67	18	4
Total (n=205)	1	31	54	11	3
English					
JC (n=56)	4	57	32	. .	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	. .	28	60	12	. .
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	. .	15	67	18	. .
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	. .	42	47	11	. .
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	3	2	84	11	. .
Total (n=205)	1	32	55	9	3
History					
JC (n=56)	4	57	32	. .	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	. .	33	57	10	. .
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	4	16	76	4	. .
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	. .	42	47	11	. .
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=42)	. .	10	81	9	. .
Total (n=208)	1	34	56	7	2
Mathematics					
JC (n=56)	4	57	29	4	6
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	. .	23	62	15	. .
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	. .	14	57	25	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	. .	34	50	16	. .
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	67	19	14
Total (n=217)	1	28	52	14	5

TABLE XV--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching				
	6000- 7999	8000- 9999	10000- 11999	12000- 13999	14 & Above
	%	%	%	%	%
Accounting					
JC (n=56)	54	32	. .	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	36	45	9	6	4
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	10	35	35	10	10
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	45	45	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=44)	2	45	30	18	5
Total (n=205)	33	41	14	8	4
Biology					
JC (n=56)	53	29	4	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	38	47	11	. .	4
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	24	72	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	50	45	5
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=39)	15	62	13	3	7
Total (n=205)	39	48	7	2	4
English					
JC (n=56)	54	32	. .	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	38	51	6	. .	5
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	22	67	4	4	3
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	55	39	6
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	11	78	5	. .	6
Total (n=205)	39	51	4	2	4
History					
JC (n=56)	54	32	. .	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	38	51	6	. .	5
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	40	52	. .	4	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	55	39	6
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=42)	17	74	5	. .	4
Total (n=208)	41	49	3	2	5
Mathematics					
JC (n=56)	54	29	4	7	6
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	38	51	6	. .	5
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	21	61	11	4	3
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	50	42	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	6	67	17	10	. .
Total (n=217)	35	48	9	5	3

TABLE XV--Continued

Academic Area	Ed.D. in College Teaching				
	6000- 7999 %	8000- 9999 %	10000- 11999 %	12000- 13999 %	14 & Above %
Accounting					
JC (n=56)	54	32	.	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	43	36	6	6	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	15	35	30	10	10
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	58	32	8	.	2
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=44)	25	50	14	7	4
Total (n=205)	41	38	9	6	6
Biology					
JC (n=56)	54	29	4	7	6
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	45	40	6	.	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	76	20	4	.	.
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	50	34	5	.	11
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=39)	44	39	3	3	11
Total (n=205)	52	33	4	2	9
English					
JC (n=56)	54	32	.	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	47	38	6	.	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	33	56	4	4	3
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	63	32	3	.	2
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	49	46	.	.	5
Total (n=205)	50	39	2	2	7
History					
JC (n=56)	54	32	.	7	7
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	47	38	6	.	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	32	44	.	4	20
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	63	29	5	.	3
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=42)	64	26	.	.	10
Total (n=208)	53	33	2	2	10
Mathematics					
JC (n=56)	54	29	4	7	6
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	47	38	6	.	9
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	54	32	7	4	3
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	55	32	8	.	5
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	35	46	10	9	.
Total (n=217)	48	35	7	4	6

N=476

As noted in Table XV, the starting salary for a Ph.D. in an academic area appears to be \$10000-11999; for a Ph.D. in College Teaching, \$8000-9999; and for an Ed.D. in College Teaching, \$6000-7999. However, the problem may be in a College Teaching graduate's being considered for a position at all. Once a position has been offered, it is possible that the disparity in starting salary may not occur.

Table XVI reveals that North Texas doctoral graduates perceive that the starting salary is higher for Ph.D.'s in an academic area for all groups of schools and for all academic areas than it is for Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.

TABLE XVI

STARTING SALARY FOR DOCTORAL GRADUATES ACCORDING TO
ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL AS PERCEIVED
BY NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES

Academic Area.	Ph.D. in Academic Area				
	6000- 7999	8000- 9999	10000- 11999	12000- 13999	14 & Above
	%	%	%	%	%
Accounting					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	14	57	29
Total (n=8)	12	68	20

TABLE XVI--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area				
	6000- 7999 %	8000- 9999 %	10000- 11999 %	12000- 13999 %	14 & Above %
Biology					
JC (n=2)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100
Total (n=7)	86	14	..
English					
JC (n=1)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	..	50	50
History					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	75	25	..
Mathematics					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50	..
Total (n=5)	80	20	..

TABLE XVI--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching				
	6000- 7999 %	8000- 9999 %	10000- 11999 %	12000- 13999 %	14 & Above %
Accounting					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	14	43	29	14	..
Total (n=8)	13	27	27	13	..
Biology					
JC (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	..	50
Total (n=7)	29	57	14
English					
JC (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	50	50
History					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	25	50	25
Mathematics					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50
Total (n=5)	..	80	20

TABLE XVI--Continued

Academic Area	Ed.D. in College Teaching				
	6000- 7999	8000- 9999	10000- 11999	12000- 13999	14 & Above
	%	%	%	%	%
Accounting					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	43	43	14
Total (n=8)	50	27	13
Biology					
JC (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50
Total (n=7)	57	29	14
English					
JC (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	50	50
History					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	..	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	50	25	25
Mathematics					
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100
Total (n=5)	80	20

N=26

In Accounting, twenty-seven per cent of the North Texas doctoral graduates perceive \$10000-11999 and twenty-seven per cent perceive \$8000-9999 as being the starting salary for a Ph.D. in College Teaching. In English, fifty per cent perceive \$8000-9999 and fifty per cent perceive \$6000-7999 as being the starting salary for an Ed.D. in College Teaching.

Question 10: Which degree-holder has a better opportunity for academic promotion?

Table XVII reveals that in all groups of schools and for all academic areas Ph.D.'s in an academic area have a better opportunity for academic promotion.

TABLE XVII

NUMBER OF YEARS IN SERVICE FOR FIRST ACADEMIC PROMOTION
FOR DOCTORAL GRADUATES QUOTED BY EMPLOYING AGENTS
ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Accounting				
JC (n=56)	14	62	14	10
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	79	17	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=21)	14	62	19	5
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	8	68	16	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=43)	2	84	14	.
Total (n=205)	8	71	16	5

TABLE XVII--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Biology				
JC (n=56)	14	61	14	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	77	19	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	8	68	20	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	8	68	16	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	3	60	37	. .
Total (n=206)	7	67	21	5
English				
JC (n=56)	14	61	14	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	77	19	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=26)	4	65	31	. .
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	8	68	16	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	. .	70	27	3
Total (n=204)	6	68	20	6
History				
JC (n=56)	14	61	14	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	77	19	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	8	64	28	. .
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	8	69	16	7
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=41)	2	66	29	3
Total (n=207)	7	67	20	6
Mathematics				
JC (n=56)	14	61	14	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	79	17	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	11	61	28	. .
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	8	68	16	8
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=49)	. .	69	31	. .
Total (n=218)	7	68	21	4

TABLE XVII--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Accounting				
JC (n=56)	12	18	59	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	19	77	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=21)	5	29	52	14
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	21	61	13
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=43)	.	23	67	10
Total (n=205)	5	21	64	10
Biology				
JC (n=56)	12	18	59	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	21	74	3
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	8	28	56	8
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	21	61	13
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	.	47	48	5
Total (n=206)	6	26	60	7
English				
JC (n=56)	12	18	59	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	21	74	3
4YR-Over 5000 (n=26)	4	35	54	7
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	21	61	13
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	.	24	62	14
Total (n=204)	5	23	63	9
History				
JC (n=56)	12	18	59	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	21	74	3
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	8	36	48	8
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	21	61	13
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=41)	.	44	51	5
Total (n=207)	6	27	60	7
Mathematics				
JC (n=56)	12	18	59	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	19	77	2
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	11	25	57	7
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	21	61	13
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=49)	.	29	63	8
Total (n=218)	6	22	64	8

TABLE XVII--Continued

Academic Area	Ed.D. in College Teaching			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Accounting				
JC (n=56)	7	23	11	59
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	34	2	62
4YR-Over 5000 (n=21)	5	29	24	42
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	32	16	47
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=43)	.	14	22	64
Total (n=205)	4	38	13	45
Biology				
JC (n=56)	7	23	11	59
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	36	2	60
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	4	32	20	44
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	32	16	47
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	.	12	35	53
Total (n=206)	4	36	16	44
English				
JC (n=56)	7	23	11	59
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	36	2	60
4YR-Over 5000 (n=26)	.	38	23	39
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	32	16	47
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	.	16	59	25
Total (n=204)	3	36	14	47
History				
JC (n=56)	7	23	11	59
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	36	2	60
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	.	32	24	36
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	32	16	47
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=41)	.	12	29	59
Total (n=207)	4	36	15	45
Mathematics				
JC (n=56)	7	23	11	59
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	2	34	2	62
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	4	32	18	46
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	5	32	16	47
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=49)	.	24	22	54
Total (n=218)	4	34	13	49

N=476

A Ph.D. in an academic area appears to achieve first academic promotion 3-4 years after initial appointment; a Ph.D. in College Teaching, 5-6 years after initial appointment; and an Ed.D. in College Teaching, 7 or more years after initial appointment.

Table XVIII reveals that North Texas doctoral graduates perceive Ph.D.'s in an academic area as having a better opportunity for first academic promotion.

TABLE XVIII

NUMBER OF YEARS IN SERVICE FOR FIRST ACADEMIC PROMOTION
FOR DOCTORAL GRADUATES ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA
AND GROUP OF SCHOOL AS PERCEIVED BY
NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Accounting				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	14	57	29	..
Total (n=8)	12	63	25	..
Biology				
JC (n=2)	..	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	..	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	..	50	..	50
Total	14	71	..	15

TABLE XVIII--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in Academic Area			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
English				
JC (n=1)	. .	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	. .	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	. .	100
History				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	. .	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	. .	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	. .	100
Mathematics				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	. .	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	. .	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	. .	100
Total (n=5)	. .	100

N=26

TABLE XVIII--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Accounting				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	14	29	57	..
Total (n=8)	12	25	63	..
Biology				
JC (n=2)	100	..
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	..	50	50	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	..	50	..	50
Total (n=7)	..	29	57	14
English				
JC (n=1)	100	..
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	100	..
History				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	100	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	100	..
Mathematics				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100	..
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=5)	80	20

TABLE XVIII--Continued

Academic Area	Ed.D. in College Teaching			
	1-2 %	3-4 %	5-6 %	7&above %
Accounting				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	..	14	29	57
Total (n=8)	..	12	25	63
Biology				
JC (n=2)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	50	50
Total (n=7)	29	71
English				
JC (n=1)	100
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	100
History				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	25	75
Mathematics				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100
Total (n=5)	100

In Accounting and Biology a large per cent of the North Texas doctoral graduates indicate less clear-cut lines of distinction between doctoral graduates with respect to number of years required in service prior to first academic promotion.

Question 11: Do employing agents prefer a Ph.D./Ed.D. in College Teaching from an institution with an excellent reputation over a Ph.D. in an academic area from a less well-known institution if all other qualifications are held constant?

Table XIX reveals that employing agents prefer Ph.D.'s in an academic area from a less well-known institution over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching from an institution with an excellent reputation.

TABLE XIX

DEGREE PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS WITH RESPECT TO REPUTATION OF
 INSTITUTION CONFERRING THE DOCTORAL DEGREE COMPARED
 ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ed.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ph.D. in Academic Area From Less Well-Known Institution %	No Pref- erence %
Accounting				
JC (n=56)	29	18	43	10
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	23	.	53	24
4YR-Over 5000 (n=20)	25	5	35	35
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	26	.	44	30
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=45)	13	.	73	14
Total (n=206)	23	5	52	20
Biology				
JC (n=56)	32	14	43	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	30	4	43	23
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	16	.	80	4
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	37	.	53	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	20	.	70	10
Total (n=206)	28	5	54	13

TABLE XIX--Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ed.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ph.D. in Academic Area From Less Well-Known Institution %	No Preference %
English				
JC (n=56)	32	14	43	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	28	4	49	19
4YR-Over 5000 (n=27)	26	.	56	18
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	32	.	59	9
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=37)	27	.	59	14
Total (n=205)	29	5	52	14
History				
JC (n=56)	32	14	43	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	32	4	45	19
4YR-Over 5000 (n=25)	24	.	56	20
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	32	.	59	9
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=40)	33	.	65	2
Total (n=206)	31	5	52	12
Mathematics				
JC (n=56)	32	14	43	11
4YR-Under 5000 (n=47)	28	6	43	23
4YR-Over 5000 (n=28)	25	7	54	14
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=38)	34	.	56	10
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=48)	19	.	63	18
Total (n=217)	28	6	51	15

N=476

It is possible that employing agents prefer an academic Ph.D. from a less well-known institution over a Ph.D./Ed.D. from an institution with an excellent reputation because an academic Ph.D. may be thought to imply depth of preparation in academic area of specialization regardless of the institution conferring the degree.

Table XX reveals that North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as preferring Ph.D.'s in an academic area from a less well-known institution over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching from an institution with an excellent reputation.

TABLE XX

DEGREE PREFERENCE OF EMPLOYING AGENTS WITH RESPECT TO REPUTATION OF INSTITUTION CONFERRING THE DOCTORAL DEGREE COMPARED ACCORDING TO ACADEMIC AREA AND GROUP OF SCHOOL AS PERCEIVED BY NORTH TEXAS DOCTORAL GRADUATES

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ed.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ph.D. in Academic Area From Less Well-Known Institution %	No Preference %
Accounting				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=7)	29	..	43	28
Total (n=8)	25	..	38	37
Biology				
JC (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	50
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=1)	100	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100	..
Total (n=7)	71	29

TABLE XX --Continued

Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ed.D. in College Teaching From Institution With Excellent Reputation %	Ph.D. in Academic Area From Less Well-Known Institution %	No Preference %
English				
JC (n=1)	100	..
4YR-Under 5000 (n=1)	100	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=2)	100	..
History				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	..	50	..
4YR-Over 5000 (n=0)
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	100	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=0)
Total (n=4)	25	..	75	..
Mathematics				
JC (n=0)
4YR-Under 5000 (n=0)
4YR-Over 5000 (n=1)	100	..
GRAD-Under 5000 (n=2)	50	..	50	..
GRAD-Over 5000 (n=2)	100	..
Total (n=5)	20	..	80	..

N=26

In Accounting, the same per cent of North Texas doctoral graduates perceive employing agents as preferring an academic Ph.D. from a less well-known institution as having no preference at all.

CHAPTER V

SUBJECTIVE COMMENTS OF THE RESPONDENTS

In keeping with the purpose of this study it is necessary not only to present the quantitative findings indicative of the preferences of employing agents for the various types of degrees, but also to present those findings indicative of the attitudes of employing agents toward the doctoral degrees included in the study. It is possible that the subjective comments obtained from the employing agents may partially explain 1) an employing agent's preference for one doctoral candidate over another, or 2) the needs an employing agent expects a job applicant to satisfy, or 3) why an employing agent may have had no preference or may have been undecided with respect to specific candidates.

The comments were primarily classified as those expressed by employing agents and those expressed by North Texas State University doctoral graduates. Beyond that, the comments were fit, although somewhat tenuously, into five categories: a) no experience with College Teaching programs/candidates; b) expectations/needs of employing agents; c) speculations; d) positive attitudes toward College Teaching programs/candidates; and e) negative attitudes toward College Teaching programs/graduates.

In most cases the author thought it more profitable to quote the comments directly.

Employing Agents

A. No experience with College Teaching

programs/candidates:

1. "We have had no experience to date with College Teaching graduates but would welcome such experience and possibly--even probably--would revise some of our opinions thereafter."
2. "Having not seen a credential of such a person in the field of Biology nor have I had the opportunity to evaluate the education and performance of such an individual I find myself biased in answering questions."
3. "We do not encounter College Teaching graduates in our job market."
4. "I have never had an application from such a person. I should like to have one at the moment since we have recently established a MAT program and I need a history instructor to offer a 'methods' course for potential junior college people, and to supervise a 'practicum' in junior college teaching."
5. "I am not familiar with this degree. I have not had applications from holders."
6. "I do not think we have ever had an applicant who had a College Teaching degree."
7. "We have never had a candidate with a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in College Teaching under consideration. Accordingly, it is impossible to know what we might think about one. Ordinarily, we look for signs of research abilities and potential for creative scholarship."
8. "I don't know enough about the program to judge-but if the content included less preparation in history than a Ph.D. it would be very unlikely we would hire one, unless there were good publications already out."

9. "I know very little about the 'Ph.D. in College Teaching' and am frankly skeptical about it. I do believe some education courses or teaching experience are invaluable for would-be teachers. But I also think that a teacher on the college level should have or work toward having that very great knowledge of his subject matter and its subtleties that is most likely to be developed in the 'traditional' curriculum and work associated with the Ph.D."
10. "I have never had experience with such graduates but admit to prejudice against 'Education' courses per se as I have never experienced or heard of one that was worth the money much less the time. We have a superb teaching staff of 7 Ph.D.'s and one tenured master's on 2 years leave to complete a Ph.D.--I am the weakest in the group and the only one with any 'Ed' courses (only 2) which were taken because they came free with my first job."
11. "I and my colleagues presently know little about the two programs compared with the Ph.D. in an academic area. Our slightly greater understanding of a Doctor of Arts in Teaching degree does not allow us to rank it with the Ph.D. On the whole, I believe, suspicion of the standards used by Departments of Education makes us look askance at any programs that they are involved with. It is still not clearly agreed that anyone has scientifically established what comprises 'good teaching'. The trends change periodically and fadism is rampant. Mastery of subject matter will be the best basis for teaching until the problem can be clarified more than is the case at present."
12. "I've not known any holders of Ph.D.'s in teaching. I'm inclined to think that the scorn the academic Ph.D. often feels for the Ed.D. would not--or at least should not--apply to the Ph.D. in teaching. Disenchantment with the teaching performance of academic area Ph.D.'s must increase substantially however, or I feel that the Ph.D. in teaching will have a very difficult time finding employment in the 4-year institutions. Additional openings will probably be slow to develop and the mean age of currently employed Ph.D.'s is relatively young."
13. "I have had no experience with College Teaching graduates as applicants for positions, and the

market has been tight enough that we could choose imaginative Ph.D.'s (on their scholarship) to interview and then select from those chosen the teacher-scholar type we are interested in."

B. Expectations/needs of employing agents:

1. "Should have willingness to listen to new ideas and a willingness to change."
2. "In the junior college it is my opinion that new doctorates do not understand, in the main, what we are trying to do here--which is neither secondary nor university in concept, rather a new or different (at least) approach. We value good teachers. We are not interested in academicians. There's not a dime's bit of difference to me whether one has the Ed.D. or the Ph.D. (I have the Ph.D.). I despise the 'Ph.D. snobbery' based on an often incompetence in foreign language which the Ph.D. encourages. I have 86 hours of foreign language, and speak two fluently and read five, so I am not another hack administrator from this point. We would like to feel that all our people understand and have a feeling for other languages and cultures. All too often, the smug Ph.D. thinks he has this because he squeezed through the poorly-done ETS FL exam. On the other hand, often the Ed.D. gets such due to his fear of FL and then perpetuates the ignorance that we have problems here in educating Americans."
3. "We look for a) academic quality, b) Christian character, and c) evidence of being a creative teacher. In a degree program I look for a person qualified in his field but who has enough breadth in experience or course work to indicate that he understands the human personality and is prepared and likely to be able to relate well to students. Courses in education, psychology, and counseling seem to me to be indicative measures connected with successful teaching experience."
4. "I'm far more concerned with character, attitudes, and love of teaching than all the other qualifying criteria."
5. "We are not concerned about what type of degree the applicant has. We are interested that the applicant can demonstrate leadership and spark creativity."

6. "For our college, the faculty qualification I would favor would be the completion of a special program aimed at preparing teachers for community colleges by combining the equivalent of an academic major at Master's degree level plus a core of professional courses and experiences emphasizing the unique character of the community college."
7. "The primary factors in college teaching are a) knowledge of subject, b) ability to relate to students, and c) academic integrity. It is not so much the degree awarded but the requirements for the degree. The college professor does not need a major in educational methods and theory (which many of us have) but sufficient course work in education to challenge the routine."
8. "The type of degree, Ph.D. or Ed.D., hired would depend on the job to be done. Ed.D. seem to be more education oriented and make excellent teachers, while Ph.D. are more research inclined."
9. "Above all, I want a prospective teacher to be interested in teaching and to be willing to do what is necessary to communicate effectively with students. After that, his academic ability and willingness to continue learning are important."
10. "In most cases, it is very difficult to find Ph.D.'s in Accounting. At our college we therefore normally recruit for MBA-CPA's and consider these credentials as terminal."
11. "We prefer men who have supervisory training in the accounting field. All of our men have been partners or managers in medium-sized or large accounting firms. We also require the teacher to be a Certified Public Accountant who has a master's degree or is currently obtaining one. We feel that attendance at professional seminars continuously are an important factor in retaining and expanding our expertise."
12. "Since our college has offered senior level work only three years, our demands are probably not typical. In our dept. (English) we have concentrated on attracting persons who are close to the doctorate. I am sure that the quality of the individual being considered and of the institution he attended are more important considerations with us than the initials used to designate his degree. All our ABD's, however, are working toward the Ph.D. degree."

13. "We have never placed any emphasis, possibly wrongfully, on College Teaching graduates. Since our Accounting program is designed to create CPA's, our emphasis has been the CPA certificate and an advanced degree, plus experience and knowledge."
14. "Since our institution is currently heavily committed towards training of secondary school teachers, the employment of any new personnel will be thusly affected. Certain courses of non-education nature might be handled as well or better by persons whose training was a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in College Teaching. Certain institutions offering such a degree provide, however, programs in which students take content courses in the main college which upgrades the quality of the program."
15. "We are a smaller liberal arts college, co-ed, with a five person Biology department faculty. Quite honestly, we have had little experience with individuals other than the Ph.D. or M.S. in an academic discipline. Most important to us, though, rather than degree would be the characteristics: general rapport with fellow faculty and students; effective teaching and communication; student counseling; and generally contributing to the goals of the college and of the department. Since we are primarily a teaching institution, we have little available time or \$\$\$\$ for individuals demanding to continue their research. Likewise, generally, since we are small and recognize the responsibility to provide students with a return on their college tuition investment; our experience with individuals exposed to a great deal of learning theory classroom work, with little or no actual classroom teaching experience has been disappointing. Practical innovation coupled with common sense, experience, and an appreciation of human nature, particularly student human nature and the understanding that each student in a lab or classroom is different are important to us. One must recognize that one must struggle toward the 'ideal'; with the knowledge that the 'ideal' is never attainable. My experience after 15 years of college teaching is that the mechanisms of 'decision-making' are as variable as the persons rendering (I use the term advisedly) the decisions."

16. "I have come to look for two items as prime in consideration of candidates. A. Flexibility. Can a candidate teach in several areas? Is he willing to learn a new one? We just have not slots for people who teach only one thing and who are unwilling to teach anything else. Here, we all teach composition, for example, so we seek people who not only can teach composition but who are skilled at writing and teaching of writing. B. Professional commitment. Under this seem to be subsumed other desirable traits such as a) humane interest in people, b) scholarship, c) intellectual curiosity, d) willingness to give of self, etc. I see little place for people who look on teaching as a 'sinecure', a place where they can collect a check and do something else."
17. "College teaching is held important by us but we seek only academically trained people."
18. "A faculty member in an academic community should combine a blend of teaching and research. His obligation is to transmit as well as create knowledge. Emphasis in the academic area during graduate training is imperative."
19. "As we are a community college, the emphasis on the doctorate is far less than at a four-year institution or university. Generally, Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s are not appropriate to teaching institution background as they (the degrees) are so research oriented. We look for sound academic background (MA minimum) and ability to communicate with our rather diverse student population."
20. "Given minimum formal education (usually Master's), personal qualities, including a tendency to continue to educate oneself, through reading, study, and research, are more important to us than formal education."
21. "We are a junior college. We are not interested in filling our teaching positions with persons who hold the Ph.D. or Ed.D. We encourage our Master's people to improve their position by additional education. We like to look to those teachers who are already with us. When we have a position to fill we look toward a person with a Master's degree."
22. "We are a 2-yr community college. We do not prefer doctoral applicants -- in fact prefer M.A.'s."

23. "Competency in subject matter is of first order priority. If that can be established, the name of the degree is not important. Those whose training in professional education is very extensive are usually deficient in subject matter--you can't do it all."
24. "Since our college offers no graduate work we are able to find a better choice of teachers in young teachers with a master's plus 30 hours in mathematics."
25. "We are much more interested in how much one knows than whether or not he's had some how-to-do courses. Effective teaching is absolutely necessary, but that comes more with experience than methods courses."
26. "I can see a need for such a degree and have advocated such in the past. My answers on this questionnaire are predicated to the needs and characteristics of my department. With an expanding, but still small institution, and a newly initiated graduate program, I do not feel that I can afford staff members whose sole commitment is to teaching. I need persons who are capable of and interested in both teaching and research."
27. "As a university department we are interested in all of our full-time staff members being able to direct Ph.D. and M.S. theses and to carry on research in their area of specialization."
28. "NA for this dept. All must have research-publication training."
29. "We are a research oriented department. What we look for is teaching and research potential. Most Ed.D.'s or Ph.D.'s in College Teaching do not have the research potential we are looking for. I would like to hire staff with some education courses but very few of our job candidates have ever had any. However, even if a candidate did have some ed. courses I doubt very much if it would add significantly to his candidacy for the position."
30. "To date we have employed those who have Ph.D.'s or are Ph.D. candidates from universities with excellent reputations. We look for candidates who are specialists in fields of history in which we offer upper-level or graduate courses and seminars and who

have written or are writing a thesis in the area of specialization we need in our program."

31. "In a period of time when regular Ph.D. graduates are having a difficult time finding employment, I find it difficult to even consider a College Teaching graduate. Our department has and will continue to emphasize research as well as teaching. I find little room for the person who can teach only."
32. "Unemployable as far as our needs are concerned."

C. Speculations of employing agents:

1. An intern experience might be substituted for learning theory/methodology courses.
2. "It is difficult to answer as a single bald question--interaction exists."
3. "While the (academic) Ph.D. may have been indicated as more desirable, it is too research oriented and some broadening of educational understanding would be desirable."
4. "We want to look at the individual. We prefer doctoral degrees. Naturally, we want to look at the undergraduate and master's background as well as the work at the doctoral level. It would be difficult for us to say we would take one type of doctoral over another in all cases."
5. "There are many criteria we use in hiring new people. Foremost on the list is the particular specialized area to be covered by the new person. We make an effort to hire people with diverse backgrounds from different schools. We try to expose our students to many different viewpoints. Therefore I would find it quite impossible to list a set of characteristics or degrees for every college teacher being graduated from an institution."
6. "Any good department head will look at other things than the type of doctorate an applicant has."
7. "Research requires a high level of intellectual curiosity and self-discipline. It is our experience that individuals with these qualities are also the most enthusiastic teachers. Publications help others to share the results but a publish or perish philosophy is not conducive to outstanding teaching or research."

8. "The important decision making area has little or nothing to do with the name of the degree. The question is: How well is the individual (not the institution from which he comes) equipped for creative, independent, scholarly teaching and research to fulfill the purposes of the department he may join? When these purposes are defined to be creation of advanced and original subject-matter, the taking of courses, no matter how many, is far from sufficient."
9. "While I consider a knowledge of languages a hallmark of an educated man, I believe that real proficiency in one language is better than superficial knowledge of two."
10. "Individual faculty members are rated differently. Objectivity is impossible."
11. "Combination of academic Ph.D. and demonstrated teaching ability. Number of methods courses not important--kind of courses important. Number of years of experience less important than qualitative evaluations of teaching."
12. "I am an advocate of the degree 'Doctor of Arts' for the true teacher, to give much more latitude in selection of course work. Demonstrated teaching ability and experience are far more important criteria than simply the academic degree obtained. For instance, two faculty members with the B.A. degree were employed in the past two years in preference to applicants with the doctorate, lacking a desirable level of experience."
13. "I strongly doubt if the choice is between a Ph.D. in an academic field vs a Ph.D. in College Teaching. The choice is between a Doctorate of Arts and a Ph.D. The Ed.D. degree except in the Department of Education would not satisfy our faculty."
14. "We are very much interested in the DA in College Teaching. We have this year employed such a graduate. I am fully aware of the dangers of being swallowed up by the 'Ph.D. octopus' particularly during the current market situation, but we simply must make a breakthrough and begin to give more attention to teaching than is possible under most Ph.D. programs."
15. "We have had no College Teaching graduates because all who were interviewed were unable to relate to the 'REAL' world and/or students."

16. "We have had little experience as yet with graduates of a CT program. We are not impressed with the Ed.D. people we have met so far--at least, not as teachers."
17. "Some Ph.D. programs are not as good as some of the better Ed.D. programs. Many institutions do not require a language or stat for the Ph.D. or Ed.D. I know of Ed.D. programs that require both. I had rather have a good master's person from a good institution than a Ph.D. or Ed.D. from one well respected southern university rapidly becoming known as 'the mill'."
18. "The value of the teaching degree will have to be established in the academic marketplace. Until we have some evidence that preparation for the teaching degree is just as rigorous as the preparation for the academic Ph.D. and more appropriate for the teaching role, we will be inclined to favor the academic Ph.D."
19. "I have indicated a preference for the Ph.D.'s in the academic area. This has not been influenced by language experience, but by the general idea of competence in the subject matter field. Some of our faculty with Ph.D. in teaching degrees are limited by their competence and cannot do a good job with advanced undergraduate courses. We do not give first emphasis to the name of the degree--but to the ability of the individual and we have some excellent individuals with Ph.D. in teaching degrees. On the other hand, I take issue with the assumption that a person with a Ph.D. in the academic field is not a good teacher. This is not a good assumption. It requires more than compassion to be a good teacher. Our best teachers are our most educated teachers. Frankly, the Ph.D. in teaching degrees have generally had a lower reputation because these degrees have generally had less rigor to their requirements than the standard Ph.D. It is not a question of number of credits, or how many language exams. It is a question of involvement; of being a 'Chemist' and not an 'observer of Chemistry' etc.--(One of our best English teachers has the DA degree and the Ph.D.)."
20. "At the present time, when given choice among many applicants I select from among the Ph.D.'s. I tell myself that other degrees are equivalent but we still hire Ph.D.'s when the contracts go out."

21. "For the record may I say that good teaching requires primarily a tremendous amount of hard work, dedication to an ideal of excellence and an unerring instinct for the proper route to follow. I doubt if these are qualities that can be instilled by courses in education or any other disciplines."
22. "The problem we've found in trying to establish an innovative and creative college here is (outside of the major problem of working in a state college system where administrators don't know anything about subject matter areas) that education-oriented people don't have enough knowledge of subject matter to handle the courses in a creative fashion. They have all the jargon ('life-needs', 'behaviorial objectives', 'individualized learning processes') but no knowledge. It is becoming a farce. An increase in Education-Administration degrees and we'll be in as bad shape as the high schools."
23. "I have employed but one. One problem is lack of flexibility; that is, as a dept. of English we need to have people prepared in specific literary areas, and the College Teaching degree stresses methodology. I have the same argument with the Ed.D.--while an individual acquires 1 area of literary specialization, he is not as flexible as the Ph.D. who usually has 2. Problem is compounded by split in methodology courses; some are offered in School of Ed., some in English Dept."
24. "I do not feel that College Teaching graduates are employable (in the present market) in schools which aspire to a graduate program. They should be employable in junior college and limited scope/limited offering, 4-year schools. The junior colleges tend, however, to want people with extensive experience in high school teaching. This leaves a very thin market except for the exceptional candidate."
25. "While I believe more methodology courses for the college classroom instructor will be very helpful, the primary emphasis should be in the academic discipline."
26. "I would consider for employment only the MA in English (MAT if I knew for certain that the program was as rigorous as a good MA) or the Ph.D. I would probably pass over a person from a school whose program I do not know, at least by reputation, and

respect. If I knew the candidate or particularly respected his recommenders, the place of training would not matter."

27. "We would approve one Ph.D. in College Teaching in each academic area. Though I have known a number of brilliant exceptions, I have two fears about such people: a) They may be insufficiently grounded in the academic discipline. b) They are inferior people who have chosen what is generally considered a less demanding discipline because of a limited potential."
28. "Frankly, I think any young college teacher in this part of the world would be well advised to stick to a sound Ph.D. program. No damage is done and some help may result from a few courses in learning theory and pedagogy. But the best teachers we find are those who know their subject, like students, and want to share their knowledge with the students. Why weaken a student by excessive amounts of psychology when the most exciting teachers are those who transmit their love of their subject to their students. Learning theory won't hurt a man who already knows his academic material."
29. "While we are certainly aware of the need for college teachers who are better equipped to teach, we don't view the specialized College Teaching degree as the answer. The solution for the private liberal arts school is simply better prepared people in the academic areas. How? A) A better apprenticeship in teaching while a graduate student. B) Workshops and short courses supporting teaching. C) A thorough orientation into university structure and governance. A man with only 24 doctorate hours of subject area would not be able to survive here and I doubt if we would hire him. Internal faculty selection committees--including people from Law and Education--have repeatedly rejected Ed.D. and Ph.D. (Ed.) candidates for top administrative positions here. A harsh reality but it's true. The doctoral degree in this area will have to attract substantially better people, in addition to being upgraded, if the degree is to achieve recognition."
30. "We like to employ Ph.D.'s in academics who have experience in supervised teaching and we provide supervised teaching opportunities for all our own candidates. But this experience is in addition to and not a substitute for academic training in one's discipline. I doubt very much that good teachers

are made through courses in education. Apprenticeship in the classroom offers a far superior training opportunity and greater opportunity for the creative teacher to develop his own style."

31. "We have found that recipients of the Ph.D. in Education are less qualified teachers than Ph.D.'s in mathematics who are motivated toward teaching. We find that teaching skills are not being successfully taught in formal courses and the time spent on these subjects detracts from the scholarship and knowledge of the discipline necessary to outstanding teaching."
32. "I believe the only persons qualified to teach accounting courses are those with accounting experience. I would prefer a Certified Public Accountant over a Ph.D. (academic area). I would not consider an Ed.D. or Ph.D. (College Teaching) except for methods courses. In my opinion fewer methods courses and more professional courses (accounting courses for accounting majors) and liberal arts courses will better prepare the future teacher."
33. "A 'tested' researcher and teacher is highly desirable."
34. "We prefer the Ph.D. in an academic area and have doubts about most work in 'education', i.e., methodology, statistics, etc. However, we feel that even the Ph.D. in English could have more emphasis on teaching and less on research, and that the candidates for the degree be in some way chosen or retained for their teaching aptitude and ability and not because they are devoted researchers. We want our people to be thorough scholars in the field of English, but also interested in teaching what they know to others--not only in doing research or writing learned articles. Their graduate work in English should ideally include college teaching experience under supervision, the kind of teaching experience that will help them to identify problems, find better ways to teach, etc. There will be appointments open for good scholars-teachers, but they had better have a Ph.D. in English."
35. "History departments are still subject matter oriented."

36. "In the field of history the current job crisis makes it possible to upgrade faculty by securing Ph.D.'s from 1st class universities. This situation would make it difficult for Ed.D. or Ph.D. candidates to acquire positions in universities with large professional history departments."

D. Positive attitudes toward College Teaching

programs/candidates:

1. "An institution of this kind, I suspect, would always prefer someone who had prepared for College Teaching. Our principal role is as a teaching institution with research and publication having a very low priority."
2. "College Teaching graduates, either Ph.D. or Ed.D., are becoming more attractive to the prospective hiring institutions. Standards of quality teaching are not always measureable by 'knowledge of subject' only. There are many ill-founded attitudes that must be broken, however, before straight Ph.D. candidates can be considered as no more prestigious than a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in College Teaching with a respectable block of academic area course work. If it were not for the current attitude and accrediting pressures, I would prefer the College Teaching degree for the classroom teacher."
3. "I have found Ed.D. candidates for teaching positions to be as well qualified as most Ph.D.'s and they usually do a better job as college teachers. I frankly prefer them to most Ph.D. candidates in areas wherein the Ed.D. is awarded."
4. "In our case, it is preferrable to have one person with a degree in Math-Education for maintaining communications with the teacher-training in the Department of Education."
5. "I do not believe special preference would be given to Ph.D. in academic area over Ed.D. or Ph.D. in College Teaching from an institution with a program comparable to that at North Texas."
6. "Given preference I would attempt to have a mixture of types (Ph.D.-academic, Ph.D.-College Teaching) in any one department. Our policy is to strive for a balance of experience in kind and length of service."

Some old, some young, some in-between. Reputation of institution is not that crucial when compared to individual qualifications and characteristics."

7. "Too many graduates and too many colleges have little regard for preparation in 'how to teach'. Too many deans and others who employ others only think of academic preparation and related factors."
8. "If they have Ph.D. (in College Teaching) and good subject matter background there is a good possibility. An Ed.D. is not accepted in Biology."
9. "Would accept person from any institution only if person had excellent recommendations."
10. "The situation has improved considerably over the past ten years. We are less prejudiced against these people, especially when we see 'pure' academicians getting extremely interested in pedagogical problems."
11. "Our Ed.D.'s in College Teaching have about as much success gaining employment as do our Ph.D.'s, but they go to different types of institutions. However, our Ed.D.'s have perhaps twice as much mathematics as is the case in your program. I can't really believe that people having a doctorate with only 24 doctorate hours in some area of specialization will be employable in today's market."
12. "I'd take a Ph.D. in College Teaching so long as the university where such a degree was offered knew what it was up to. I'd not look at such a degree from many universities. The whole problem is one of genuine commitment to the taught discipline-- and not a foolish mileage of educational cliches."

E. Negative attitudes toward College Teaching

programs/graduates:

1. "We would rarely consider an applicant with this type of degree, except possibly in the Department of Education. In the other areas, we would always prefer the Ph.D. in the academic area."
2. "In today's market, with a glut of excellent Ph.D.'s available, many of whom are excellent teachers, there is no point in considering anything less,

which the Ed.D. certainly is. The Ed.D. is for people not bright enough or intellectual enough, or disciplined enough to do a Ph.D."

3. "One or two (methods courses) don't hurt if the guy transcends them."
4. "Prefer Ph.D. in academic area. Once hired, however, an Ed.D. or Ph.D. in teaching will be graded on performance at this institution and type of degree is barrier only for promotion to administrative position in academic area."
5. "Not interested in Ed.D. in College Teaching, nor Ph.D. in College Teaching in Accounting. The Ed.D. would be important for other areas--Bus. Edn., Secreterial Administration--but only if coupled with an M.B.A."
6. "Yes for 2-year colleges. Seldom for 4-year and upper-level colleges."
7. "Unemployable here."
8. "I would never hire a person without a Ph.D. in history. I question the value of courses in methods at any level, and believe that apprenticeship is the best teacher. Ideally, the candidate should have along with the Ph.D. in history, some courses in general psychology (not Psych. of learning, which is drivel, but adolescent psych., mental development, abnormal psych.) and a considerable knowledge of other disciplines in social sciences and humanities. 'College Teaching' degrees are worthless."
9. "I'm sure that graduates of College Teaching programs are highly suitable for much of post-secondary education; but they are not suitable for a university faculty."
10. "Accounting should not be offered as a major on the Doctor of Arts degree. Ed.D. in Accounting seems unnecessary as teachers colleges are disappearing. Unless purpose is to give degrees to junior college teachers, most of whom seem to have education backgrounds and thus generally could not get into Ph.D. programs in accounting without meeting whopping deficiencies, that degree should be abandoned. The CPA certificate continues to be important for college teachers of accounting. The NTSU College of Education

seems too isolated from the mainstream of accounting to be a reliable curriculum builder for that field."

11. "We have never employed anyone with a 'teaching' degree."
12. "Probably not employable at this institution."
13. "If you mean Ph.D.'s in College Teaching, they could not be employable here."
14. "Ph.D.'s or Ed.D.'s in College Teaching might well be used in junior and community colleges or in small liberal arts colleges, and perhaps, in certain areas, e.g., freshman English, or mathematics, or sciences--not social sciences or history--in large universities. I think some amount of education courses in methodology, etc., will be increasingly important in the future for research oriented teachers. But it is rarely got by any Ph.D.'s today from major universities. Your program sounds good in its idea of combining the two (an academic field and knowledge of Ed. research results), but its greatest weakness, I have to say, is that it is at NTSU. You are simply not going to be able to place your graduates at any important schools."
15. "I would not hire them. I firmly believe that the best research material is also the best teaching material."

Doctoral Students

The following comments were submitted by the North Texas State University doctoral graduates who participated in the study:

1. "Dependent on academic discipline background and courses as well as experience or expressed desire to teach."
2. "As good here as any other graduate if they qualify in the field needed."
3. "Some difficulty encountered last year in gaining acceptance from universities for the College Teaching graduates. Junior colleges seemed more receptive--but paid less."

4. "Because of the surplus of college teachers it is my opinion that the employability of College Teaching graduates is marginal."
5. "In our department, if all other things are equal, a Ph.D. would be chosen over an Ed.D., but an Ed.D. who is a good teacher would be hired over a research Ph.D. There is no salary or promotion differential between a Ph.D. or Ed.D."
6. "I majored in College Teaching and feel that this major has been helpful to me in my work."
7. "With such intense competition for jobs, even the very poorest institutions try to fill their positions with 'supermen'. An academic Ph.D. will always edge Doctor of Arts in College Teaching--or for that matter Ph.D. in College Teaching. Any degree less than an academic Ph.D. will always be suspect--for if the graduate were truly capable, why did he opt a Ph.D. in College Teaching?"
8. "In the area of Business Administration only those holding terminal degrees in Bus. Adm. (first) and statistics or social sciences (second) would be considered."
9. "As the degree gets older and more accepted, the employability of College Teaching graduates will be greater."
10. "A. When business teacher education is 'housed' in College of Education, the Ph.D. and Ed.D. tend to be looked upon with equal favor. B. When business teacher education is in College of Business, the Ph.D. is preferred to the Ed.D. C. Salaries are slightly higher for Ph.D.'s than for Ed.D.'s. D. There is a 'sacredness' to the Ph.D. which the Ed.D. does not possess."
11. "I think, in general, there should be a good demand for College Teaching graduates. In this particular development, since current emphasis is on developing a graduate program, the only applicants who are being considered for permanent appointment are people with Ph.D. in mathematics from well-known institutions. In addition, a satisfactory record of publication is required for new appointees. So an applicant with a Ph.D. or Ed.D. in College Teaching would not be considered at all."

12. "There is a bias in our university toward any terminal degree that is not a Ph.D. in a specialized area."

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the opportunities available for employment to Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching by revealing the attitudes/preferences of employing agents with respect to Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching and Ph.D.'s in an academic area. An effort was also made to cross-validate the attitudes/preferences of employing agents with the perceptions of North Texas State University doctoral graduates with regard to the hiring process.

It was shown in Chapter I that little effort has been made to study scientifically the attitudes of employing agents in higher education toward Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in College Teaching. For this reason, the present study was exploratory in nature and was designed to detect the expression of differentiative attitudes by employing agents toward College Teaching graduates.

The instrument used in this study was constructed after surveying the literature concerning the employment process in higher education. The questionnaire was designed to be used specifically to answer the questions posed for this study. In an effort to establish the validity of the

questionnaire, a panel of five judges was selected from employing agents in higher education. The reliability of the questionnaire was established by means of a panel of twenty employing agents. Responses obtained from the two panels of judges served as an aid in the construction of a final questionnaire which contained thirteen items, one of which was open-ended and optional. The research instrument was printed in booklet form and mailed to seven hundred employing agents whose institutions were listed in the Directory of Higher Education. This resulted in a return of four hundred eighty-seven of which four hundred seventy-six were useable. This represented a 68 per cent useable return.

The questionnaire was revised so as to be appropriate for doctoral graduates. The validity and reliability of the instrument were established in a manner similar to the other questionnaire, doctoral graduates being used in place of employing agents. The research instrument was printed in booklet form and mailed to forty-one North Texas State University doctoral graduates who had received their degrees in the period between January, 1966, and August, 1971. This resulted in a return of twenty-six of which all were useable. This represented a 63.4 per cent useable return.

Findings

The study resulted in the following major findings:

1. The employing agents sampled preferred Ph.D.'s in an academic area over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching. This was true for all academic areas used in the study.

2. The employing agents preferred Ph.D.'s in College Teaching over Ed.D.'s in College Teaching. This was true for all academic areas used in the study.

3a, b, and c. There was no difference between groups of schools, geographic regions, state-supported, and private schools in their employment preference for Ph.D.'s in an academic area.

4a, b, and c. If a choice exists between a Ph.D. in College Teaching and an Ed.D. in College Teaching, the preference is for the former, regardless of type of school, geographic location, or whether it is a state-supported or a private school.

5. The single largest percentage of employing agents indicated a preference for prospective teachers without foreign language competency.

6. Employing agents preferred 24-35 semester hours in the major field above the Master's for all academic areas used in the study.

7. The single largest percentage of employing agents indicated a preference for prospective teachers who had had no professional learning theory and methodology courses.

8. Employing agents preferred prospective teachers to have 2-3 years of teaching experience at the time of their appointment.

9. The starting salary for Ed.D.'s in College Teaching is less than that for Ph.D.'s in College Teaching which is less than that for Ph.D.'s in an academic area.

10. Ph.D.'s in an academic area have a better opportunity for first academic promotion in all types of schools for all academic areas. Likewise, Ph.D.'s in College Teaching seemed to fare better than Ed.D.'s in College Teaching.

11. Employing agents preferred Ph.D.'s in an academic area from a less well-known institution over Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching from an institution with an excellent reputation.

12. The North Texas State University doctoral graduates' perceptions of the attitudes/preferences of employing agents toward Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching were in complete agreement with the results obtained by sampling employing agents in higher education.

Conclusions

The findings reported in Chapters IV and V and summarized in this chapter lead to the following major conclusions:

1. The College Teaching graduate, in particular an Ed.D. in College Teaching, when competing with an equally

qualified academic area graduate for a higher education position, will frequently experience a negative attitude from employing agents. While many employing agents seem to consider individual credentials, invariably the academic Ph.D. will be chosen.

2. The College Teaching graduate is differentiated from the academic area graduate not in terms of a) foreign language competency, or b) number of semester hours in the major field, but rather in terms of the preparation an academic area graduate has had in the realm of research and publications. It is believed that a graduate who has completed an academic Ph.D. program, regardless of the number of semester hours he has accumulated, has greater knowledge of his field and thereby more flexibility with regard to the level of courses he can teach. It is also agreed among employing agents that the type of department having control over a doctoral program contributes to or detracts from the employability of a doctoral graduate.

3. Competence in a foreign language is not particularly stressed by employing agents for two reasons: a) employing agents agree that a graduate who is "competent" by virtue of having passed a foreign language examination is meaningless; and b) statistics or computer programming may be chosen by a doctoral student in lieu of a foreign language.

4. Employing agents are not particularly concerned with a graduate's previous teaching experience. They are interested in his having had an apprenticeship while doing his graduate work, but barring that they prefer having him learn on-the-job. A common belief particularly among departmental chairmen is that knowledge of subject matter automatically results in teaching ability.

5. Education courses are not looked upon favorably by employing agents. If a graduate knows his subject and is interested in imparting it to students, this is more conducive to success in the classroom than is learning "how-to-teach" which might detract from a doctoral student's academic advancement.

6. Employing agents are skeptical of candidates who undertake a College Teaching program in preference to an academic one.

7. Recommendations and reputation of institution conferring the doctoral degree are high priority with employing agents.

8. Employing agents generally believe that College Teaching graduates are employable only according to the needs and expectations of specific departments and institutions.

9. It is possible that a certain amount of the employing agents who did not respond to the questionnaire may have even more negative attitudes toward Ph.D.'s/Ed.D.'s in College Teaching than those who did respond.

Implications

The initial impetus for the present study was provided by the large number of College Teaching graduates who revealed their frustrations and disillusionments about locating higher education positions to the researcher. It is in this area that the results of the study may have their greatest implications. Prospective College Teaching candidates must be realistically aware of the employment limitations that may prevail. They should recognize, well in advance of their venture into the academic marketplace, that they typically will not be placed on an equal basis with academic area graduates. Prospective College Teaching candidates should recognize that they should, in effect, be more highly qualified than their academic area competitors for higher education positions. Finally, College Teaching candidates should be especially aware of the attitudes that may be expected from employing agents in the fields which typically employ academic area graduates. In particular, Ed.D.'s in College Teaching should be aware that employing agents tend to have even stronger negative attitudes toward this degree than toward a Ph.D. in College Teaching.

On the basis of the subjective comments provided by the employing agents, additional implications of the study are that 1) College Teaching graduates are employable only according to the needs of a department or institution. 2) Better communication between and joint planning by the

education department and the various academic departments might result in more favorable College Teaching programs.

3) Unfamiliarity with College Teaching programs and graduates may have affected the results of the study.

A final implication of the study is that employing agents in higher education should re-examine their own attitudes regarding College Teaching graduates. In a period when higher education is being bombarded by demands for qualified and effective teachers, the denial of a teaching position to College Teaching graduates, based solely on the negative attitudes toward type of degree held by the graduate, is open to serious question.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present study has generated the following research possibilities:

1. While the attitude assessment technique proved fruitful for this study, other studies concerning employment attitudes toward College Teaching graduates should consider using a case study approach which would present more in-depth material about the candidates.

2. The present study did not statistically determine why employing agents have negative attitudes toward College Teaching graduates in academic employment. The role that cultural attitudes play in this area should also be investigated in a precise manner.

3. Future studies concerned with College Teaching graduates should consider an expansion of the academic areas. Additionally, a broader sample of various types of higher education institutions should be investigated.

4. Additional studies should be concerned with the effectiveness of College Teaching graduates. Such areas as research productivity and teaching ability evaluated by colleagues and students are examples of areas which require additional research.

5. Research in the area of differentiation of College Teaching graduates should be expanded into business and industry populations. College and university placement services offer unique and accessible opportunities for such research.

6. A comparative study of the present program in College Teaching with what is expected by employing agents should be devised.

7. Serious consideration ought to be given to the future of an Ed.D. in College Teaching.

Further research in the above areas may help contribute to an increased understanding and acceptance of College Teaching graduates in higher education and in the world of work in general.

APPENDIX A
DESCRIPTION OF TYPICAL Ph.D. AND Ed.D. DEGREES
IN COLLEGE TEACHING

The degrees with which this study is concerned are characterized by the fact that they combine training both in an academic area and in education. While the titles of the degrees may vary, they are, in general, as described below.

1. Ed.D. in College Teaching.

- A. Prerequisites. Equivalent of undergraduate major in a specific academic area.
- B. A mean of fifty-one semester hours are required to be taken in the following areas:
 - (1) Academic Area. A mean of twenty-four semester hours at the graduate level.
 - (2) Education. A mean of thirty-six semester hours which include courses in research, statistics, and practicum. A mean of twelve additional semester hours are recommended in the area of personality development, counseling, and guidance.
 - (3) Dissertation. Maximum twelve semester hours.
- C. Examinations. Admission examination, written and oral qualifying examinations, dissertation proposal defense, and final oral examination required.

2. Ph.D. in College Teaching.

The program of study for this degree is basically the same as that for the Ed.D. in College Teaching. The difference between the two lies in the fact that a candidate for the Ph.D. in College Teaching must satisfy one of the following additional requirements: (1) reading competency in

a foreign language(s); (2) advanced statistics or research courses; or (3) proficiency in computer programming.

APPENDIX B
DESCRIPTION OF TYPICAL Ph.D. DEGREE IN AN ACADEMIC AREA

- A. Prerequisites. A mean of eighteen semester hours at the graduate level in an academic area.

- B. A mean of sixty-three semester hours is required to be taken in the following areas:
 - (1) Academic area. A mean of thirty-six semester hours at the graduate level.
 - (2) Minor. A mean of nine semester hours to be taken in a related field.
 - (3) Special problems and dissertation. A mean of eighteen semester hours.

- C. Foreign language. A candidate must show reading competency in at least one foreign language.

- D. Examinations. Admission examination, qualifying examination, and final examination required.

APPENDIX C
NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DENTON, TEXAS

College of Education

76803

Sept. 27, 1971

Dear Sir:

As a member of the academic community, I am sure that you are aware of the need for additional meaningful research concerning the higher education employment decision-making process.

The enclosed instrument, developed within the College of Education at North Texas State University, is part of a nation-wide study designed to produce data related to decision-making processes regarding higher education appointments. I am hopeful that you will be interested in devoting a few minutes of your time to complete the study instrument.

You will be asked to answer questions with respect to three types of degree-holders: (1) Ph.D. in an academic area. The program of study for this graduate involves a major in area of specialization and a minor in a related field. (2) Ed.D. in College Teaching. The program of study for this graduate usually involves at least 24 semester hours in an area of specialization. An equal number of semester hours are taken in the field of education in such courses as methodology, learning theory, research, and statistics. No foreign language is usually required. (3) Ph.D. in College Teaching. The program of study for this graduate is basically the same as for the Ed.D. in College Teaching. The difference between the two lies in the fact that the Ph.D. in College Teaching must satisfy one of the following additional requirements--reading competency in a foreign language; or proficiency in computer programming; or an advanced research and/or statistics program.

No identification is required on the instrument. Please be assured that your responses will become an anonymous part of the data collected in the study. The number on the end of the questionnaire will be removed upon receipt so you and your school will remain anonymous. The numbers are used as a record for follow-up. If you wish to receive an abstract of the completed study, you may indicate by checking the appropriate item appearing in the initial part of the booklet.

Since other phases of this research cannot be initiated until analysis of the responses to the instrument is concluded, it would be most helpful if you could return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible. Please note that both postage and the return address appear on the back of the booklet. If you will fold the questionnaire once so that the address shows and then staple the edges, it may be returned by mail.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your cooperation and assistance.

Very cordially yours,

Diana Gonzalez

Diana Gonzalez

ACADEMIC POSITION _____
 IF DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMAN, NAME OF DEPARTMENT _____
 DO YOU WISH TO RECEIVE ABSTRACT OF COMPLETED STUDY YES _____ NO _____

This questionnaire is being sent to Academic Deans and Departmental Chairmen from randomly selected colleges and universities. No individual will be identified, and all information which you supply will be kept strictly confidential.

1. Please give the number of full-time staff members teaching in the discipline(s) under your supervision who hold each of the following degrees as the highest earned degree.

	Ph.D. in academic area	Ph.D. in College Teaching	Ed.D. in College Teaching	Masters	Other
Accounting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Biology	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
English	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
History	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Do you have a preference for one of the following degrees? Please check one in the discipline(s) under your supervision.

	Accounting	Biology	English	History	Mathematics
Ph.D. in academic area	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ph.D. in College Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ed.D. in College Teaching	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
No preference	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. On the average, in how many foreign languages do you prefer doctoral job applicants to be competent? Please check one column for each of the disciplines under your supervision.

	0	1	2	Undecided
Accounting	_____	_____	_____	_____
Biology	_____	_____	_____	_____
English	_____	_____	_____	_____
History	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. At what level do you prefer doctoral job applicants to have had experience? Please check one column in each discipline under your supervision.

	Secondary level	College level	Both Secondary & College levels	No preference
Accounting	_____	_____	_____	_____
Biology	_____	_____	_____	_____
English	_____	_____	_____	_____
History	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. How many years of teaching experience either at the secondary or college level or both do you prefer doctoral job applicants to have for initial appointments? Please check one column for each discipline under your supervision.

	0-1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8 or more	Undecided
Accounting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Biology	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
English	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
History	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Mathematics	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

9. On a nine months basis, what starting salary would generally be recommended for a doctoral job applicant who has received one of the following degrees within the past year? Please make one response for each degree category in the discipline(s) under your supervision.

	Ph.D. in Academic Area	Ph.D. in College Teaching	Ed.D. in College Teaching
Accounting	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE
Biology	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE
English	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE
History	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE
Mathematics	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE	6200 / 6500 / 7000 / 7500 / 8000 / 147 ABOVE

4.

10. What is the average number of years for first academic promotion for people teaching in the various disciplines? Please make one response, if applicable, for each degree category in the discipline(s) under your supervision.

	Ph.D. in Academic Area				Ph.D. in College Teaching				Ed.D. in College Teaching			
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7&above	1-2	3-4	5-6	7&above	1-2	3-4	5-6	7&above
Accounting	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Biology	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
English	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
History	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Mathematics	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/

11. With respect to the reputation of the institution conferring the degree, which one of the following doctoral job applicants would you prefer, if all other qualifications were held constant? Please check one in each discipline under your supervision.

	Accounting	Biology	English	History	Mathematics
Ph.D. in College Teaching from institution with excellent reputation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ed.D. in College Teaching from institution with excellent reputation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Ph.D. in Academic Area from less well-known institution	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
No preference	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. On a scale from 1-10 and using 1 for the most important reason, rate in order of importance the reasons for (a) academic promotion, and (b) tenure.

	(a) Academic Promotion	(b) Tenure
Age	_____	_____
Creative Teaching	_____	_____
Experience	_____	_____
Professional activity	_____	_____
Publications	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____
Scholarship	_____	_____
Tenure (applicable to (a) only)	_____	_____
Type of Degree	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____

13. OPTIONAL If you care to comment on employability of College Teaching graduates, space has been provided for you to do so.

· NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

DENTON, TEXAS

College of Education

78203

Oct. 27, 1971

Dear North Texas State Doctoral Graduate:

As a member of the academic community, I am sure that you are aware of the need for additional meaningful research concerning the higher education employment decision-making process.

The enclosed instrument, developed within the College of Education at North Texas State University, is part of a nation-wide study designed to produce data related to decision-making processes regarding higher education appointments. I am hopeful that you will be interested in devoting a few minutes of your time to complete the study instrument.

You will be asked to answer questions with reference to the person(s) (i.e., Academic Dean, Departmental Chairman) directly involved in appointing you to your first full-time teaching position after completion of the doctoral degree. This person(s) will be referred to as an employing agent in the questionnaire. There are three types of degree-holders involved in the questionnaire: (1) Ph.D. in an academic area. The program of study for this graduate involves a major in area of specialization and a minor in a related field. (2) Ed.D. in College Teaching. The program of study for this graduate usually involves at least 24 semester hours in an area of specialization. An equal number of semester hours are taken in the field of education in such courses as methodology, learning theory, research, and statistics. No foreign language is usually required. (3) Ph.D. in College Teaching. The program of study for this graduate is basically the same as for the Ed.D. in College Teaching. The difference between the two lies in the fact that the Ph.D. in College Teaching must satisfy one of the following additional requirements--reading competence in a foreign language; or proficiency in computer programming; or an advanced research and/or statistics program.

No identification is required on the instrument. Please be assured that your responses will become an anonymous part of the data collected in the study. If you wish to receive an abstract of the completed study, you may indicate by checking the appropriate item appearing in the initial part of the booklet.

Since other phases of this research cannot be initiated until analysis of the responses to the instrument is concluded, it would be most helpful if you could return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible. Please note that both postage and the return address appear on the back of the booklet. If you will fold the questionnaire once so that the address shows and then staple the edges once, it may be returned by mail.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your cooperation and assistance.

Very cordially yours,

Diana Gonzalez

Diana Gonzalez

ACADEMIC RANK _____

NAME OF DEPARTMENT _____

TYPE OF DEGREE: (CHECK ONE)

Ph.D. in academic area _____ Ph.D. in College Teaching _____ Ed.D. in College Teaching _____

FULL-TIME STUDENT ENROLLMENT (Fall, 1971) _____

NUMBER OF FULL-TIME FACULTY EMPLOYED IN SCHOOL (Fall, 1971) _____

IS YOUR SCHOOL: (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE ITEMS)

Liberal Arts	_____	Private	_____
Technical	_____	Four-year without graduate school	_____
Teacher-training	_____	Four-year with graduate school	_____
State-supported	_____	Junior college	_____

DO YOU WISH TO RECEIVE ABSTRACT OF COMPLETED STUDY YES _____ NO _____

This questionnaire is being sent to Ph.D.'s in academic areas, Ed.D.'s in College Teaching, and Ph.D.'s in College Teaching who have graduated from North Texas State University in the last five years. No individual will be identified, and all information which you supply will be kept strictly confidential.

1. Please give the number of full-time staff members teaching in your discipline who hold one of the following degrees as the highest earned degree.

Ph.D. in academic area	Ph.D. in College Teaching	Ed.D. in College Teaching	Masters	Other (specify)
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. In your discipline, does your employing agent have a preference for one of the following degrees? Please check one.

Ph.D. in academic area	Ph.D. in College Teaching	Ed.D. in College Teaching	Other (specify)	No preference
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

3. In your discipline, on the average, in how many foreign languages does your employing agent prefer doctoral job applicants to be competent? Please check one.

0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ Undecided _____

4. How many semester hours above the Master's in your academic area of specialization does your employing agent prefer doctoral job applicants to have? Please check one.

Less than 24 _____ 24-35 _____ 36-47 _____ 48-59 _____ 60-71 _____ 72 & above _____

5. If education courses, such as methods courses, supervision of student teaching, etc., are taught in your department, what type of degree does your employing agent prefer the person teaching these courses to have? Please check one.

Ph.D. in academic area	_____	Ed.D. in Secondary Education	_____
Ph.D. in College Teaching	_____	Other (specify)	_____
Ed.D. in College Teaching	_____	No preference	_____
Ph.D. in Secondary Education	_____	Not applicable	_____

6. How many professional methods or learning theory courses does your employing agent prefer doctoral job applicants to have had? Please check one.

0 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 & above _____ Undecided _____

7. At what level does your employing agent prefer doctoral job applicants to have had experience? Please check one.

Secondary level _____ College level _____ Both Secondary and College levels _____ No preference _____

8. How many years of teaching experience at the secondary and/or college level does your employing agent prefer doctoral job applicants to have for initial appointment? Please check one.

0-1 _____ 2-3 _____ 4-5 _____ 6-7 _____ 8 or more _____ Undecided _____

9. On a nine-months basis, what starting salary is generally recommended for a doctoral job applicant who has received one of the following degrees within the past year? Please respond to each category as you know conditions to exist in your discipline.

Ph.D. in Academic Area					Ph.D. in College Teaching					Ed.D. in College Teaching				
6000	8000	10000	12000	14 & 7999	6000	8000	10000	12000	14 & 7999	6000	8000	10000	12000	14 & 7999
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

10. What is the average number of years for first academic promotion for people teaching in your discipline? Please respond to each category as you know conditions to exist in your discipline.

Ph.D. in Academic Area				Ph.D. in College Teaching				Ed.D. in College Teaching			
1-2	3-4	5-6	7&above	1-2	3-4	5-6	7&above	1-2	3-4	5-6	7&above
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

11. With respect to the reputation of the institution conferring the degree, which one of the following doctoral job applicants would your employing agent prefer, if all other qualifications were held constant? Please check one.

Ph.D. in College Teaching from institution with excellent reputation _____	Ph.D. in Academic Area from less well-known institution _____
Ed.D. in College Teaching from institution with excellent reputation _____	No preference _____

12. On a scale from 1-10 and using 1 for the most important reason, rate in order of importance the reasons for (a) Academic Promotion, and (b) Tenure, following your employing agent's guidelines.

	(a) Academic Promotion	(b) Tenure
Age	_____	_____
Creative Teaching	_____	_____
Experience	_____	_____
Professional Activity	_____	_____
Publications	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____
Scholarship	_____	_____
Tenure (applicable to (a) only)	_____	_____
Type of Degree	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____

13. OPTIONAL If you care to comment on employability of College Teaching graduates, space has been provided for you to do so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Atkinson, Carroll, Pro and Con of the Ph.D., Boston, Meador Publishing Co., 1945.
- Barzun, Jacques, Teacher in America, Boston, Little, Brown, and Co., 1945.
- _____, The American University, New York, Harper and Row, Inc., 1968.
- Berelson, Bernard, Graduate Education in the United States, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.
- Brickman, William W. and Stanley Lehrer (eds.), A Century of Higher Education, New York, Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962.
- Brown, David G., The Market for College Teachers, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, University of North Carolina Press, 1965.
- Brown, Laurence D. and J. Marlowe Slater, The Doctorate in Education, Washington, D. C., The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1960.
- Caplow, Theodore and Reece McGee, The Academic Marketplace, New York, Basic Books, 1959.
- Carmichael, Oliver C., Graduate Education: A Critique and A Program, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- Cartter, Allan M., An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education, New York, Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1966.
- Christie, Dan E., The Development of Doctoral Programs by the Small Liberal Arts College, Brunswick, Maine, Bowdoin College, 1967.
- Cordasco, Francesco, Daniel Coit and the Protean Ph.D., Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1960.
- Counelis, James Steve, editor, To Be A Phoenix: The Education Professoriats, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.

- Bells, Walter C., Degrees in Higher Education, Washington, The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
- Garrison, Roger H., Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, Washington, The American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
- Heiss, Ann M., The Preparation of College and University Teachers, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, University of California, 1968.
- Hoffman, Lindsey, Doctorate Production in United States Universities, 1929-1967, Washington, National Education Association, 1965.
- Hofstadter, Richard and Wilson Smith, American Higher Education: A Documentary History, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Hollis, Ernest V., Toward Improving Ph.D. Programs, Washington, American Council on Education, 1945.
- James, William, Ph.D. Octopus -- In Memories and Studies, New York, Longmans, Green, 1917.
- Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution, Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1968.
- Malden, Henry, On the Origin of Universities and Academic Degrees, London, John Taylor, 1835.
- Maul, Ray, Teacher Supply and Demand in Universities, Colleges, and Junior Colleges, 1963-64 and 1964-65, Washington, Research Division, National Education Association, 1965.
- McGrath, Earl J., The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.
- _____, The Quantity and Quality of College Teachers, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.
- National Academy of Sciences, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities, 1958-1966, Washington, National Academy of Sciences, 1967.
- Pfnister, Allan O., The Academic Origins of College Faculties: Sources of Advanced Degrees, The Doctorate, Vol. II, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.

- Rashdall, Hastings, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, 2nd. ed., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Robertson, Neville and Jack K. Syster, The Doctorate in Education, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1971.
- Rogers, James A., Staffing American Colleges and Universities, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Schweitzer, George K., The Doctorate, Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas, 1965.
- Skilling, Hugh H., Do You Teach? Views on College Teaching, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Skinner, B.F., The Technology of Teaching, New York, Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968.
- Spurr, Stephen H., Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Storr, Richard J., The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Wahlquist, John T., Innovations in the Preparation of College Teachers, Bloomington, Indiana, Phi Delta Kappa, 1970.
- Walters, Everett, ed., Graduate Education Today, Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.
- Wilson, Logan, The Academic Man: A Study in the Sociology of A Profession, London, Oxford University Press, 1942.

Articles

- Adkins, Edwin P., "The Federal Government and Higher Education," The Educational Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 423-427.
- Arden, Eugene, "Faculty as Teachers," The Educational Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 447-452.
- Arlt, Gustave, "The First Ph.D.'s Under Title IV," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (Winter, 1963), 241-249.
- Blegen, Theodore C., "How Can Graduate Schools Increase the Supply of College Teachers?" Journal of Higher Education, XXX (March, 1959), 127-133.
- Cardozier, V. R., "Preparing College Teachers," Improving College and University Teaching, XVI (Spring, 1968), 131-133.

- Cartter, Allan M., "A New Look at the Supply of College Teachers," Educational Record, IV (Summer, 1965), 267-77.
- _____, "Future Faculty: Needs and Resources," Improving College Teaching, Lee, Calvin T., ed., Washington, American Council on Education, 1967, 113-35.
- _____, "The Supply and Demand of College Teachers," Journal of Human Resources, I (October, 1966), 22-38.
- Cartter, Allan M. and Robert Farrell, "Higher Education in the Last Third of the Century," Educational Record, IV (Summer, 1965), 119-128.
- Dunlop, Richard S., "Not Enough Doctors in the Schoolhouse," Journal of Secondary Education, XLIII (February, 1968), 65-69.
- Glass, John F. and Judith Glass, "Improving Graduate Education," The Educational Forum, XXXII (May, 1968), 439-446.
- "Graduates and Jobs: A Grave New World," Time, XCVIII (May, 1971), 49-59.
- Haggerty, Melvin E., "The Professional Training of College Teachers," The North Central Association Quarterly, II (Winter, 1927), 108-123.
- Lady, Andrew R., "Honoris Causa: An Examination of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (Spring, 1967), 197-205.
- McBride, Lewis B., "The Literature of Higher Education, 1965," The Educational Record, V (Winter, 1966), 18-49.
- "M.A.?, M.Phil.?, D.A.?, C.D.?, Ph.D.?: Intermediate Graduate Degrees," Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Languages Association, I (Summer, 1967), 1-39.
- Rosenberg, Ralph P., "The First American Doctor of Philosophy Degree," Ventures, VI (Summer, 1966), 31-37.
- Schmitt, Hans A., "Teaching and Research: Companions or Adversaries?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXVI (Winter, 1965), 419-427.
- Torrey, George N. and Richard P. Finn, "Let's Stop Apologizing for Degrees in Education," School and Community, LVI (March, 1970), 35-52.
- Whaley, Gordon W., "American Academic Degrees," The Educational Record, XLVII (Summer, 1966), 525-537.

Wortham, Mary, "The Case for a Doctor of Arts Degree: A View from Junior College Faculty," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LIII (December, 1967), 372-389.

Reports

Adams, Richard P., The Outlook from the University: The Social Sciences and the Humanities, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.

Albright, A. D. and John E. Barrows, Preparing College Teachers: A Project Report, Lexington, Kentucky, The University of Kentucky, 1959.

Brown, David G., Academic Labor Markets: A Report Submitted to the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, Department of Labor, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina, 1965.

Cartter, Allan M., Graduate Education in a Decade of Radical Change, Berkeley, California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

_____, The After-Effects of Putting the Blind Eye to the Telescope, Chicago, American Association of Higher Education, 1970.

Case, Chester H., Beyond Evaluation: The Quality Control Model of Evaluation and the Developmental Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1971.

Chase, John L., Doctoral Study: A Report to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1970.

Doctor's and Master's -- Good and Bad: A Report of the Committee on Policies in Graduate Education, New York, The Association of Graduate Schools, 1957.

Dunham, Ralph E., Teaching Faculty in Universities and Four-Year Colleges, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1966.

Eells, Walter C. and Harold A. Haswell, Academic Degrees, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1960.

Glenny, Lyman, Doctoral Planning for the 1970's, Berkeley, California, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

- Hansen, Harold P., The Ph.D. Surplus -- Realities and Illusions, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
- Reitz, J. Wayne, The Outlook from the Federal Government, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
- Report on the Training of Teachers in Mathematics, Chicago, Commission on the Training and Utilization of Advanced Students of Mathematics, 1965.
- Simon, Kenneth A. and Marie G. Fullam, Projections of Educational Statistics to 1976-77, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Spolding, Willard and Leslie Wilbur, Approaches to Preparing Prospective College Teachers, Sacramento, California, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, 1968.
- Wolfle, Dael, America's Resources of Specialized Talent: A Current Appraisal and a Look Ahead, Washington, President's Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training, 1954.

Publications of Learned Organizations

- American Association of Junior Colleges, Preparing Two-Year College Teachers for the 70's, Washington, American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.
- Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, The Doctor's Degree in Professional Fields: Joint Statements by the Association of Graduate Schools and the Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1966.
-
- _____, New Doctor of Philosophy Programs, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1965.
-
- _____, The Preparation of Junior College Teachers, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1967.
-
- _____, Teachers for Junior Colleges, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1966.
-
- _____, The Ph.D. in Transition, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1967.

- _____, The Doctor of Philosophy Degree, Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1964.
- Deener, David R., New Directions for the Ph.D., Washington, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, 1970.
- Dunham, E. Alden, Rx for Higher Education: Doctor of Arts Degree, Chicago, American Association of Higher Education, 1970.
- Goforth, John, The Career Decisions of College Teachers, Atlanta, Georgia, Southern Regional Educational Board, 1969.

Unpublished Materials

- Berwald, Helen D., "Attitudes Toward Women College Teachers in Institutions of Higher Education Accredited by the North Central Association," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Minneapolis, Minnesota, University of Minnesota, 1962.
- Simpson, L. A., "A Study of Employing Agents' Attitudes Toward Academic Women in Higher Education," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania State University, 1969.
- Wood, Carvel W., "An Investigation of Three Assumptions Upon Which Doctoral Dissertations in Education are Based," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford, California, Stanford University, 1967.