

379
N81d
NO. 1079

ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS AND SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENTS IN MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF SOUTHERN
ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS TOWARD
EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREES AND
PROGRAMS

DISSERTATION

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

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Michael M. Mayall, B. A., M. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1976

Mayall, Michael M., Attitudes of College and University Presidents and School Superintendents in Member Institutions of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Toward External Doctoral Degrees and Programs. Doctor of Education (Higher Education), August, 1976, 149 pp., 39 tables, bibliography, 44 titles.

The problem with which this study is concerned was the analysis of administrative reaction towards the external doctoral degree as it pertained to initial employment and promotion.

The purposes of this investigation were to

- 1) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for employment and promotion in school systems accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
- 2) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for initial employment and promotion in junior/community colleges accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
- 3) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for initial employment and promotion in baccalaureate granting colleges and universities accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
- 4) determine which degree and institutional factors concerning the nontraditional external doctorate are not accepted in
 - a) school systems
 - b) junior/community colleges
 - c) baccalaureate granting colleges and universities;

- 5) determine which degree and institutional factors concerning the nontraditional external doctorate are acceptable in
 - a) school systems
 - b) junior/community colleges
 - c) baccalaureate granting colleges and universities.

A Likert-type attitude scale was developed into an instrument meeting the criterion to measure the attitudes of baccalaureate granting college and university presidents, junior/community college presidents and school superintendents toward external doctoral degrees and programs. The initial instrument was presented to a panel of jurors to establish the validity. The reliability of the instrument was established by the test-retest technique. Research hypotheses were tested with the F test and analysis of variance to determine if there were significant differences in the attitudes of the groups under study toward statements on the instrument. The hypotheses were either retained or rejected at the .05 level of significance.

Analysis of the data compiled from the responses of the administrators responding revealed that junior/community college presidents had more positive attitudes toward acceptance of the external doctoral degree than did school superintendents in initial employment. College and university presidents overall held more favorable attitudes toward acceptance of the external doctorate than school superintendents in initial employment. Chief administrators holding at least one external degree were more receptive in the

employment of a new employee holding the external doctoral degree, and chief administrators' attitudes overall were more positive toward the external doctoral degree in direct relationship to its similarity with the traditional doctoral degree.

The major conclusions were that the traditional doctoral degree still has strong advantages and that the institutional and program characteristics of the degree granting institution were very important. Many chief administrators are still undecided concerning the external doctoral degree. Chief administrators appear to be receptive to changes in traditional doctorate programs.

The following major recommendations were made:

1. Educational institutions must develop specific policies as to the nature of the doctoral degree acceptable at that institution for initial employment and promotion.

2. Prospective doctoral students must carefully evaluate the acceptance factors of the external doctoral degree prior to making a commitment to such a program.

3. Current traditional doctoral degree programs must evaluate carefully their present requirements in light of what is demanded, and what is only a matter of tradition for the institution and the degree.

4. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools must develop more expertise in and criteria for the accreditation standards as they apply to institutions granting external doctoral degrees.

© Copyright by
Michael Marvin Mayall
1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Delimitations	
Basic Assumptions	
Procedures for Collection of Data	
The Population	
Selection of the Sample	
Instrument	
Study Design	
Procedure for Analysis of Data	
Testing the Hypotheses	
Reporting of Data	
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	
II. RELATED LITERATURE	21
Introduction	
Sample Survey of External Doctorate Programs	
Synthesis of Related Research	
III. QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION AND DATA COLLECTION	38
Introduction	
Identification of Populations and Selection of Samples	
Development of the Instrument	
Validation of the Instrument	
Administration of the Instrument for the Collection of Data	

IV.	TREATMENT AND PRESENTATION OF DATA	Page 51
	Introduction	
	Treatment of the Data	
	Data Compiled from the Attitude Scale	
	Testing of Hypotheses	
V.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	103
	Summary	
	Findings	
	Conclusions	
	Recommendations	
APPENDICES	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY	146

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Number of Institutions Holding SACS Membership by State and Study Sample December, 1974	12
II. Percentages of Returns from the Data Producing Samples	49
III. Percentage of Respondents from Samples According to Institutional Size . . .	54
IV. Percentage of All Respondents from Samples According to Primary Funding Source of the Institution	56
V. Significance of the Relationship Between Institutional Funding Source and the Acceptance of the External Doctoral Degree Earned by a New Employee	57
VI. Significance of the Relationship Between Institutional Funding Source and the Acceptance of the External Doctoral Degree Earned by a Present Employee	58
VII. Percentage of Respondents from All Samples According to Degree Attainment	59
VIII. Percentage of Respondents from Samples According to Type of Degree Attainment	60
IX. Significance of the Relationship Between Respondents Holding an External Degree and the Accep- tance of the External Doctoral Degree for New Employees	61

	Page
X. Significance of the Relationship Between Respondents Holding an External Degree and the Acceptance of the External Doctoral Degree for a Present Employee	62
XI. Acceptance of an External Doctoral Degree of an Assessment Variety for a Prospective New Employee . . .	64
XII. Acceptance of an External Doctoral Degree of the Extension Variety for a Prospective New Employee . . .	65
XIII. Acceptance of an External Doctoral Degree of an Assessment Variety for a Present Employee	66
XIV. Acceptance of an External Doctoral Degree of an Extension Variety for a Present Employee	67
XV. Response to Statements on the Ques- tionnaire Related to Accredita- tion of Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions	68
XVI. Response to Statements Related to Institutional Characteristics of Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions	70
XVII. Response to Statements Related to Program Characteristics in Doctoral Degree Programs	72
XVIII. Response to Statements Related to Curriculum Organization and Evaluation in Doctoral Degree Programs	75
XIX. Response to Statements Related to Admission and Candidacy in Doctoral Degree Programs	78

	Page
XX. Response to Statements Related to Residency and the Dis- sertation in Doctoral Degree Programs	80
XXI. Response to "A" University's External Doctorate Program for a Prospec- tive New Employee	82
XXII. Response to "A" University's External Doctorate Program for a Current Employee	83
XXIII. Response to "B" University's External Doctorate Program for a Prospec- tive New Employee	84
XXIV. Response to "B" University's External Doctorate Program for a Current Employee	85
XXV. Response to "C" University's External Doctorate Program for a Prospec- tive New Employee	86
XXVI. Response to "C" University's External Doctorate Program for a Current Employee	87
XXVII. Response to "D" University's External Doctorate Program for a Prospec- tive New Employee	89
XXVIII. Response to "D" University's External Doctorate Program for a Current Employee	89
XXIX. Significance of the Difference in Attitudes Between School Super- intendents and Junior/Community College Presidents in the Accep- tance of Nontraditional External Doctoral Degrees in Initial Employment	91

	Page
XXX. Significance of the Difference in Attitudes Between Junior/Community College Presidents and Baccalaureate Granting College and University Presidents in the Acceptance of Nontraditional External Doctorates in Initial Employment	93
XXXI. Significance of the Difference Between School Superintendents and College and University Presidents in the Acceptance of Nontraditional External Doctorates in Initial Employment	94
XXXII. Significance of the Difference of Attitudes of Administrators Toward the Acceptance of the Nontraditional External Doctorate for Prospective New Employees and Current Employees	96
XXXIII. Significance of Difference in Administrative Attitudes Toward the External Doctoral Degree Earned by a Current Employee in Relation to Institution Size	97
XXXIV. Significance of Difference in Administrative Attitudes Toward the External Doctoral Degree Earned by a Current Employee in Relation to Institution Size	98
XXXV. Significance of Difference in Administrative Attitudes Toward Acceptance of the External Doctoral Degree in Relation to Perceived Differences from the Traditional Doctoral Degree	100
XXXVI. Breakdown of Data on Respondents and Institutions Obtained for the Study N = 348*	136

	Page
XXXVII. Summary Data of Questions 7-49 Obtained from Respondents in Study	137
XXXVIII. Raw Data Obtained from Respondents on Questions 7-41	138
XXXIX. Raw Data Obtained from Respondents on Questions 42-49	144

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, several changes have occurred which have had a great impact upon an educator's decision to pursue the doctoral degree.

A major consideration is the current surplus of educators (16, 19). This surplus is having an effect upon those who would have left full time employment a few short years ago to pursue the doctoral degree and, then on completion, almost immediately be able to select his choice of many attractive educational openings. Today's graduate of a doctoral program finds no easy task of locating employment and chances are he will be forced to accept a position of no greater magnitude than the one he left prior to such a pursuit (18, 30). Today's doctoral aspiring educator finds himself choosing many times between a Ph. D. and job security. Another major consideration involves advancement within his own educational institution. In the past fringe benefits of leave and tenure assisted many educators to pursue academic goals, often times with written or verbal commitments as to increased opportunity and responsibility from their institutions upon termination of leave. With affirmative action plans and equal opportunity requirements, it becomes

virtually impossible and illegal for institutions to make commitments for vacancies which do not exist, nor are yet advertised (32). Another major consideration involves the current recession and spiraling economy. If the previous factors have not had a negative effect on one's doctoral ambitions, certainly this situation may, as many educators will find tuition and residency cost factors an economic decision with uncertain rewards. Thus, the decision to pursue one's doctoral ambition has become even more of a problem to the educator today than in the past.

In addition to the previously mentioned situations confronting the educator wishing to pursue the doctoral degree, changes in the world of graduate study also confront him (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 21, 22). In 1971, the Commission on Nontraditional Study (8) was founded and charged with the assessment of higher education's response to the pressures of society. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published studies and specific recommendations relating to non-traditional and external study. The Newman Commission issued its report on the role of federal government in seeking of new educational directions in American education. Early in the 1970's the external degree suddenly came to the attention of the American academic community. Several university systems made plans to initiate it and others announced plans to give it serious study. New colleges and universities were specifically created to issue the external degree. Popular

magazines, professional journals and even newspapers began to describe, support, and condemn the external degree (5, 9, 11, 13, 14, 25, 35); but even so, the external doctorate was born in America in two basic varieties, the assessment degree, and the extension degree. The president of the Carnegie Corporation adequately summed up the situation when he said that, "the external degree--one that can be earned by a student outside the normal institutional framework--is an idea whose time seems to have come in this country" (26, p. 78).

The American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education formed special bodies to examine the future of nontraditional approaches. Provision for the future acceptance of external degrees and other non-traditional programs came in December of 1971, when the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools revised its controlling policy to read,

The Commission does not wish to be restrictive on new, special activities of a member institution but rather seeks to encourage innovation, and an imaginative approach to providing quality instruction, according to the educational needs of the colleges' constituents (19, p. 165).

Even more recently, new institutions based solely on the external degree have sought and achieved "Candidate Status" from their regional accrediting associations such as Nova University and Union Graduate School (1). It appears that in a very short time, the external doctoral degree will clearly distinguish itself, via recognized accreditation, from efforts of the previously unacceptable "degree mills" (31).

For the past several years, educators across the nation have been receiving information from numerous external doctorate programs and interest is developing as to the future acceptability of such a degree (7, 8, 20, 24, 33, 34). Many faculty who have attempted to research the acceptance factors concerning the external doctorate have found little in the way of recognized research other than in periodical debate and information supplied by external degree institutions themselves. Other faculty have enrolled with little immediate concern in new institutions such as Western Colorado University, California Western University, Laurence University, Nova University, Union Graduate School, Walden University, and others in anticipation of acceptance or partial professional acceptance by graduation day. It is at this point this study was designed to answer basic questions concerning the acceptance of the external doctoral degree by educational institutions accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools as well as specific

indicators as to which degree and institutional characteristics have greater employment potential.

Statement of the Problem

This study was the analysis of administrative reactions towards nontraditional external doctoral degrees as they pertained to initial employment and promotion.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this investigation were to

- 1) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for employment and promotion in school systems accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
- 2) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for initial employment and promotion in junior/community colleges accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
- 3) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for initial employment and promotion in baccalaureate granting colleges and universities accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools;
- 4) determine which degree and institutional factors concerning the nontraditional external doctorate are not accepted in
 - a) school systems
 - b) junior/community colleges
 - c) baccalaureate granting colleges and universities;
- 5) determine which degree and institutional factors concerning the nontraditional external doctorate are acceptable in
 - a) school systems
 - b) junior/community colleges
 - c) baccalaureate granting colleges and universities.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following hypotheses were tested:

- 1) Significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in initial employment of educators will be found in school system superintendents and junior/community college presidents.
- 2) Significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in initial employment of educators will be found in community/junior college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents.
- 3) Significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in initial employment of educators will be found in school system superintendents and college and university presidents overall.
- 4) Significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate by all administrators involved in this study will be found as it applies to the employment of new employees and current employees.
- 5) Institutional size will significantly affect the acceptability or rejection of the external doctorate degree earned by a current effective employee.
- 6) Institutional size will significantly affect the acceptability or rejection of the external doctorate degree earned by a prospective new employee.
- 7) The degree to which the external doctorate programs and institutions are perceived to differ from traditional doctorate programs will determine the acceptability of the degree by all administrators involved in this study.

Significance of the Study

The study focused on the external doctoral degree and determined the acceptability of such a degree in a

representative sample of educational institutions accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools as expressed by chief administrators making or influencing institutional employment decisions.

This study was significant in that it

- 1) determined representative regional acceptability of such a degree through a nondisguised structured method;
- 2) provided information as to the specific levels of educational institutions which tend to accept or reject such a degree;
- 3) provided additional information as to acceptance or rejection of such a degree as it relates to new employment and current position advancement;
- 4) provided specific information as to the factors of the external degree which appear to be acceptable or objectional in education employment, where:
 - a) educators will be in a better position to evaluate the affects of entering such a program
 - b) educators and prospective doctoral candidates can better evaluate such programs according to their professional acceptability and
 - c) existing graduate institutions can better evaluate trends and activity concerning their programs and modification in relation to employer acceptance in institutions accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Definition of Terms

The following terms have restricted meaning and thus were defined for this study.

Chief administrator was used in this study to refer to the chief administrative officer of the institution or school system. These were presidents, superintendents or

other such titles used by the institutions involved in the study.

External doctoral degree referred to the Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, and Doctor of Arts, earned from an institution outside the recognized institutional framework normally associated with doctoral study. The external degree is either an assessment degree which emphasizes advanced placement and demonstration of competence rather than a specific curricular process or the extension degree which is more traditional in program but does not center on a campus and utilize the traditional residence period (19).

"Degree mill" referred to an organization that awards degrees without requiring its students to meet educational standards for such degrees established and traditionally followed by reputable institutions (31).

Institutionally acceptable or recognized referred to whether or not the administration of an institution will accept the external doctoral degree as being adequate for employment, promotion, or financial recognition of an otherwise equally qualified individual for a position in which an earned doctorate is either desired or required by that institution.

Nondisguised-structured study referred to what Campbell, as stated by Sax (27), has distinguished as the scales such as the Thurstone and Likert, in which the respondent was

given accurate information about the purpose of the questionnaire but was restricted in his responses by the investigator.

Delimitations

The following delimitations were imposed on this study:

- 1) This study did not propose to evaluate the external degree granted by any specific institution, but rather attempted to provide criteria for a future such assessment of an external doctorate or external degree program as related to employment in institutions holding membership in Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- 2) The findings in this study were restricted to school systems having at least one secondary school, junior/community colleges and baccalaureate granting institutions holding membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- 3) The findings were further delimited to the attitudes and perceptions of chief administrators in institutions involved in this study.

Basic Assumptions

Basic to this study was the assumption that the responses of the chief administrative officer of the institution or school system did, in fact, reflect or affect the current administrative attitude of that institution or school system as it related to employment and promotion of professional staff.

In addition, the design of this study also assumed that specific external degree program and institutional factors concerning the acceptability or rejection of the external doctoral degree could be identified through the use of a questionnaire.

Procedures for Collection of Data

After the validity and reliability had been established using a panel of experts and the test-retest method, a questionnaire then was mailed to college and university presidents and school superintendents in the region accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Names and addresses of the chief administrators were obtained from a directory published by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (29). Because of the large numbers of colleges and schools in this area, stratified random samples of institutions were administered in proportion to their number by state. Random numbers were used to facilitate the selection of the sample.

After a three week period following the mailing of the questionnaire a follow-up letter was sent to all those individuals who did not return the questionnaire. After another three week period a second follow-up letter and an additional questionnaire was sent to those not responding. Anonymity was guaranteed in the report of this study; however, coding was used in the follow-up of returns.

The Population

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools region is a geographic area of 11 states and includes 358 baccalaureate granting universities and colleges, 291 junior and community colleges, and 1,742 school systems with one or more secondary schools.

Selection of the Sample

In order to insure an adequate sample, 20 per cent of the population was tested. This resulted in a total of 478 chief administrators who were contacted and included 74 baccalaureate granting college and university presidents, 56 junior/community college presidents, and 348 school system superintendents. To select specific institutions, random numbers were used in selection in relation to the number and levels of educational institutions by state included under the membership of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.

To select the specific institutions for the study, a representative sample of 20 per cent of the various institutional categories for each state in the region of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools was selected using random procedures. Table I was developed, using data from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to facilitate selection of state samples (20).

Instrument

To gather information on the attitudes of selected baccalaureate granting college and university presidents, junior/community college presidents, and school superintendents, a Likert-type attitude scale was developed. The Likert-type scale is frequently used in the measurement of attitudes. Shaw and Wright (28) stated that the Likert-type scales are, for the most part, valid and reliable. The interpretation of

TABLE I
NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS HOLDING SACS MEMBERSHIP
BY STATE AND STUDY SAMPLE
DECEMBER, 1974

State	Baccalaureate Colleges and Universities		Junior/Community Colleges		School Systems With Secondary Accreditation	
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
Alabama	25	6	22	4	181	36
Florida	29	6	32	6	170	34
Georgia	38	8	20	4	190	38
Kentucky	25	6	20	4	81	16
Louisiana	23	4	4	1	186	38
Mississippi	15	4	18	4	98	20
North Carolina	45	8	50	10	187	38
South Carolina	23	4	22	3	110	22
Tennessee	28	6	19	4	115	22
Texas	70	14	54	10	260	52
Virginia	37	8	30	6	164	32
Total	358	74	291	56	1142	348

Likert scores is based upon the distribution of sample scores. The scale should always have the reliability and validity established on a sample.

Procedures for construction of the Likert type scale were those stated by Oppenheim (23). An item pool was established that contained statements covering a variety of aspects of the external doctoral degree. These statements were based upon information concerning the external doctoral degree taken from literature and catalogs from a variety of external degree granting institutions.

A panel of jurors were asked to evaluate the questionnaire. Six of the jurors were school and college administrators with at least five years experience, and five held traditional doctoral degrees. All jurors were administrators in a position to make employment recommendations or decisions. One additional juror was an external doctoral degree candidate and another juror was selected from a traditional doctoral degree program. The pool of questions assembled was submitted to the panel of jurors. Forty-nine items were considered to have face validity by seven of the eight jurors and were retained in the final form of the questionnaire administered to the samples.

To establish reliability, the completed questionnaire was administered to a sample of ten school and college administrators who held traditional doctoral degrees and who

were selected after the study sample had been determined, on a test-retest basis with a minimum of seven days between administrations. This correlation statistic was then computed using the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation. The final instrument had a test-retest correlation of a positive .92.

Study Design

This study was designed to compare several populations but since no more than two populations were compared at any one time, one-way analysis of variance was used.

Ferguson (15, p. 208) stated that "the analysis of variance is a method for dividing the variation observed in experimental data into different parts, each part assignable to a known source, cause, or factor." In addition, he states, "In its simplest form the analysis of variance is used to test the significance of the differences between the means of a number of different populations." The design of this study was also concerned whether or not the variation between means is greater than expected from random sampling fluctuation. "One advantage of the analysis of variance is that reasonable departures from assumptions of normality and homogeneity may occur without seriously affecting the validity of the inferences drawn from the data (15, pp. 219-220). It should also be noted that Ferguson (15, p. 218) stated that "the t test may be considered in a

particular case of the F test. It is a particular case which arises when $K=2$."

Procedure for Analysis of Data

When the instruments had been returned the data from each questionnaire were transferred to key punch cards for automatic processing at the computing center at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. Rejection or retention of the hypotheses was based on the results of applying one-way analysis of variance to the data. The .05 level of significance formed the minimum basis for retention of the hypotheses stated in the null form on the F test. A detailed presentation of the data is contained in Chapter IV.

Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis one was tested by computing the level of significance between the mean scores of school system superintendents and junior/community college presidents on those items in the questionnaire dealing with initial employment of qualified applicants holding the external doctoral degree.

Hypothesis two was tested by computing the level of significance between the mean scores of junior/community college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents on those items in the questionnaire dealing with the initial employment of qualified applicants holding the external doctoral degree.

Hypothesis three was tested by computing the level of significance between the mean scores of school system superintendents and college and university presidents on those items in the questionnaire dealing with the initial employment of qualified applicants holding the external doctoral degree.

Hypothesis four was tested by computing the level of significance between the mean scores on those items dealing with initial employment of qualified applicants holding the external doctorate with the mean scores on those items dealing with the financial recognition of a present employee earning the external doctoral degree by all responding in the study.

Hypothesis five was tested by computing the level of significance between the responses of large and small institutions on all items dealing with financial recognition of current employees holding the external doctorate. Mean scores of 3.25 and above indicated acceptance and mean scores of 2.75 and below indicated rejection of the degree.

Hypothesis six was tested by computing the level of significance between the responses of large and small institutions on all items dealing with initial employment of qualified applicants holding the external doctorate. Mean scores of 3.25 and above indicated acceptance and mean scores of 2.75 and below indicated rejection of the degree.

Hypothesis seven was tested by computing the level of significance between the mean scores on the items representing external degree program characteristics being judged as traditional and those being judged as innovative or non-traditional. Items on external doctorate program characteristics achieving mean scores of 3.25 and above were reported as positive program characteristics and items achieving mean scores of 2.75 and below were reported as negative external degree program criteria.

Reporting of Data

After all computations had been made the data were entered into tables for ease of reporting and interpretation. Additional data concerning institutional funding sources and degree attainment of the chief administrators involved were reported in the study and additional tests of significance were undertaken where the data warranted.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of this study is organized as follows: Chapter II contains a review of related literature and research; Chapter III describes procedures used in the collection of the data; Chapter IV is a presentation of the data; and Chapter V contains summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Council on Higher Education, Accredited Institutions of Higher Education, Washington, D. C., American Council on Higher Education, 1974-1975, pp. 36, 204.
2. Arnstein, George, "Ph.D., Anyone?" American Education, X(July, 1974), 6-10.
3. Bent, Harvey E., "The Meaning of the PHD Degree," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII(January, 1962), 13-19.
4. Berleson, Bernard, Graduate Education in the United States, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.
5. Bollough, Vern L., "Ph.D. From Where," The Nation, CXCI(September 24, 1960), 180-191.
6. Boroff, David, "American Fetish--The College Degree," New York Times Magazine, February 14, 1960, p. 11.
7. Bridgeport University, "Modmap" (Modular Multiple Alternatives Program), Program Description 1973-1974, Bridgeport, Connecticut, September, 1973.
8. Commission on Non-Traditional Study, Diversity by Design, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1973.
9. Crider, Blake, "College Degrees by Correspondence," School and Society, LXIII(November, 1940), 425-438.
10. Dear, E. C., "Doctor of Arts Graduate in Physical Education," Contemporary Education, XLV(February, 1974), 155-156.
11. Dressel, Paul, "Graduate Programs with Off-Campus Learning," Journal of Higher Education, XLIII(July, 1972), 525-530.
12. Eells, Walter, Degrees in Higher Education, Washington, D. C., The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.
13. Fagan, Edward, "Doctorate in English Education--Who Needs It?" English Education, V(May, 1974), 159-164.

14. Ferber, Robert, "The Administration of the Ph.D. Degrees," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII (October, 1960), 389-391.
15. Ferguson, George, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971, pp. 208, 214-215, 218-220.
16. Fort Worth Star Telegram, Parade Magazine, March 2, 1975.
17. Hartsell, Charles W. and B. F. Farrar, "How Well Do You Know Your Home Study Student," Adult Leadership, XV(May, 1966), 9, 13.
18. Horvat, John, "Educator Sees Teacher Shortage," Fort Worth Star Telegram, May 2, 1975.
19. Houle, Cyril, The External Degree, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1973.
20. Laurence University, "Bulletin," Santa Barbara, California, 1973.
21. Meacham, Esther, "What is a Ph.D.," Journal of Home Economics, LV(May, 1963), 360.
22. Mitchell, Donald, "Lets Get the Record Straight: A Case of Nova University's External Doctorate in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LV(June, 1963), 370-375.
23. Oppenheim, Abraham, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York, Basic Books, 1966, pp. 133-142.
24. Nova University, "Bulletin," Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 1973.
25. Pifer, A., "Is It Time for an External Degree?" College Board Review, LXXVIII(Winter, 1970-71), 5-10.
26. Porter, Lee, Degrees for Sale, New York, Arco Publishing Company, 1972.
27. Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 226-227.
28. Shaw, Marvin and Jack Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, pp. 21-30.
29. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Proceedings, 79th Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, December, 1974.

30. Tenner, Edward, "Don't Call Me Doktor!" Chronicle of Higher Education, X(March 31, 1975), p. 32.
31. The College Blue Book, "Accreditation and Professional Planning," Los Angeles, California, College Planning Programs, Ltd., III(1968), p. 27.
32. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 11246, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office.
33. Wall Street Journal, "No College Degree," Advertisement by California Western University, February, 1975.
34. Western Colorado University, "Bulletin," Grand Junction, Colorado, 1973.
35. Whaley, W. Gordon, "American Academic Degrees," The Education Record, XLVII(Fall, 1966), 525-537.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Changing forms, new structures, different means, new challenges and opportunities for higher education have in recent years become central points of discussion, planning research, and action in the academic world. Previous accreditation purposes and practices are being questioned and reexamined. Re-evaluation of institutional purposes, procedures, and outcomes are taking place in American higher education (2).

The University of London, in Great Britain, has provided direction toward the development of a "learning society" through its external degree programs since 1857. In recent years, the British Open University has become operational and visible to the academic world in providing educational programs and opportunities for a clientele whose work schedules and availability do not permit the obtaining of higher education through the traditional modes. In the United States in recent years many new programs and institutions of a similar nature are being planned and implemented; among them are Empire State College of the State University of New York, the University Without Walls, the Union Graduate

School, the Fielding Institute, Western Colorado University, Laurence University, Walden University, California Western University, Minnesota Metropolitan State College, Nova University, all of which are involved in the development and granting of the external degree.

In 1971, the Commission on Non-Traditional Study was created to assess higher education's response to the pressures of societal change during the 1960's (2). The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has published studies and recommendations relating to non-traditional study. The Newman Commission has issued a report on the role of the federal government in encouraging new educational directions. The American Council on Education, the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education have all formed special bodies to examine the future of higher education with specific emphasis on non-traditional approaches. The Educational Amendments of 1972 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, passed by the Ninety-Second Congress, intended to improve post-secondary education by providing assistance to educational institutions and agencies for several purposes. These purposes included

- (1) encouraging the reform, innovation and improvement of post secondary education, and providing equal educational opportunity for all;
- (2) the creation of institutions and programs involving new paths to career and professional training, and new combinations of academic and experimental learning;
- (3) the establishment of institutions and programs based on the technology of communication;
- (4) the carrying out in postsecondary educational institutions of changes in internal structure and operations designed to clarify institutional priorities and purposes;
- (5) the design and introduction of cost-effective methods of instruction and operation;
- (6) the introduction of institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and re-entering the institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs;
- (7) the introduction of reforms in graduate education, in the structure of academic professions, and in the recruitment and retention of faculties; and
- (8) the creation of new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and the introduction of reforms in current education's practices related thereto (9, p. 93).

The external degree exists in foreign countries almost solely to deal with the scarcity of educational opportunity for their populations. In the United States, the reasons which draw interest in the external degree are rather complex. To some degree, a desire does exist to broaden the base of educational opportunity for those segments of the society which have been unserved and underserved in the past. In part, major changes in methods of instruction and

assessment techniques make it possible to award the external degree. Finally, motivation to provide the external degree has come from the attempt to meet the needs of three diverse groups in modern American society: (1) the very talented who need less time; (2) those who missed a first chance at higher education and wish a second; and (3) those who previously were not thought intellectually capable to undertake college work (5, p. 45; 2).

Houle (5, pp. 47-50) stated that if it were to be assumed that all high school graduates should go to college and that, in turn, all those entering college should complete a baccalaureate degree, the unserved adult population in 1971 would have been 49,811,000. Only the most academic utopia would ever grant these assumptions, but this figure was given to indicate the largest present adult audience for an external baccalaureate degree.

To be more realistic, the individual most likely to seek an external baccalaureate degree is the adult who, at some time in the past, attended college. This individual chose to proceed with higher education, went through admission procedures, and began a program of study which he never completed.

According to the United States Bureau of the Census, December, 1971, it was estimated that 11,782,000 adults twenty-five years of age and older had previously entered higher education but had not gone beyond the third year of

college. It is further predicted that this number will increase to 22,305,000 by the year 1990 unless alternatives to higher education, such as the external degree, are provided (5, p. 53).

Education, since World War II, especially on the graduate level, has been emphasized more than ever before. Data concerning the number of people who have begun master's and doctoral degree programs without completing them are far too incomplete to estimate numbers of potential graduate external degree students accurately (5, p. 61).

Moreland (7), in an article, stated that the "acceptance of the idea that college degrees can be earned without attendance at a university is no fad. Off-campus programs are already having a tremendous impact on higher education." He goes on to state that a report issued in 1972 by the Educational Testing Service indicated that there were from 1,000 to 1,400 nontraditional programs in colleges and universities.

Houle (5, p. 149) made an additional comment concerning the motivation of external degree seekers. "When the Regents External Degree was announced in New York State, approximately five thousand people wrote to express an interest in it." A questionnaire was sent to these individuals and 1370 people replied. When they were asked why they were interested in the degree, more than half said it was for reasons of employment.

The question then remains as to the attitude of society and the academic community toward the external degrees awarded by new institutions created to award them with no record of previous quality to maintain.

Sample Survey of External Doctorate Programs

Since the 1960's many external doctorate programs have come into view in the United States. This portion of the study will be devoted to brief descriptions of sample institutions and programs of varying types which are representative of many of the new external doctorate programs.

No attempt will be made to evaluate these programs but rather the purpose will be to simply describe the institution and the degree requirements. All information concerning these institutions was supplied by these institutions (1, 3, 6, 8, 11).

Nova University (8)

Nova University was chartered in 1964 as a graduate university and became affiliated with the New York Institute of Technology in 1970. Nova University is a private, non-sectarian and non-profit institution which was accredited as a special purpose institution by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1971.

The University offers Ph.D. degrees in the fields of oceanography, behavioral sciences, and life sciences. Master

of Science degrees are offered in counseling and guidance, early childhood education, and instructional systems. The off-campus Ed.D. program for public school administrators and community college faculty and administrators has become one of the better known external doctorate programs in the United States.

The off-campus Ed.D. program is organized around a cluster of 25 to 30 doctoral students who live in the same geographic area. A cluster becomes operational when 25 to 30 participants are accepted. A cluster coordinator is appointed for each cluster formed and serves as a leader, business manager, and liaison between Nova University and the cluster. All cluster coordinators hold a doctoral degree or equivalent.

A key component of the off-campus program is the input of the national lecturers. In addition to delivering special knowledge in a discrete discipline, the national lecturer suggests relevant political ideas and skills. The national lecturers serve to expand the horizons of educators and to develop a consciousness of the national scope of their concerns. They introduce ideas that are not indigenous to the cluster area. As nationally recognized experts in their field, they lend an enhancement to the study guides and other instructional aides. Seminars also are conducted by professors from local universities who reinforce and clarify material for the students.

Students are responsible for field problems which should address themselves to current problems in an actual educational setting. Students are also responsible for a dissertation that must meet on-campus standards. Students must complete six required modules of study and pass proficiency tests at the conclusion of each. Students receive grades of pass/no pass on the modules. During the second year of the program the student elects two modules in his area of concentration during the final phase of studies and the third year is devoted to the dissertation for which no credit is given. A total of fifty-four semester hours credit are given during the first year of study and eighteen hours of semester credit during the second year.

Once each year a one-week institute is held at Nova University. A participant is required to attend two institutes during the three years of the program.

Admission requirements in the administration and behavioral science areas require master's degree granted by an accredited institution. Admission requirements in the engineering technology option include a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution and a community college teaching certificate. In addition, the student must be employed by a community college in engineering technology and secure three letters of recommendation from leaders in community colleges indicating performance levels of the applicant as a teacher and/or administrator.

The Fielding Institute (3)

The Fielding Institute was founded in March of 1974 and is currently recognized by the state of California as having fulfilled the requirements for awarding graduate degrees. In addition, the Fielding Institute has applied for approval by the Bureau of School Approvals of the State of California and for candidate status with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The Fielding Institute is a non-sectarian, non-profit educational institution.

The Fielding Institute offers programs leading to the Ph.D., Psy.D., D.A., and M.A. through external study. The present format for the doctoral level programs consists of four concurrent aspects.

The knowledge and skill aspect of the program is not developed through a specified curriculum. Each Fielding graduate must have acquired mastery in each of twelve basic knowledge and skill areas related to the degree sought.

Field Study I aspect of the program centers around the development of a doctoral proposal to be used as a blueprint for the learning activities of the program. The Fielding consultant, selected by the student and approved by Fielding, serves as an advisor to the student. A doctoral mentor is a member of the Fielding core faculty and guides the student through all phases of the doctoral program.

The Fielding Colloquim consists of three week summer seminars held at the Fielding Institute. Students are

required to attend these seminars until they have finished their program of study. These colloquia are organized around the specific learning needs of the students attending. In addition to the instructional purposes, orals are conducted for students who have completed dissertations or final projects.

The Field Study II aspect of the program centers around independent study and completion of the traditional dissertation or doctoral projects for doctor of arts candidates.

Fielding uses credit-no credit symbols and credits are based upon the semester unit; however, graduation requirements are not based upon the accumulation of units. The duration of study required is a minimum of twenty months to a maximum time limit of five years for completion of a doctoral degree.

Admission requirements include a master's degree or equivalent and professional experience in education. In addition, recommendations from educators must be submitted along with a portfolio of life-learning experiences which relate to the proposed area of study at Fielding Institute.

Western Colorado University (11)

Western Colorado University was chartered on May 20, 1971, under the Colorado Non-profit Corporation Act as a private independent institution of higher learning with the power to develop programs and grant degrees at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Board of Trustees adopted a formal

resolution to file a status study report and an application for regional accreditation during the 1976-77 academic year.

The university offers bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees through external study. The doctoral degrees include the D.A., D.B.A., Ed.D., and the Psy.D.

The off-campus program centers around "Topics of Study" and the graduation contract. The initial graduation contract between the University and the student determine the number of "Topics of Study" to be completed and the nature of these topics. The "Topics of Study" may include independent study, research papers, seminars, workshops, tutorials, internships, field work, research projects, or other approved activities directly related to the achievement of competency in one's chosen field. Each "Topic of Study" is equivalent to four semester credits.

The basic requirements for the doctoral degree at Western Colorado University include ninety semester hours of graduate study with a minimum of sixty semester hours earned through regular on-campus study or at Western Colorado University. A minimum of thirty-six semester units must be earned through Western Colorado University and eight of the thirty-six must be earned on campus. In addition to the semester hour requirements, continuous registration for a period of one calendar year and the satisfactory defense of a dissertation or doctoral project for the doctor of arts degree is required.

Admission requirements include a master's degree and professional experience. Recommendations from educators must also accompany the admissions form.

Laurence University (6)

Laurence University was founded in 1969, and the opening of the University to students took place during 1970. Laurence University originally was chartered as a profit-making corporation under the laws of the State of Florida. The University has since moved to the State of California and is operating under provision 29023 A 3 of the California Educational Code. Laurence University grants the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees which are both external.

The Laurence University program of study consists of two phases, "matriculated status" and "candidacy status." Matriculated status consists of formal admission to the University which includes the acquisition of a Master's degree, the minimum of fifteen hours in the area of degree specialization, a minimum of three years experience in education, two letters of recommendation from educators, and enrollment in a summer session. Candidacy status consists of the completion of the summer session, registration for a semester of dissertation guidance, and acceptance of the dissertation or project.

Graduation requirements include a total of twenty-four semester hours of which ten are earned during each of two

semesters of dissertation guidance for the Ed.D., and ten additional hours for the Ph.D.

California Western University (1)

California Western University was founded in 1974 and is empowered to confer degrees under provision 29023 A 3 of the California Educational Code, and is currently a profit making corporation.

California Western University currently offers a full range of degrees at the bachelor's, master's, and doctorate levels, all of which are external.

The University has no prescribed curriculum nor does it offer courses as it functions entirely as an assessment institution. Currently the University is developing packaged units of study in undergraduate areas.

California Western University is using a pre-assessment format with subsequent continued study assignments for completion of deficiencies. Students are required to research fully their areas of specialty and submit a comprehensive paper of their findings to the University. This research paper is then reviewed by a University appointed professional in the field of the student's degree goal. From the evaluation of the research paper, subsequent continued study assignments are made until the University feels the appropriate knowledge and skills have been achieved by the student.

Once the student has achieved the knowledge and skill proficiency level required by California Western University, the student submits his proposal for dissertation or doctoral project. Once the dissertation or project is approved, the student has met the requirements for the degree.

Admission requirements include a master's degree from a recognized source, three years of professional experience in the field of study, and a detailed resume including the applicant's personal qualifications and specific educational objectives. In addition, three professional references must be provided.

Synthesis of Related Research

The question, "How will potential employers view the external doctorate degree?" was approached by Gephart, Saretsky, and Bost (4) through Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development and Research. This recently conducted study involved a sample of deans of education (71.5 per cent), administrators in the largest school systems in the fifty states (7.6 per cent), and personnel administrators in junior colleges (20.2 per cent), representing 191 respondents (48 per cent return). Seventeen broad aspects of doctoral programs generally found in both traditional and external doctorate programs were ranked in terms of their desirability as a program characteristic in terms of: (a) a factor influential in the consideration of a job applicant; (b) their

influence on the promotion decision. The results indicated: "Potential employers do not appear to rank the specific characteristics of a degree program high among influencers of the hiring decision. And the degree specifics are even less influential in promotion" (4, p. 408).

Moreland (7), however, in his article stated that one new external degree program in Florida will produce more external education doctorates in the next three years than the three largest traditional producers. Also mentioned in his article is the fact that many other new external degree programs are developing and have developed with greatly relaxed standards. One California university (10) has recently advertised its Ph.D. program in the Wall Street Journal, offering a "state approved" external degree in six months or less.

In fairness to the results of the study conducted by Gephart and others (4), it must be pointed out that a neutral stance was taken and no reference to the external degree was made in the questionnaire. In addition, no attempt was made to secure results concerning criteria on accreditation status, funding sources, types of institutions, faculty qualifications, or institutional reputation as they relate to the acceptance or rejection of the degree. It appears the study's intent was to determine the employability of holders of the external doctorate but may have only determined the

extent to which employers are willing to accept changes in doctoral programs currently classified as traditional. In addition, no real attempt was made to obtain a representative sample of educational employers in relation to the number of educational institutions in the population.

Although no conflicting research was located, it might be noted also that additional research supporting the study was not found either. Based on the continued debate as evidenced in the professional journals, there is sufficient justification for a structured nondisguised study to investigate in more depth the original question of administrative attitudes concerning the acceptability of such a degree along with an attempt to develop a basis for evaluation of a wide variety of emerging external doctorate institutions and programs. It should also be noted that in 1976, the largest group of external doctorate candidates will be receiving their degrees in a period of decreasing school enrollment and shrinking employment opportunity (4), further justifying the need for research in this area.

The recency of the topic under investigation resulted in a dearth of related research and literature available to the researcher during the conduct of this study.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. California Western University, "Printed Materials," Santa Ana, California, 1975.
2. Commission on Non-Traditional Study, Diversity by Design, San Francisco, California, 1973.
3. Fielding Institute, "Bulletin," Santa Barbara, California, 1975.
4. Gephart, William J., Gary Saresky, and David Bost, "How Potential Employers Value Components of Traditional and External Doctorates," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI(February, 1975), 406-408.
5. Houle, Cyril, The External Degree, San Francisco, California, Jossey Bass, 1973.
6. Laurence University, "Bulletin," Santa Barbara, California, 1973.
7. Morland, Richard, "The External Doctorate in Education: Blessing or Blasphemy?" Phi Delta Kappan, LV (November, 1973), 163-168.
8. Nova University, "Bulletin," Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 1975.
9. Public Law 92-318, Educational Amendment of 1972 to the Higher Education Act of 1965, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1972, p. 93.
10. Wall Street Journal, "No College Degree," advertisement by California Western University, February, 1975.
11. Western Colorado University, "Bulletin," Grand Junction, Colorado, 1974.

CHAPTER III

QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION AND DATA COLLECTION

Introduction

It was the aim of this study to survey randomly selected groups of school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and presidents of baccalaureate granting colleges and universities in institutions accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to determine their attitudes toward external doctoral degrees and programs as they pertain to both prospective and existing professional employees.

Literature concerning the external doctoral degree was surveyed and information was gathered from several sources. Although little research has been done on the acceptability of the external doctoral degree to date, much is being written, and speculation as to the acceptability covers the range from acceptable to unacceptable.

Identification of Populations and Selection of Samples

Populations in this study were identified as chief administrative officers in school systems, junior/community colleges, and baccalaureate granting colleges and universities

in member institutions of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. School superintendents were classified as one population, junior/community college presidents were classified as a second population, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents as a third population. From these three populations, stratified random samples by state were identified. Sax stated that "representative samples are ones which have been drawn in a random, unbiased manner" (5, p. 129). "A random selection procedure is one in which every element of the population has an equal chance to be selected for the sample and, therefore, every possible sample of a certain size is equally probable" (2, p. 332). Considering the sample drawn, any sample has an equal chance of being selected as the sample to be used in a study, thus the process of random selection is bias free (2, p. 332).

The random selection technique was publicized by the selective service in 1939. At that time the popular name referring to the procedure was the "fishbowl technique." A technique more commonly used in research is a table of random numbers. For the selection of the sample to be truly random, there must be no attempt to exclude any element of the population.

Determining sample size is always of prime importance in a research study. Among the various aspects of sample

size to be considered are the statistical procedures--homogeneity, heterogeneity, generalizability, and attrition of the sample--and the data gathering process. "One such point is the fact that the statistical dividing line between small and large samples is a sample of thirty" (2, p. 332). The samples in this study were drawn from the populations with the use of a table of random numbers. Differences in the characteristics of the three populations, school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents, should be equally allowable by chance due to the sampling procedures; the characteristics of school superintendents and college and university presidents should be about the same in the sample as in the population. Each sample contained 20 per cent of the total population by state. Eleven states were involved in the study.

If the group under investigation is homogeneous, then a smaller sample may be used. If the group under study is heterogeneous, a larger sample will be required. School superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents in institutions accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools under investigation in this study were considered as not being extremely homogeneous in their attitudes on the issue of the acceptability of external doctoral degrees and

programs to the extent that there would be no real concern of complete agreement. It was felt that the three populations within themselves would not be widely diversified populations on the issues in question of acceptance of the external doctorate degree. Determining the generalizability of the sample to the population is an important consideration when deciding upon sample size. It is necessary to obtain a sample that will include the attributes of the population to which generalizations are to be made. Characteristics of the population should be represented proportionally (5, p. 129). In the samples, one of the more important assumptions underlying the random selection procedures is that this process will give every element of the population an equal chance to be included. Any sample that is drawn by the random procedure would, therefore, include all elements of the population and that sample would be representative of that population.

Further investigation into sample size indicated that there is no real answer to what size a sample should be. "The question of how large a sample should be is basically unanswerable, other than to say that it should be large enough to achieve representativeness" (2, p. 346). "Samples smaller than thirty are to be avoided, especially with parametric statistics. The use of samples of size thirty or larger usually insures for the investigator the benefits of

the central limit theorem" (4, p. 151). Concerning the sample and the size required, Fox states the following:

If data are to be collected from captive groups of students, the researcher is reasonably certain that his accepting and data-producing samples will be close together in size. However, if he plans to use data-gathering instruments which will be mailed to the accepting sample, then he will find that serious attrition is a very real threat, for returns of thirty percent are common, and even lower returns occur with disheartening frequency (2, p. 348).

Based upon these ideas, it was concluded that a sample of 20 per cent for each population would be sufficient to provide the data required for the testing of hypotheses. Samples of this size would provide enough data to represent attitudes of the populations toward external doctoral degrees and programs.

Attrition factors are usually uncertain and prediction can only be a reasonable forecast about the percentage of returns expected. Factors which may affect attrition include time of year, job position, interest in the study, length of the questionnaire, and ease of answering questionnaire. A 70 per cent return in each population was desired as a minimum requirement.

Development of the Instrument

There are various types of attitude scales used in the research process. In this study the instrument developed was the Likert-type. "The Likert scale is a widely used

type of ordinal measurement" (7, p. 125). A large number of scaling techniques used in research procedures involve the respondent's reacting to a stimulus. Self-reporting scales are presented to the subjects and responses are dependent upon some certain combination of stimuli.

The two most common types of attitude scales are the Likert and Thurstone. Both scales are a series of statements which are usually restricted to one statement or description. The Likert-type attitude scale was chosen for this study after some investigation of both the Likert and the Thurstone procedures. "Whether the Likert method is an adequate, perhaps superior alternative to the Thurstone method, has been a point of discourse since Likert's monograph appeared" (7, p. 125). Both methods have been the most important procedures used for the measurement of attitudes. Both are used extensively despite the fact that some of the more recent scaling innovators, such as Guttman, have attempted to establish the comparative validity, reliability, and efficiency of the Thurstone and Likert attitude scales. Several important differences between these scales were found. The following points became important in the issue of the difference between the Thurstone and Likert scales:

The Likert method of scoring an attitude scale, of any given number of items, consistently produces more reliable results than the Thurstone method of scoring the scale: and the Likert method of scale construction and scoring requires fewer items to produce the same reliability as the Thurstone method (7, p. 171).

The Likert-type scale used in this study has five categories ranging from total disagreement to total agreement of the item in question. The third category or middle response indicated uncertainty on the item.

Five categories of responses were presented to the respondent. For the purpose of analyzing the data, each category was assigned a numerical value: strongly agree, 5; agree, 4; undecided, 3; disagree, 2; and strongly disagree, 1. Constructing the Likert-type scale for this study was facilitated by the use of a panel of jurors. According to Oppenheim (3, p. 133), a panel of jurors should be selected to agree upon the face and content validities of the questions placed on the questionnaire. The jurors validating the questions should be representative of the population under investigation.

Prior to the selection of the jurors, an item pool was established. Items used in the pool were based on various books, periodicals, and publications concerning external degrees and programs. This original item pool was then edited according to suggestions made by Edwards and Kilpatrick (1, p. 332). The edited item pool was mailed to the judges, who were persons considered to be competent in the area of school, college, and university administration.

To determine the selection of jurors, several criteria were desired. First, all jurors must have had at least five

years experience in school or college and university administration. At least 70 per cent must hold earned doctoral degrees and not have been associated directly with an external doctorate program. At least one juror was to be an external doctorate candidate and at least one juror was to be a candidate from a traditional doctorate program.

Eight jurors were selected meeting the stated criteria, and the initial edited questionnaire was mailed to them for additional editing and suggestions. Numerous suggestions for addition and deletion of items as well as items to be rephrased were received.

A final form of the questionnaire based upon juror critique was developed for the study, consisting of forty-nine items considered to have both face validity and content validity by a minimum of seven of the eight jurors. A copy of this instrument may be found in Appendix E.

Validation of the Instrument

Reliability and validity of the questionnaire were important factors. Shaw and Wright stated that "the Likert-type scales are often valid and reliable, but they should be treated as other scales. The scales should always have the reliability and validity established" (6, p. 21).

Validity

The quality of research can be no better than the procedures used to collect and analyze the data. "If the

procedures used possess all the necessary and desirable attributes, then the potential for sound research is present" (2, p. 352). An important portion of this study was devoted to the development of a suitable data gathering instrument. Before the instrument could be mailed to the data producing samples, the validity and reliability had to be established. "Because research findings are so dependent upon the instrument used to gather information, the researcher is responsible for selecting those instruments which best fit the requirements of his investigation" (5, p. 154) An important part of the selection of the instrument is related to past performance of the type scales under consideration.

In writing research reports which include the use of tests, inventories, questionnaires, or rating scales, the investigator should take the responsibility of evaluating all tests used in the investigation. However, when the researcher has found it necessary to construct his own test or where new examinations are being employed, much care should be devoted to the objective evaluation of the instrument (5, p. 156).

Although the Likert-type scales are often reliable and valid, the instrument constructed in this study was validated to minimize error.

The face validity was established by a panel of jurors. "Face validity," or validity of the content, is of value in instances where the criterion to be judged in each instance must relate to the entire instrument.

Reliability

The test-retest technique was used to establish reliability in this study. A minimum of seven days had elapsed between the first and second administration of the final instrument. Sax states:

To determine the stability of measurements, we administer the same questionnaire twice to one group of respondents. The correlation between their scores on the two administrations would be the coefficient of stability. This coefficient is dependent upon the amount of time elapsing between the two administrations as well as on the extent to which the beliefs, attitudes, or opinions of the respondents actually change. In general, the longer the time lapse, the lower the coefficient of stability is likely to be. Also, if questions are poorly constructed, we can expect respondents to change their answers on repeated testing simply because they are uncertain what they are expected to do; thus, they may have different frames of references each time they respond (5, p. 230).

Roscoe went on to state:

By far the most popular of the several available coefficients of correlation is the Pearson correlation coefficient, which may be defined as the mean of the z scores' products of two paired variables. It is represented by the lowercase letter r and may be calculated from the formula

$$P_r = \frac{\sum x Z_x \sum y Z_y}{N} \quad (4, p. 105).$$

The Pearson coefficient of correlation was calculated from the two administrations of the final instrument developed for this study. Administration of the instrument was performed on a representative group of ten school, college,

and university administrators holding traditional doctoral degrees and selected after the study sample had been determined. By using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient, the value of r was found to be .92.

Administration of the Instrument for the Collection of Data

Administering the final questionnaire to the chief administrators in the samples was undertaken to collect data for this study.

Accompanying the questionnaire was a letter of explanation (Appendix C). A return, self-addressed envelope was included with the questionnaire. "The difficulty usually lies not in choosing the sample, but in getting those persons selected for the sample to return their questionnaire" (5). Bias may occur because sufficient questionnaires are not returned; therefore, every available method should be used to obtain a 100 per cent return. The percentage of returns may be increased by sending more than one follow-up letter, by registering the letter, or by making a phone call to the respondent. In Table II, the percentages of questionnaires returned are shown. In this study, three separate attempts were made to retrieve all possible questionnaires.

TABLE II
 PERCENTAGES OF RETURNS FROM THE DATA PRODUCING SAMPLES

N = 478

Respondents	Initial Mailing	First Follow-up	Second Follow-up	Total
School Superintendents	(N = 192) 55	(N = 41) 12	(N = 14) 4	(N = 247) 71
Community/Junior College Presidents	(N = 36) 63	(N = 4) 6	(N = 3) 5	(N = 43) 74
Baccalaureate granting College and University Presidents	(N = 49) 62	(N = 6) 9	(N = 3) 4	(N = 58) 75
Combined Samples	(N = 277) 57	(N = 51) 11	(N = 20) 4	(N = 348) 72

After the questionnaires were mailed to the samples, a three-week time span elapsed before a follow-up letter was mailed. A copy of this letter is in Appendix C.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Edwards, A. L. and F. P. Kilpatrick, "The Scale Discrimination Method for Measuring Social Attitudes," American Psychologist, II(October, 1947), 332.
2. Fox, David, The Research Process in Education, New York, Prentice Hall, 1969.
3. Oppenheim, Abraham, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York, Basic Books, 1966.
4. Roscoe, John, Fundamental Statistics, Dallas, Texas, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
5. Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, McGraw-Hill, 1968.
6. Shaw, Marvin and Jack Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
7. Summers, Gene, editor, Attitude Measurement, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1970.

CHAPTER IV

TREATMENT AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the procedures for treatment of data and the statistical treatment of those data are presented. Most of the data collected were treated statistically and were related to the purposes and research hypotheses of this study. Other descriptive data were collected and are presented without any type of statistical treatment since they assist in the clarification of the overall problem under study. All data presented in this study are the reactions of the school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents who responded to the questionnaire used. A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix E and the raw data responses are contained in Appendix H.

Treatment of the Data

After the termination of the data collection period, the data were tabulated and statistical treatment was applied to test the research hypotheses. Tabulation of the data for statistical treatment was accomplished by key punching directly from the questionnaires onto IBM punchcards. Each

set of data was coded for the purpose of distinguishing between the three groups, school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents. Additional groupings of the samples were made for optional data treatment based upon the descriptive information obtained in Part A of the questionnaire. The Computer Center at North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, through the use of data processing equipment, applied various statistical treatments to the data. These statistical treatments are discussed later in this chapter.

The research hypotheses as stated in Chapter I were restated in the null hypothesis form to be tested statistically. Tenable hypotheses then could be tested and on the basis of this test either be retained or rejected. To test the hypotheses, one way analysis of variance was used. Retention or rejection of these hypotheses was made at a minimum .05 level of significance. All of the hypotheses were related to the Likert-type scale developed for use in this study.

There were three samples used for gathering data for this study. The samples were drawn from three populations, school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents by stratified random sampling techniques. The F test or

one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the significance of difference between the means. The F ratio was calculated by using the following formula (1, p. 215):

$$F = \frac{S^2_b}{S^2_w}$$

S^2_b = Variance between groups

S^2_w = Variance within groups

Tables presented by Ferguson (1, pp. 452-455) were used to determine the retention or rejection of the hypotheses at a minimum of .05 level of significance.

Presentation of Descriptive Data Compiled from the Questionnaire

Part A

Data presented in this portion of the chapter came from Part A of the questionnaire developed for use in this study. Although these data are of a descriptive nature, this portion of the questionnaire was used in testing hypotheses. The data collected on Part A of the questionnaire were reflective of the type of institutions in the samples, the primary funding sources of those institutions, the degree attainment of the chief administrator, the nature of that degree, and the size of that institution.

The percentage of the respondents from the samples according to institutional size are presented in Table III.

TABLE III
 PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS FROM SAMPLES
 ACCORDING TO INSTITUTIONAL SIZE
 N = 348

Sample	Percentage in Each Category				Total
	0-100 staff	101-500 staff	501-1000 staff	over 1,000 staff	
School superintendents	(N = 59) 17	(N = 122) 35	(N = 44) 13	(N = 23) 6	(N = 248) 71
Junior/community college presidents	(N = 17) 5	(N = 25) 7	(N = 1)	(N = 43) 12
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents without graduate programs	(N = 10) 3	(N = 13) 4	(N = 23) 7
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents with graduate programs	(N = 7) 2	(N = 15) 4	(N = 6) 2	(N = 4) 1	(N = 32) 9
Total	(N = 93) 27	(N = 175) 50	(N = 51) 15	(N = 27) 7	(N = 346) 99

As shown in Table III the majority of the respondents reporting were from institutions employing between 101 and 500 professional staff.

The smallest percentage of respondents from the samples was from institutions employing over 1000 professional staff. Differences between the means of the samples as affected by institutional size will be discussed in the testing of hypotheses V and VI later in this chapter.

The data presented in this chapter did not always total 100 per cent due to the omissions and double marking on the questionnaire by the respondents involved in the study.

It was possible for the investigator to divide the sample of baccalaureate granting college and university presidents into two sub-samples; those with graduate programs in their institutions and those without graduate programs. The sub-samples were shown in Table III. Analysis of variance was used to test the difference in means between these sub-samples on items 7-49. The F ratio required for significance of difference of the two sub-samples was not obtained at the .05 level and thus future tables did not separate these sub-samples as directed by the computer program. The lack of individual returns for the sub-samples played a major role in the branching program as well as the individual differences in the returns.

Question two in Part A of the questionnaire requested information from the samples concerning the primary funding

source of the institution. In Table IV are presented the percentage of all sample returns according to funding source of the institution they represent.

TABLE IV
PERCENTAGE OF ALL RESPONDENTS FROM SAMPLES
ACCORDING TO PRIMARY FUNDING SOURCE
OF THE INSTITUTION

Sample	Percentage in each Category	
	Public	Private
School superintendents	(N = 245) 70	(N = 4) 1
Junior/community college presidents	(N = 34) 10	(N = 9) 3
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	(N = 21) 6	(N = 34) 9
Total	(N = 300) 86	(N = 47) 13

Eighty-six per cent of all respondents reporting were from publicly funded institutions and 13 per cent were from privately funded institutions. School superintendents reporting from privately funded institutions comprised only 1 per cent of the total samples while college and university presidents reporting from privately funded institutions comprised 12 per cent of the total samples.

Analysis of variance was used to test the differences between the means of publicly funded institutions and privately funded institutions reporting. In Table V, a summary of the results of analysis of variance to the data as they pertain to new employees are presented.

TABLE V
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
INSTITUTIONAL FUNDING SOURCE AND THE
ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL
DEGREE EARNED BY A NEW EMPLOYEE

Group	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Public	1	3.5451	1.0035	299
Private	1	3.2340	1.2547	47
Total	1	3.5028	1.0446	346

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	3.9311	1	3.9311	3.6297	0.0576
Within	372.5660	344	1.0830	..	NS
Total	376.4971	345

The F ratio obtained for significance of difference in the relationship between the institutional funding source and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree for new employees was 3.6297. The F ratio obtained indicated the relationship between institutional funding source and the professional acceptance of the external doctoral degree for

new employees was not significant at the .05 level. The level of significance obtained, 0.0576, was, however, approaching significance at the .05 level and additional study may indicate significance.

In Table VI, a summary of the results of analysis of variance to the data are presented as they relate to the relationship between funding source and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a present employee.

TABLE VI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INSTITUTIONAL FUNDING SOURCE AND THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE EARNED BY A PRESENT EMPLOYEE

Group	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Public	1	3.6532	1.1643	297
Private	1	3.4130	1.2749	46
Total	1	3.6209	1.1806	343

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	2.2972	1	2.2972	1.6511	0.1997
Within	474.4316	341	1.3913	..	NS
Total	476.7289	342

The F ratio obtained for significance of difference in relationship between institutional funding source and the

acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a present employee was 1.6511, resulting in the level of significance of 0.1997 which did not reach the .05 level.

Although no significant differences were found in the relationship between institutional funding source and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree for new and present employees, administrators responding from publicly funded institutions tended to have more positive attitudes toward the external doctoral degree.

Question three in Part A of the questionnaire requested information from the samples concerning the highest degree held by the chief administrator. In Table VII, as presented, is the percentage of all samples according to the highest degree held by the chief administrator.

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS FROM ALL SAMPLES
ACCORDING TO DEGREE ATTAINMENT

Sample	Percentage in Each Category			
	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate	Other*
School superintendents	(N = 7) 2	(N = 155) 44	(N = 72) 21	(N = 13) 4
Junior/community college presidents	..	(N = 10) 3	(N = 31) 9	(N = 2) ..
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	(N = 3) 1	(N = 4) 1	(N = 48) 14	..
Total	(N = 10) 3	(N = 169) 48	(N = 151) 44	(N = 15) 4

*This category included associate degrees, education specialist degrees, and professional degrees outside of education

Sixty-five per cent of the samples included school superintendents with graduate degrees and 27 per cent included college and university presidents reporting they held graduate degrees. Forty-four per cent of all respondents held doctoral degrees while 48 per cent of all respondents held master's degrees.

Question four in Part A of the questionnaire asked chief administrators responding to state whether or not at least one of the degrees held was an external degree. The percentage of external degrees held by all samples in comparison with traditional degrees are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS FROM SAMPLES ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF DEGREE ATTAINMENT

Sample	Percentage in Each Category	
	Traditional Degree	At Least One External Degree
School Superintendents	(N = 216) 62	(N = 26) 7
Junior/Community College Presidents	(N = 36) 10	(N = 3) 1
Baccalaureate Granting College and University Presidents	(N = 53) 15	(N = 2) 1
Total	(N = 305) 87	(N = 31) 9

Eighty-seven per cent of the total samples responded that they did not hold an external degree while 9 per cent responded that they did hold at least one external degree. Eighty-four per cent of those stating that they held at least one external degree were from the school superintendent sample.

Analysis of variance was used to test the differences between the means of those respondents who held at least one external degree with those who did not, on their acceptance of the external doctorate degree. In Table IX, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they pertain to new employees is shown.

TABLE IX

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENTS HOLDING AN EXTERNAL DEGREE AND THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE FOR NEW EMPLOYEES

Group	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations	
Traditional	1	3.4638	1.0205	304	
External	1	3.9032	1.2742	31	
Total	1	3.5044	1.0521	335	
Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	5.4316	1	5.4316	4.9648	0.0265
With	364.3117	333	1.0940	..	S
Total	369.7433	334

The F ratio obtained for significance of difference in the relationship between respondents holding an external degree and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a new employee was 4.9648, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0265 which did exceed the .05 level. Significant differences were found in the relationship between respondents holding an external degree and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a new employee.

In Table X, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they pertain to present employees is shown.

TABLE X

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENTS HOLDING AN EXTERNAL DEGREE AND THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE FOR A PRESENT EMPLOYEE

Group	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Traditional	1	3.6345	1.1340	301
External	1	3.7096	1.4875	31
Total	1	3.6415	1.1690	332

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	0.1586	1	0.1586	0.1158	0.7339
Within	452.1878	330	1.3703	..	NS
Total	452.3464	331

The F ratio obtained for significance of difference in the relationship between respondents holding an external

degree and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a present employee was 0.1158, resulting in a level of significance of 0.7339 which did not reach the .05 level. Although no significant differences were found in the relationship between respondents holding an external degree and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a present employee, significant differences were found for new employees indicating that chief administrators holding external degrees may be more receptive of the external doctoral degree held by a new employee.

All respondents, those holding traditional degrees and those holding at least one external degree, did appear to have favorable attitudes toward the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by both the new and present employee.

Data Compiled from the Attitude Scale

Part B

The attitude scale developed for this study contained statements about the acceptance of the external doctoral degree factors involved in a wide variety of external doctorate programs and specific program descriptions. These were statements related to the purposes and hypotheses of the study.

The attitudes of the school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were revealed by their

responses to each of the statements; these reactions range from strong agreement to complete disagreement. A numerical value beginning with five for strong agreement to one for strong disagreement was assigned to each of the positions in Part B, C, and D of the questionnaire. If the mean score for any of the statements was below 2.75 then the majority of the respondents held negative attitudes toward that particular statement. If the mean score was above 3.25, the respondents as a whole held positive attitudes towards that statement. As the mean scores increased above 3.25 and decreased below 2.75 the attitudes were stronger. Mean scores between 2.75 and 3.25 were an indication of indecision pertaining to the majority of respondents.

Responses to statement 7 on the questionnaire are presented in Table XI. Two of the samples had favorable

TABLE XI

ACCEPTANCE OF AN EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE OF AN
ASSESSMENT VARIETY FOR A PROSPECTIVE
NEW EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	3.538	0.987	Positive	249
Junior/community college presidents	3.833	1.187	Positive	42
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	3.107	1.073	Undecided	56
Total	3.504	1.043	Positive	347

attitudes toward this statement while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided on this statement. Although the overall response to this statement was positive, school superintendents and junior/community college presidents appear to be more receptive in the acceptance of an external doctoral degree of the assessment variety earned by a new employee.

On a similar statement referring to the attainment of an extension variety of the external doctoral degree, the responses are presented in Table XII. Again two of the

TABLE XII

ACCEPTANCE OF AN EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE OF THE
EXTENSION VARIETY FOR A PROSPECTIVE
NEW EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	3.604	0.984	Positive	248
Junior/community college presidents	3.976	0.975	Positive	42
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	3.142	1.073	Undecided	56
Total	3.575	1.019	Positive	346

samples held favorable attitudes toward this statement while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided.

Statement 9 concerned the attainment of the external degree of the assessment variety as it pertained to a current employee. The responses to this statement are shown in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

ACCEPTANCE OF AN EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE OF AN ASSESSMENT VARIETY FOR A PRESENT EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	3.627	1.192	Positive	247
Junior/community college presidents	3.880	1.193	Positive	42
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	3.400	1.081	Positive	55
Total	3.622	1.179	Positive	344

All samples held favorable attitudes toward this statement. This indicated that all administrators involved in the study held favorable attitudes toward the external doctoral degree of the assessment variety earned by a current employee.

The final statement posed in Part B of the questionnaire pertained to the acceptance of the external doctoral degree of an extension variety for current employees. The responses to this statement are shown in Table XIV. All samples held

TABLE XIV

ACCEPTANCE OF AN EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE OF AN
EXTENSION VARIETY FOR A PRESENT EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	3.669	1.204	Positive	245
Junior/community college presidents	4.095	0.905	Positive	42
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	3.527	0.997	Positive	55
Total	3.698	1.148	Positive	342

favorable attitudes towards this statement, indicating that all administrators involved in this study held favorable attitudes toward the acceptance of the external doctoral degree of the extension variety earned by a current employee.

From Part B of the questionnaire concerning the attitudes of administrators involved in this study toward the concept of the external doctoral degree earned by both new and present employees, the idea behind the external doctoral degree is acceptable. It also appears that the idea behind the external doctoral degree is slightly more acceptable for current employees.

Part C

Part C of the questionnaire contained attitude statements concerning wide and varied factors of external doctoral degree programs of both the assessment and extension type across the United States. The responses to the statements concerning regional accreditation are presented in Table XV.

TABLE XV

RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE RELATED
TO ACCREDITATION OF DOCTORAL DEGREE
GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
11 Full-regional accreditation as a minimum requirement	1	4.500	0.611	Positive	246
	2	4.268	0.775	Positive	41
	3	4.693	0.508	Positive	49
13 "Candidate Status" as a minimum requirement	1	3.991	0.876	Positive	243
	2	4.153	1.089	Positive	39
	3	3.065	1.420	Undecided	46
15 Future plans only, towards regional accreditation	1	3.292	1.151	Positive	239
	2	2.486	1.260	Negative	37
	3	3.227	1.538	Undecided	44

*1 = school superintendents
2 = junior/community college presidents
3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

All of the samples held strong positive feelings towards full regional accreditation of the granting institution as

a minimum requirement while only one sample, the school superintendents, had positive feelings towards only future plans concerning regional accreditation as a minimum requirement. The baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided on this issue while the junior/community college presidents held strong negative attitudes. Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held undecided attitudes toward the granting institution having only achieved candidate status while school superintendents and junior/community college presidents held positive attitudes toward this item. In summary, full regional accreditation is an important item concerning the acceptance of a doctoral degree, while candidate status is far better than announced plans only, concerning future accreditation.

The responses to items on the questionnaire relating to institutional characteristics of the degree granting institution are presented in Table XVI. Four of the items drew positive responses from all samples. These include: statement 17, ". . . the granting institution should be established and recognized for its traditional programs," statement 19, ". . . the granting institution should be associated with known institutions of higher education," statement 23, ". . . the granting institution should be a non-profit educational institution," and statement 29,

TABLE XVI

RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL
CHARACTERISTICS OF DOCTORAL DEGREE
GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
17 Established and recognized for traditional programs	1	3.688	0.842	Positive	244
	2	3.512	1.003	Positive	41
	3	3.938	0.966	Positive	49
19 Associated with known institutions	1	3.832	0.741	Positive	245
	2	3.609	0.971	Positive	41
	3	3.872	1.055	Positive	47
21 Publicly funded	1	2.487	0.707	Negative	246
	2	1.829	0.919	Negative	41
	3	2.085	0.855	Negative	47
23 Non-profit educational institution	1	3.869	0.974	Positive	245
	2	3.585	1.024	Positive	41
	3	3.812	1.265	Positive	48
25 Involved in undergraduate studies as well	1	3.546	0.846	Positive	245
	2	2.878	1.144	Undecided	41
	3	3.265	1.094	Positive	49
27 Maintain a traditional campus	1	3.032	0.906	Undecided	245
	2	2.756	1.135	Undecided	41
	3	3.458	1.219	Positive	48
29 Majority of courses on a "home" campus	1	2.874	1.030	Undecided	247
	2	2.525	0.986	Negative	40
	3	3.520	1.166	Positive	48

*1 = school superintendents
2 = junior/community college presidents
3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

". . . the granting institution may utilize an open time-frame for completion of its courses and requirement."

Statement 21, ". . . the granting institution should be a publicly funded institution," drew negative attitudes from all samples. Statement 25, ". . . the granting institution should be involved in undergraduate as well as graduate studies," drew positive reactions from the school superintendents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents while the junior/community college presidents were undecided on the item. Statement 27, ". . . the granting institution should maintain and utilize a traditional campus," drew undecided reactions from school superintendents and junior/community college presidents while baccalaureate granting college and university presidents had positive attitudes toward the item. Statement 29, ". . . the granting institution should offer the majority of its courses on a 'home' campus," drew an undecided response from school superintendents while junior/community college presidents had strong negative feelings and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents responded in a positive manner toward the item. Thus, it appears that the institutional characteristics of the granting institution are important factors in the acceptance of the external doctoral degree with the funding source of the institution being unimportant.

The responses to items on the questionnaire relating to doctoral program characteristics of the degree granting

institution are presented in Table XVII. Two of the items drew positive responses from all samples. These included

TABLE XVII
RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS RELATED TO PROGRAM
CHARACTERISTICS IN DOCTORAL
DEGREE PROGRAMS

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
12	1	3.817	0.882	Positive	246
May issue the D.A. or other new doctoral degrees	2	4.050	0.814	Positive	40
	3	3.872	0.875	Positive	47
14	1	3.069	1.223	Undecided	244
Should issue the traditional Ph.D. or Ed.D.	2	2.575	1.174	Negative	40
	3	3.326	1.087	Positive	49
18	1	3.056	0.811	Undecided	246
May utilize a high percentage of part-time faculty	2	3.512	1.003	Positive	41
	3	2.416	1.251	Negative	48
35	1	2.870	1.085	Undecided	247
Fifty per cent of course requirements met at granting institution	2	2.707	1.188	Negative	41
	3	3.520	1.051	Positive	48

TABLE XVII--Continued

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
36 Require at least two years study beyond a master's degree	1	3.894	0.748	Positive	246
	2	4.048	0.773	Positive	41
	3	4.081	0.975	Positive	49
38 Require at least three years study beyond a bachelor's degree	1	3.784	0.732	Positive	246
	2	3.073	1.232	Undecided	41
	3	3.795	1.040	Negative	49

*1 = school superintendents

2 = junior/community college presidents

3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

statement 12, ". . . the granting institution may issue the Doctor of Arts or other new doctoral degrees," and statement 36, ". . . the granting institution should require at least two years equivalent study beyond an earned master's degree."

All other statements drew mixed reactions between the samples. These included statement 14, ". . . the granting institution should issue the traditional Doctor of Philosophy or the Doctor of Education," in which school superintendents were undecided while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held positive attitudes. The junior/community college presidents held negative attitudes toward

the item. Statement 18, ". . . the granting institution may utilize a high percentage of part-time faculty," drew an undecided response from school superintendents while junior/community college presidents held favorable attitudes toward the item. Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held negative attitudes toward item 18. Statement 35, ". . . the granting institution should require at least fifty per cent of the course requirements taken at that institution," drew negative responses from junior/community college presidents while baccalaureate granting college and university presidents responded in a positive manner. School superintendents were undecided on the issue. Statement 38, ". . . the granting institution should require a minimum of at least three years of study beyond the granting of the bachelor's degree," drew a positive response from the school superintendents while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held negative attitudes. The junior/community college presidents were undecided on the item. In summary, statements related to program characteristics of the granting institution drew mixed reactions from the chief administrators involved in this study. It appears that many attitudes towards the traditional doctoral program characteristics are being reconsidered by school superintendents and junior/community college presidents as well as some baccalaureate granting college and university presidents.

The responses to items on the questionnaire relating to curriculum organization and evaluation characteristics of the granting institution are presented in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII
RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS RELATED TO CURRICULUM
ORGANIZATION AND EVALUATION IN DOCTORAL
DEGREE PROGRAMS

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
16 May utilize the internship in lieu of required course work	1	3.800	1.058	Positive	245
	2	3.585	1.094	Positive	41
	3	3.142	1.060	Undecided	49
22 Should use the traditional semester or quarter time-frame	1	2.689	0.971	Negative	245
	2	2.024	1.106	Negative	41
	3	2.958	1.166	Undecided	48
24 May utilize the "credit," "no credit" grading system	1	3.577	0.939	Positive	246
	2	3.170	0.738	Undecided	41
	3	2.836	1.105	Undecided	49
26 Should use the traditional grading system	1	2.780	0.862	Undecided	246
	2	2.560	1.096	Negative	41
	3	3.333	1.098	Positive	48

TABLE XVIII--Continued

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
28 May utilize an open time frame for completion of courses and requirements	1	3.777	0.723	Positive	247
	2	3.900	0.590	Positive	40
	3	3.479	0.922	Positive	48
32 May utilize highly individualized student developed courses	1	3.805	0.700	Positive	247
	2	3.926	0.685	Positive	41
	3	3.326	0.851	Positive	49
37 May utilize advanced placement with credit for previous experience and accomplishment	1	3.834	0.727	Positive	247
	2	3.804	0.748	Positive	41
	3	3.340	0.938	Positive	47

*1 = school superintendents

2 = junior/community college presidents

3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

Three of the items drew positive responses from all samples. These included statement 28, ". . . the granting institution may utilize an open time-frame for completion of its courses and requirements," statement 32, ". . . the granting institution may utilize highly individualized student developed

courses," and statement 37, ". . . the granting institution may utilize advanced placement with credit for previous educational and/or accomplishment in the field of study."

Statement 16, ". . . the granting institution may utilize the internship in lieu of required coursework, drew positive responses from school superintendents and junior/community college presidents while baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided. Statement 22, ". . . the granting institution should use the traditional semester or quarter time-frame," drew negative responses from school superintendents and junior/community college presidents while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided concerning the statement. Statement 24, ". . . the granting institution may utilize a 'credit,' 'no credit' grading system," drew a positive response from school superintendents while the college and university presidents were undecided on the item. Statement 26, ". . . the granting institution should use the traditional grading system," drew negative responses from the junior/community college presidents while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held positive attitudes toward the item. School superintendents were undecided on the issue.

In summary, it appears that some areas of curriculum organization and evaluation in doctoral degree programs are being questioned and are creating doubt for employers of doctoral graduates involved in this study.

The responses to items on the questionnaire relating to admission and candidacy to doctoral degree programs are shown in Table XIX. Statement 20, ". . . the granting institution

TABLE XIX

RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS RELATED TO ADMISSION AND
CANDIDACY IN DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
20 Should utilize formal written and oral examinations prior to candidacy	1	3.840	0.754	Positive	245
	2	3.268	1.265	Positive	41
	3	4.083	0.985	Positive	48
33 Should utilize standardized and recognized entrance requirements	1	2.955	1.090	Undecided	247
	2	2.658	1.257	Negative	41
	3	3.877	1.073	Positive	49
34 Should utilize age limits on degree candidacy	1	2.077	0.650	Negative	246
	2	1.951	0.773	Negative	41
	3	2.166	0.930	Negative	48

*1 = school superintendents

2 = junior/community college presidents

3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

should utilize formal written and oral examinations prior to candidacy," received a positive response from all samples while statement 34, ". . . the granting institution should utilize age limits on degree candidacy," received a negative response from all samples. Statement 33, ". . . the granting institution should utilize standardized and recognized entrance requirements," drew positive responses from baccalaureate granting college and university presidents while junior/community college presidents held negative attitudes. School superintendents were undecided on the issue.

In the area of admission and candidacy, potential employers are concerned with age limits placed upon doctoral candidacy and some administrators are questioning the traditional entrance requirements. All administrators involved in this study still favor the formalized written and oral examinations prior to candidacy.

The responses to items on the questionnaire relating to the residency and dissertation aspects of doctoral degree programs are presented in Table XX. Only statement 30, ". . . the granting institution may utilize doctoral projects and theses in lieu of the traditional dissertation," received a positive response from all samples. Statement 39, ". . . the granting institution should require the traditional one year of residency on campus," drew negative attitudes from school superintendents and community college presidents while

TABLE XX

RESPONSE TO STATEMENTS RELATED TO RESIDENCY AND THE
DISSERTATION IN DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

Statement	Sample*	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
30 May use doctoral projects and theses in lieu of a disserta- tion	1	3.668	0.842	Positive	247
	2	4.097	0.995	Positive	41
	3	3.367	1.093	Positive	49
39 Should re- quire one year campus residence	1	2.502	0.970	Negative	247
	2	1.926	0.958	Negative	41
	3	3.416	1.163	Positive	48
40 May use a summer residency in lieu of one year	1	3.734	0.886	Positive	245
	2	3.926	0.932	Positive	41
	3	2.959	0.956	Undecided	49
41 Need not require a residency	1	2.931	1.019	Undecided	247
	2	3.341	1.196	Positive	41
	3	2.265	1.094	Negative	49

*1 = school superintendents

2 = junior/community college presidents

3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held positive attitudes toward the statement. Statement 40, ". . . the granting institution may utilize a summer

residency in lieu of the traditional one year residence period," drew positive responses from school superintendents and junior/community college presidents while baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided toward the statement. Statement 41, ". . . the granting institution need not require a residency period," drew a positive response from junior/community college presidents while baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held negative attitudes toward the statement. School superintendents were undecided on the item.

In summary, the statements related to residency and dissertation in doctoral programs drew comments dissimilar to those of many traditional programs. All administrators responding had favorable responses toward the doctoral project rather than the traditional dissertation and the majority of administrators in this study were receptive to modification of the traditional residence requirement.

Part D

Part D of the questionnaire contained attitude statements concerning specific external doctoral degree programs of varying types. Samples were asked to respond to each of these from acceptability at their institution for both new employees and for present employees. Institution "A" was described as:

. . . doctoral programs are available in general education, educational counseling and higher

education. The students are required five weeks in residence in the area of the university, where they attend class from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. five days a week. Six different courses are taken during this session for which the students earn 12 semester hours of credit. During the school year candidates register for 14 semester hours of Dissertation/Project Guidance. The dissertation is written in or near the candidate's home town under a field advisor who has been approved in advance by the University. If the dissertation is accepted the candidate returns to the University the following summer to defend an abstract of it before a group of his fellow students and one adjunct faculty member. This fulfills all of the degree requirement. The University is currently chartered by the state as a profit making institution and has no form of accreditation status at present.

The responses to this program as it applies to prospective new employees are presented in Table XXI. All samples

TABLE XXI

RESPONSE TO "A" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE PROGRAM FOR A PROSPECTIVE NEW EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	2.492	1.134	Negative	244
Junior/community college presidents	2.100	1.194	Negative	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	1.625	0.761	Negative	48
Total	2.3203	1.1373	Negative	332

expressed negative attitudes toward "A" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for prospective new employees.

Table XXII presents responses from the samples toward "A" University's external doctoral program as it applies to acceptance for current employees. All samples expressed

TABLE XXII
RESPONSE TO "A" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE
PROGRAM FOR A CURRENT EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	2.733	1.191	Negative	243
Junior/community college presidents	2.275	1.176	Negative	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	1.896	0.856	Negative	48
Total	2.5559	1.1854	Negative	331

negative attitudes toward "A" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for current employees.

In summary, it appears that a non-accredited proprietorship doctoral institution degree is unacceptable by all administrators involved in this study for both new and present employees.

Institution "B" was described as:

. . . doctoral programs are available in public school administration and higher education. Although the program is external, "B" University students are required to take the same courses and meet the same admission and candidacy requirements as most traditional programs. Courses are offered on Saturday and evenings throughout the state and there is no residency period or age limits (candidate or course age) imposed. The traditional dissertation or an acceptable doctoral project is required with the candidate defending both at the proposal and completion state. "B" University is a state supported and regionally accredited institution offering internal doctoral programs also.

The responses to this program as it applies to prospective new employees are presented in Table XXIII. All samples

TABLE XXIII

RESPONSE TO "B" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE PROGRAM FOR A PROSPECTIVE NEW EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	4.279	0.882	Positive	244
Junior/community college presidents	4.625	0.627	Positive	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	3.584	1.145	Positive	48
Total	4.219	0.940	Positive	332

expressed positive attitudes toward "B" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for prospective new employees.

In Table XXIV are presented responses from the samples toward "B" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for current employees. All samples expressed positive attitudes toward "B" University's external

TABLE XXIV

RESPONSE TO "B" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE
PROGRAM FOR A CURRENT EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	4.391	0.899	Positive	243
Junior/community college presidents	4.700	0.607	Positive	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	3.771	1.076	Positive	48
Total	4.338	0.931	Positive	331

doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for current employees.

In summary, it appears that state supported and regionally accredited external doctorate programs are positively viewed by potential employers as reasonable alternatives to the traditional doctorate degree for both new and current employees.

Institution "C" was described as:

. . . doctoral programs are available in educational leadership and community college teaching.

The students attending "C" University are enrolled in regional clusters of 25 to 32 students across the nation. The students, most of whom are school administrators or community college teachers meet once a month in seminars to work on their practicums and to participate in discussions held by "national lecturers" of considerable eminence who are flown in from their home campuses for the day. The students are responsible for the mastering of eight fields of competence and substantive examinations are required. Students are required to attend "C" University campus for two brief summer institutes and are required to write and defend a major research paper. "C" University is a private non-profit graduate level institution holding "candidate status" from its regional accreditation agency.

The responses to this program as it applies to prospective new employees are presented in Table XXV. Two of the

TABLE XXV

RESPONSE TO "C" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE PROGRAM FOR A PROSPECTIVE NEW EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	3.684	1.072	Positive	243
Junior/community college presidents	3.850	0.892	Positive	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	2.618	1.225	Negative	47
Total	3.551	1.140	Positive	330

samples expressed positive attitudes toward "C" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for a

prospective new employee while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents held negative attitudes towards acceptance.

In Table XXVI are presented responses from the samples toward "C" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for current employees. Two of the

TABLE XXVI

RESPONSE TO "C" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE PROGRAM FOR A CURRENT EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	3.930	1.107	Positive	242
Junior/community college presidents	4.025	0.891	Positive	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	2.830	1.239	Undecided	47
Total	3.784	1.168	Positive	329

samples, school superintendents and junior/community college presidents, expressed positive attitudes toward "C" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for current employees, while the baccalaureate granting college and university presidents were undecided about the acceptance.

In summary, it appears that a private, non-profit graduate level institution awarding the external doctorate degree and achieving candidate status only with its regional accrediting association may be acceptable for both new and current employees in educational institutions other than baccalaureate granting colleges and universities.

Institution "D" was described as:

. . . doctoral programs are available in almost any field. The students are required to submit their resumes and transcripts for university evaluation and a mutually agreed upon program is designed. Minimum requirements for all doctoral degree candidates include an "extensive" research paper in the candidate's area of specialty and an "acceptable" dissertation, project or thesis. Although candidates are not required to come to the "D" University offices, visits during the final stages of the program are encouraged as well as the personal receipt of the degree if at all possible. "D" University is authorized to grant degrees under state law and is currently a profit making institution. "D" University is currently considering its reorganization to non-profit status and the eventual seeking of regional accreditation status.

The responses to this program as it applies to prospective new employees are presented in Table XXVII. Two of the samples, junior/community college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents, expressed negative attitudes toward "D" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for a prospective new employee, while the school superintendents were undecided about the acceptance.

TABLE XXVII

RESPONSE TO "D" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE
PROGRAM FOR A PROSPECTIVE NEW EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	2.758	1.140	Undecided	242
Junior/community college presidents	2.255	1.143	Negative	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	1.809	1.013	Negative	47
Total	2.557	1.173	Negative	330

In Table XXVIII are presented the responses from the samples toward "D" University's external doctorate program

TABLE XXVIII

RESPONSE TO "D" UNIVERSITY'S EXTERNAL DOCTORATE
PROGRAM FOR A CURRENT EMPLOYEE

Sample	Mean Scores	Standard Deviation	Reaction to Statement	Number of Observations
School superintendents	2.375	1.217	Negative	242
Junior/community college presidents	2.893	1.169	Undecided	40
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	1.894	1.005	Negative	47
Total	2.687	1.235	Negative	329

as it applies to acceptance for current employees. Two of the samples, school superintendents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents, expressed negative attitudes toward "D" University's external doctorate program as it applies to acceptance for a current employee, while junior/community college presidents were undecided about acceptance.

In summary, it appears that doctoral institutions seeking non-profit status and eventual regional accreditation status are unacceptable degree granting institutions for employment; however, school superintendents remain undecided upon the issue for new employees and junior/community college presidents remain undecided for existing employees.

Testing of Hypotheses

The tenability of the hypotheses stated in Chapter I was determined by statistical analysis techniques. The results of this analysis are presented in the following portion of the chapter. Each hypothesis was either retained or rejected at a minimum of the .05 level of significance. Analysis of variance was used to determine if significant relationships existed between the attitudes of school superintendents, junior/community college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents as indicated on the descriptive and attitudinal data of the questionnaire.

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I was restated in the null form as follows:

There is no significant difference between the attitudes of school superintendents and junior/community college presidents in the acceptance of the nontraditional external doctoral degree in the initial employment of an educator.

In Table XXIX, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they pertain to initial employment of external doctorates is shown. The F ratio obtained for significance

TABLE XXIX

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN ATTITUDES BETWEEN
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND JUNIOR/COMMUNITY
COLLEGE PRESIDENTS IN THE ACCEPTANCE OF
NONTRADITIONAL EXTERNAL DOCTORAL
DEGREES IN INITIAL EMPLOYMENT

Sample	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
School superintendents	1	2.9859	0.5032	249
Junior/community college presidents	1	3.2054	0.5974	43
Total	1	3.0182	0.5229	292

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	1.7663	1	1.7663	6.5837	0.0108
Within	77.8035	290	0.2683	..	S
Total	79.5698	291

of difference in the relationship was 6.5837, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0108. The null hypothesis must be rejected based upon the responses to items 7, 8, 42, 44, and 46 combined on the questionnaire which were directly related to hypothesis I.

The original research hypothesis was retained as stated in Chapter I. Significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in the initial employment of educators were found in school system superintendents and junior/community college presidents. Junior/community college presidents hold significantly more positive attitudes than school superintendents toward the acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in the initial employment of educators.

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II was restated in the null form as follows:

There is no significant difference between the attitudes of junior/community college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents in the acceptance of the nontraditional external doctoral degree in the initial employment of an educator.

In Table XXX a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they pertain to initial employment of external doctorates is shown. The F ratio obtained for significance

TABLE XXX

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN ATTITUDES BETWEEN
 JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND
 BACCALAUREATE GRANTING COLLEGE AND
 UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS IN THE
 ACCEPTANCE OF NONTRADITIONAL
 EXTERNAL DOCTORATES IN
 INITIAL EMPLOYMENT

Sample	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Junior/community college presidents	1	3.2054	0.5974	43
Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	1	3.3095	0.6797	56
Total	1	3.2643	0.6441	99

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	0.2636	1	0.2636	0.6328	0.4283
Within	40.4040	97	0.4165	..	NS
Total	40.6675	98

of difference in the relationship was 0.6328, resulting in a level of significance of 0.4283 which did not reach the minimum of the .05 level. The null hypothesis was retained based upon the responses to items 7, 8, 42, 44, 46, and 48 combined on the questionnaire and the statistical evidence presented in Table XXX. There was no significant difference between the attitudes of junior/community college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents in

the acceptance of the nontraditional doctoral degree in the initial employment of an educator.

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III was restated in the null form as follows:

There is no significant difference between the attitudes of school superintendents and college and university presidents in the acceptance of the nontraditional external doctoral degrees in the initial employment of an educator.

In Table XXXI, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they pertain to the initial employment of

TABLE XXXI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS IN THE ACCEPTANCE OF NON-TRADITIONAL EXTERNAL DOCTORATES IN INITIAL EMPLOYMENT

Sample	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
School superintendents	1	2.9859	0.5032	249
College and university presidents overall	1	3.2643	0.6441	99
Total	1	3.0651	0.5603	348

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	5.4888	1	5.4888	18.3525	0.0108
Within	103.4798	346	0.2991	..	S
Total	108.9686	347

external doctorates is shown. The F ratio obtained for significance of difference in the relationship was 18.3525, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0108. The null hypothesis was rejected based upon the responses to items 7, 8, 42, 44, 46, and 48 combined on the questionnaire which were related to hypothesis III. Significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in initial employment of educators were found in school system superintendents and college and university presidents overall. College and university presidents hold significantly more positive attitudes than school superintendents toward the acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate in the initial employment of educators.

Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV was restated in the null form as follows:

There are no significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate by all administrators involved in this study as it applies to the employment of new employees and acceptance for current employees.

In Table XXXII, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they apply to new employees and current employees is shown. The F ratio obtained for significance of difference was 1.8460, resulting in a level of significance of 0.1745

TABLE XXXII

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE OF ATTITUDES OF
ADMINISTRATORS TOWARD THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE
NONTRADITIONAL EXTERNAL DOCTORATE FOR
PROSPECTIVE NEW EMPLOYEES AND
CURRENT EMPLOYEES

Group	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
New employees	1	3.0651	0.5603	348
Current employees	1	3.0069	0.5680	346
Total	1	3.0361	0.5645	694

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	0.5877	1	0.5877	1.8460	0.1745
Within	220.3046	692	0.3184	..	NS
Total	220.8923	693

which did not reach the minimum of the .05 level. The null hypothesis was retained based upon the responses to items 7, 8, 42, 44, 46, 48 combined and 9, 10, 43, 45, 47, and 49 combined on the questionnaire which were related to hypothesis IV. There were no significant differences in the attitudes toward acceptance of the external nontraditional doctorate by all administrators involved in this study as it applies to the employment of new employees and acceptance for current employees.

Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V was restated in the null form as follows:

There is no significant difference in the acceptability or rejection of the external doctoral degree earned by a current effective employee based upon institutional size.

In Table XXXIII, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they apply to the acceptance or rejection of the external doctoral degree earned by a current effective employee in relation to institution size is shown. The F

TABLE XXXIII

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDES
TOWARD THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE EARNED BY A
CURRENT EMPLOYEE IN RELATION TO
INSTITUTION SIZE

Group		Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Under 100 staff		1	3.0072	0.5595	92
Over 1000 staff		1	2.9294	0.4902	26
Total		1	2.9901	0.5440	118

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	0.1226	1	0.1226	0.4121	0.5222
Within	34.5045	116	0.2975	..	NS
Total	34.6270	117

ratio obtained for significance of difference was 0.4121, resulting in a level of significance of 0.5222 which did not reach the minimum of the .05 level. The null hypothesis was

retained based upon the responses to items 9, 10, 43, 45, 47, and 49 combined on the questionnaire which were related to hypothesis V. There was no significant difference in the acceptability or rejection of the external doctoral degree earned by a current effective employee based upon institutional size.

Hypothesis VI

Hypothesis VI was restated in the null form as follows:

There is no significant difference in the acceptability or rejection of the external doctoral degree earned by a prospective new employee based upon institutional size.

In Table XXIV, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they apply to the acceptance or rejection of

TABLE XXXIV

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDES
TOWARD THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE EARNED BY A
PROSPECTIVE NEW EMPLOYEE IN RELATION TO
INSTITUTION SIZE

Group	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Under 100 staff	1	3.0125	0.5883	93
Over 1000 staff	1	2.8950	0.6011	27
Total	1	2.9861	0.5907	120

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	0.2888	1	0.2888	0.8262	0.3652
Within	41.2432	118	0.3495	..	NS
Total	41.5320	119

the external doctorate earned by a prospective new employee in relation to institution size is shown. The F ratio obtained for significance of difference was 0.8262, resulting in a level of significance of 0.3652 which did not reach the minimum of the .05 level. The null hypothesis was retained based upon the responses to items 7, 8, 42, 44, 46, and 48 on the questionnaire which were related to hypothesis VI. There was no significant difference in the acceptability or rejection of the external doctoral degree earned by a prospective new employee based upon institutional size.

Hypothesis VII

Hypothesis VII was restated in the null form as follows:

There is no significant difference in the acceptability of the external doctoral degree by all administrators involved in this study based upon how the external doctorate programs are perceived to differ from traditional doctorate programs.

In Table XXXV, a summary of the analysis of variance to the data as they apply to the acceptance of the external doctoral degree by all administrators in relationship to their perception of how those degrees differ from the traditional is shown. The F ratio obtained for significance of difference was 25.6636, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0001. This significance statistic should be carefully viewed in context, however, due to the fact that the means

TABLE XXXV

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDES
TOWARD ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORAL DEGREE
IN RELATION TO PERCEIVED DIFFERENCES FROM THE
TRADITIONAL DOCTORAL DEGREE

Items	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
Nontraditional	1	3.2732	0.5861	337
Traditional	1	3.4996	0.5750	338
Total	1	3.3866	0.5911	675

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Variance Estimate	F Ratio	Level of Significance
Between	8.6525	1	8.6525	25.6636	0.0001
Within	226.9026	673	0.3372	..	S
Total	235.5551	674

compared were, for the most part, antipodic and the results were anticipated by the researcher. The null hypothesis was rejected based upon the difference between the combined means of 11, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39 judged to be traditional, and the combined means of items 12, 15, 16, 18, 24, 28, 30, 32, 37, 40, and 41 judged to be nontraditional on the questionnaire, and related to hypothesis VII.

The original research hypothesis was retained as stated in Chapter I. The degree to which the external doctorate programs and institutions are perceived to differ from the

traditional doctorate programs did determine the acceptability of the degree by all administrators involved in the study.

Mean scores of responses to items judged as traditional in external doctorate degree programs by all administrators involved in the study were significantly higher than mean scores of responses to items judged as nontraditional in external doctorate programs.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ferguson, George, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971.
2. Roscoe, John, Fundamental Statistics, Dallas, Texas, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The emphasis of this study was placed on the nontraditional doctoral degree and programs and the views held by school system superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents toward this concept. Particular attention was given to the views of those chief administrators in relation to the acceptability of the nontraditional external doctoral degree in their institutions for both prospective employees and current effective employees. Utilized in this study were some aspects of external doctoral degree programs across the nation to determine how the educational management structure viewed these items. Tables are presented in Appendix H that contain the responses for all the statements on the instrument.

External doctoral degree programs are in the embryo stage in the United States. There has been little done in the way of research to provide future doctoral candidates with answers as to the acceptability of these new degrees and programs in educational institutions.

This study consisted of several phases. Each phase was important in contributing to the finalization of the study. The first phase was the development of an instrument to measure the attitudes of school system superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents toward external doctoral degrees and programs. Items for the initial instrument were based on ideas contained in various sources that were researched for this study. A Likert-type attitude scale was chosen and developed into an instrument meeting the criterion to measure the attitudes of school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents toward the external doctorate concept. The initial instrument was presented to a panel of jurors for their consideration to establish the face validity of the instrument. The instrument was reconstructed using the suggestions of the jurors. Some items were changed and others were deleted. The reliability of the instrument was established, using the test-retest technique before the questionnaire was mailed to the samples.

Three samples were drawn, one from the population of school superintendents, one from the population of junior/community presidents, and one from the population of baccalaureate granting college and university presidents. A questionnaire was sent to each of the 458 individuals in

the study. There were two follow-up attempts resulting in 348 returns. An additional phase of this study involved the data that were compiled from the questionnaires returned by the three samples. These data and their statistical analyses were presented in Chapter IV. Research hypotheses were tested using analysis of variance. This statistical technique was used to determine if there were significant differences in the attitudes of school system superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents in relation to the statements on the instrument. Part A of the questionnaire contained descriptive data on the respondent and his institution. Part B contained general statements on the acceptability of the external doctoral degree concept for prospective employees and current effective employees. Part C contained specific statements concerning the characteristics of external doctoral degree programs. All hypotheses were concerned with relationships between attitudes of school system superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents on statements in parts B, C, and D of the instrument.

Findings

As a result of an analysis of data from items on the instrument, the following results were found through the

use of the analysis of variance technique:

1. There is no significant difference between the attitudes of chief administrators toward the external doctoral degree based upon the funding source of the institutions they represented. As presented in Table V, the F ratio obtained was 3.6297, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0576. Although the F ratio was not significant at a minimum of .05, it was approaching significance at that level for new employees. As presented in Table VI, the F ratio obtained was 1.6511, resulting in a level of significance of 0.1997 which did not reach the minimum of the .05 level of significance for present employees and additional study may indicate significance.

2. Chief administrators holding at least one external degree had attitudes more receptive toward acceptance of the external doctoral degree in their institutions for prospective new employees. As presented in Table IX, the F ratio obtained was 4.9648, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0265 which exceeded the minimum level of .05. Significant differences were found in the relationship between respondents holding an external degree and the acceptance of the external doctoral degree earned by a new employee.

3. There was no significant difference in the attitudes of chief administrators holding at least one external degree toward the acceptance of the external doctoral

degree in the institutions they represented for current employees. As presented in Table X, the F ratio obtained was 0.1158, resulting in a level of significance of 0.7339 which did not reach the minimum of .05 level of significance. This indicated that chief administrators holding external degrees were more favorable in their attitudes toward the external doctoral degree earned by a new employee.

4. Junior/community college presidents held significantly more positive attitudes towards acceptance of the external doctoral degree in initial employment in their institutions than did school system superintendents. As presented in Table XXIX, the F ratio obtained was 6.5837, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0108 which exceeded the minimum level of .05.

5. There were no significant differences between the attitudes of junior/community college presidents and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents in the acceptance of the external doctoral degree in the employment of a prospective employee. As presented in Table XXX, the F ratio obtained was 0.6328 which did not reach the minimum level of .05.

6. College and university presidents overall held more favorable attitudes toward the acceptance of the external doctoral degree in the initial employment of an educator than did school system superintendents. As presented in

Table XXXI, the F ratio obtained was 18.3525, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0108 which exceeded the minimum level of .05.

7. There was no significant difference in the attitudes of chief administrators overall toward the acceptance of the external doctoral degree for new employees compared with their current employees. As presented in Table XXII, the F ratio obtained was 1.8460, resulting in a level of significance of 0.1745 which did not reach the minimum level of .05.

8. There was no significant difference in the attitudes of chief administrators overall toward the acceptance of the external doctoral degree in the employment of prospective new employees or promotion of current employees based upon institution size. As presented in Table XXXIII, the F ratio obtained was 0.4121, resulting in a level of significance of 0.5222 for current employees and as presented in Table XXIV, the F ratio was 0.8262, resulting in a level of significance of 0.3652 for new employees. Neither F ratio reached the minimum level of .05.

9. Chief administrators' attitudes overall were significantly more positive toward the external doctoral degree in direct relationship to the similarity of the degree with the traditional doctoral degree. As presented in Table XXXV, the F ratio obtained was 25.6636, resulting in a level of significance of 0.0001 which exceeded the minimum level

of .05. It should be pointed out again, however, that this statistic was not unexpected due to the antipodic nature of the means compared.

The following findings were not found by statistical tests of the data obtained, but rather, were judgments made based upon the mean responses of those involved in the study compared with a predetermined criteria as to the absolute requirements necessary for acceptance of the doctoral degree.

For acceptance of the external doctoral degree, the granting institution should:

1. have achieved full regional accreditation as presented in Table XV;
2. be established and recognized for its traditional programs, as presented in Table XVI;
3. be associated with known institutions of higher education, as presented in Table XVI;
4. be a non-profit educational institution, as presented in Table XVI;
5. require at least two years equivalent study beyond an earned master's degree, as presented in Table XVII;
6. utilize formal written and oral examinations prior to candidacy, as presented in Table XIX.

In addition to the previously listed attitudes of the chief administrators involved in this study, the following

also were expressed toward acceptance of the external doctoral degree. The granting institution may:

1. issue the doctor of arts or other new doctoral degree, as presented in Table XVII;
2. utilize an open time-frame for completion of its courses and course requirements, as presented in Table XVIII;
3. utilize doctoral projects and theses in lieu of the traditional dissertation, as presented in Table XX;
4. utilize advanced placement with credit for previous educational experience and accomplishment in the field of study, as presented in Table XVIII.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were made on the basis of the findings as indicated by the attitudes of school superintendents, junior/community college presidents, and baccalaureate granting college and university presidents from member institutions of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools toward the external doctoral degree.

1. Although the external doctoral degree may be accepted in many institutions, the traditional doctoral degree continues to have strong advantages to the holder in terms of initial employment and promotion. This conclusion is based upon the implied comparison with the traditional

doctoral degree used throughout the instrument. Many administrators still adhere to its principles as evidenced in the data gathered.

2. In the acceptability of the external doctoral degree, the quality of the doctoral program and the characteristics of the granting institution are extremely important factors. This conclusion is evidenced in the responses by chief administrators in Part C of the questionnaire concerning doctoral degree program characteristics.

3. Many external doctoral degrees are viewed by chief administrators in a similar context as to the previously defined "degree mills"; however, full regional accreditation and the institutional characteristics of the granting institution do affect these attitudes in a more positive direction. This is evidenced in the responses of chief administrators in Part C and Part D of this study.

4. In the investigation of the acceptance of the external degree in institutions accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, a considerable number of chief administrators are still undecided concerning the crucial aspect of acceptance and many factors pertaining to the doctoral degree and the granting institution. This is evidenced by the number of undecided responses obtained by the questionnaire as shown in Appendix H.

5. Attitudes of administrators toward the concept of the external doctoral degree are favorable. This is

evidenced in the favorable responses of chief administrators in Part B of the questionnaire used in this study.

6. Many chief administrators are receptive to changes in traditional doctoral degree programs which have been previously associated with external doctoral degree programs and are a departure from the traditional doctoral degree programs. This is evidenced in the favorable responses of chief administrators to many nontraditional program characteristics in Part C of the questionnaire used in this study.

Recommendations

In view of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations appear to be warranted.

1. Educational institutions must develop specific policies (example shown in Appendix G) as to the nature of the doctoral degree acceptable at that institution for initial employment and promotion. The evolution of the external doctoral degree in America has left most policies as to the doctoral degree unclear and incomplete.

2. Prospective doctoral students must carefully evaluate the acceptance factors of the external doctoral degree prior to making a commitment to such a program, including the specific accreditation status of the institution as well as the characteristics involved in the institution and its reputation.

3. Current traditional doctoral degree programs must evaluate carefully their present requirements in light of what is demanded for employment by chief administrators and what is only a matter of tradition for the institution and the degree.

4. Other studies must be undertaken to determine administrative attitudes in other areas of the United States towards the acceptability of the external doctoral degree and to the expectations of the doctoral degree in general as it relates to initial employment and promotion in educational institutions. Additional studies should consider the impact of the external degree in employment outside the field of education as well as the determination of attitudes held at other administrative levels.

5. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools must develop more expertise in and criteria for the accreditation standards as they apply to institutions granting external doctoral degrees. Their future acceptability and impact upon the academic community is directly related to the attitudes and action taken by recognized regional accrediting bodies.

6. In regions where doctoral study is not readily available to educators, an alternative such as the Graduate Career Development Center in the Dallas-Fort Worth area may be considered which does not have the negative aspects found in many external doctorate programs.

APPENDIX A

VALIDATION LETTER

I recently had a dissertation proposal titled Attitudes of College and University Presidents and School Superintendents in Member Institutions of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Toward External Doctoral Degrees and Programs, approved at North Texas State University.

You have been selected as one of eight judges to review the questionnaire for the purpose of establishing validity.

The purposes of this investigation will be to:

- 1) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for employment and promotion in school systems accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- 2) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for employment and promotion in junior/community colleges accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- 3) determine to what extent nontraditional external doctorates will be recognized for initial employment and promotion in baccalaureate granting colleges and universities accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
- 4) determine which degree and institutional factors concerning the nontraditional external doctorate are not acceptable in:
 - a) school systems
 - b) junior/community colleges
 - c) baccalaureate granting colleges and universities

- 5) determine which degree and institutional factors concerning the nontraditional external doctorate are acceptable in:
 - a) school systems
 - b) junior/community colleges
 - c) baccalaureate granting colleges and universities

Please use the following steps in assisting me:

- 1) Read all questions.
- 2) Cross out any questions which do not appear to measure the stated purposes of the study. (Questions 1-6 are coding questions.)
- 3) Mark any pertinent comments directly on the sample questionnaire. (optional)
- 4) Return in stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Should you not have time to assist, return the questionnaire to me with a statement indicating that and I will select another judge.

Sincerely,

Michael M. Mayall
Doctoral Candidate,
North Texas State University

Enc.

MM:m

APPENDIX B

RELIABILITY LETTER

I recently had a dissertation proposal titled Attitudes of College and University Presidents and School Superintendents in Member Institutions of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Toward External Doctoral Degrees and Programs, approved at North Texas State University. The enclosed questionnaire has been validated by a panel of eight judges.

You have been selected as one of ten administrators to assist in a test-retest procedure to establish reliability on the questionnaire. Should you not have time to assist, return the questionnaire to me with a statement indicating that and I will select another administrator in your place.

Please use the following steps in assisting me:

- 1) Read and answer all questions. (Questions 1-6 are coding questions and will not be used in the correlation so may be omitted if you wish.) If you are not the chief administrator, answer the questions as if you were asked to do so by that administrator. I suspect that in the actual conduct of the study, not all questionnaires will be completed by the chief administrator; therefore, I have built this into the reliability tests.
- 2) Return the completed questionnaire to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope within seven days.
- 3) Upon receipt of your questionnaire or the lapse of seven days I will send you a second identical questionnaire which should be completed independently of the first. I will then compute the test-retest correlation based upon the two administrations of the instrument.

Thank you in advance for assisting me in this study.

Sincerely,

Michael M. Mayall
Doctoral Candidate,
North Texas State University

Enc.

MM:m

APPENDIX C

STUDY PARTICIPANT LETTER

Dear Chief Administrator:

I am a doctoral student at North Texas State University and am in the process of writing my dissertation, "Attitudes of College and University Presidents and School Superintendents in Member Institutions of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Towards External Doctoral Degrees and Programs." It is hoped that the information gained through this study will assist SACS members in assessing their personnel policies concerning the employment or promotion of professional personnel obtaining or holding the external doctoral degree. You are one of the chief administrators selected through random procedures to participate in this study.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire which has been designed to make answering as easy as possible. It will take approximately ten minutes to complete. All answers will be considered confidential. Please fill in the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

Sincerely,

Director of the Study,

Michael Mayall
Doctoral Candidate
7329 Vanessa Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76112

Dr. Bob Miller
Director of Community
College Programs
North Texas State University
Denton, Texas 76203

MM:m
Encl.

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

November 14, 1975

Dear Chief Administrator:

Several weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire "Attitudes of College and University Presidents and School Superintendents in Member Institutions of Southern Association of College and Schools Towards External Doctoral Degrees and Programs." I have not received a sufficient number of returns at this point to continue the study. If you have not returned the questionnaire, I would appreciate your taking a few minutes to respond.

As a doctoral candidate, I have not only the traditional pressures concerning percentages and time limits imposed on the study but the additional pressure of a postage increase in a few weeks. If you have already returned the questionnaire, thank you and please disregard this letter. If you have not returned it won't you please take a few minutes from your busy schedule to assist me?

Sincerely,

Michael M. Mayall
Doctoral Candidate
7329 Vanessa Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76112

MMM/l t

APPENDIX E

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT

PART A

1. Type of Institution
 - A. School system with at least one secondary school
 - B. Community/Junior College
 - C. Baccalaureate granting College or University without graduate program
 - D. Baccalaureate granting College or University with graduate program

2. Primary funding source
 - A. Public
 - B. Private

3. Highest degree held by chief administrator
 - A. Bachelors
 - B. Masters
 - C. Doctorate
 - D. Other

_____ please specify degree

4. The chief administrator holds at least one external degree*
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

*The external degree is earned outside the recognized institutional framework normally associated with college study. The external degree is usually either an assessment degree, which places emphasis on advanced placement and demonstration of competence rather than a specific curricular process or, the extension degree which is more traditional in program but does not center on a campus and utilize the traditional residence period.

5. Professional staff employed in your institution
 - A. 1-100
 - B. 101-500
 - C. 501-1,000
 - D. over 1,000

9. Should a present capable professional employee of your institution earn an external doctorate of the "assessment variety" would that doctorate be financially recognized by your institution? (See previous definition)

5	4	3	2	1
()	()	()	()	()
yes				no
definite	possibly	uncertain	doubtful	definite

10. Should a present capable professional employee of your institution earn an external doctorate of the "extension variety" would that doctorate be financially recognized by your institution? (See previous definition)

5	4	3	2	1
()	()	()	()	()
yes				no
definite	possibly	uncertain	doubtful	definite

PART C

The following statement represent factors involved in a wide variety of external (assessment and extension) degree programs across the United States. Please indicate what you feel the reaction of your institution would be to each of the items as they pertain to the training of present or future professional employees.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
						FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORATE DEGREE AT THIS INSTITUTION, I FEEL:
5	4	3	2	1	11.	. . .the granting institution should have achieved full regional accreditation as a minimum requirement.
5	4	3	2	1	12.	. . .the granting institution may issue the Doctor of Arts or other new doctoral degrees. (teaching rather than research oriented)
5	4	3	2	1	13.	. . .the granting institution should have achieved "candidate status" by its regional accrediting association as a minimum requirement.
5	4	3	2	1	14.	. . .the granting institution should issue the traditional Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education. (research oriented)
5	4	3	2	1	15.	. . .the granting institution should have announced future plans concerning achievement of regional accreditation as a minimum requirement.
5	4	3	2	1	16.	. . .the granting institution may utilize the internship in lieu of required course work.

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
					FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORATE DEGREE AT THIS INSTITUTION, I FEEL:
5	4	3	2	1	17. . . .the granting institution should be established and recognized for its traditional programs.
5	4	3	2	1	18. . . .the granting institution may utilize a high percentage of part-time faculty.
5	4	3	2	1	19. . . .the granting institution should be associated with known institutions of higher education.
5	4	3	2	1	20. . . .the granting institution should utilize formal written and oral examinations prior to candidacy. (all but dissertation)
5	4	3	2	1	21. . . .the granting institution should be a publicly funded institution.
5	4	3	2	1	22. . . .the granting institution should use the traditional semester or quarter time-frame.
5	4	3	2	1	23. . . .the granting institution should be a non-profit educational institution.
5	4	3	2	1	24. . . .the granting institution may utilize a "credit," "no credit" grading system.
5	4	3	2	1	25. . . .the granting institution should be involved in undergraduate as well as graduate studies.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNDECIDED	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
						FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL DOCTORATE DEGREE AT THIS INSTITUTION, I FEEL:
5	4	3	2	1	26.	. . .the granting institution should use the traditional grading system.
5	4	3	2	1	27.	. . .the granting institution should maintain and utilize a traditional campus.
5	4	3	2	1	28.	. . .the granting institution may utilize an open time-frame for completion of its courses and requirements.
5	4	3	2	1	29.	. . .the granting institution should offer the majority of its courses on a "home" campus.
5	4	3	2	1	30.	. . .the granting institution may utilize doctoral projects and theses in lieu of the traditional doctoral dissertation.
5	4	3	2	1	31.	. . .the granting institution should serve a regional rather than a national need for graduate study.
5	4	3	2	1	32.	. . .the granting institution may utilize highly individualized student developed courses of study.
5	4	3	2	1	33.	. . .the granting institution should utilize standardized and recognized entrance requirements.

STRONGLY AGREE
 AGREE
 UNDECIDED
 DISAGREE
 STRONGLY DISAGREE

FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL
 DOCTORATE DEGREE AT THIS
 INSTITUTION, I FEEL:

-
- | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 34. . . .the granting institution should utilize age limits on degree candidacy. |
| | | | | | 35. . . .the granting institution should require at least fifty per cent of the course requirements taken at that institution. |
| | | | | | 36. . . .the granting institution should require at least two years equivalent study beyond an earned masters degree. |
| | | | | | 37. . . .the granting institution may utilize advanced placement with credit for previous educational experience and/or accomplishment in the field of study. |
| | | | | | 38. . . .the granting institution require a minimum of at least three years of study beyond the granting of the bachelors degree. |
| | | | | | 39. . . .the granting institution should require the traditional one year of residence on campus. |
| | | | | | 40. . . .the granting institution may utilize a summer residency in lieu of the traditional one year residence period. |
| | | | | | 41. . . .the granting institution need not require a residency period. |

PART D

Questions 42-49 deal with your acceptance of the doctoral program as described. Please respond as to how you would react to a graduate of these programs for a professional position in your institution.

"A" University doctoral programs are available in general education, educational counseling and higher education. The students are required five weeks in residence in the area of the University, where they attend class from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. five days a week. Six different courses are taken during this session for which the students earn 12 semester hours of credit. During the school year candidates register for 14 semester hours of Dissertation/Project Guidance. The dissertation is written in or near the candidate's home town under a field advisor who has been approved in advance by the University. If the dissertation is accepted the candidate returns to the University the following summer to defend an abstract of it before a group of his fellow students and one adjunct faculty member. This fulfills all of the degree requirements. "A" University is currently chartered by the state as a profit making institution and has no form of accreditation status at present.

42. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a new employee.
43. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a present employee.

"B" University doctoral programs are available in public school administration and higher education. Although the program is external, "B" University students are required to take the same courses and meet the same admission and candidacy requirements as most traditional programs. Courses are offered on Saturday and evenings throughout the state and there is no residency period or age limits (candidate or course age) imposed. The traditional dissertation or an acceptable doctoral project is required with the candidate defending both at the proposal and completion stage. "B" University is a state supported and regionally accredited institution offering internal doctoral programs also.

44. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a new employee.
45. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a present employee.

"C" University doctoral programs are available in educational leadership and community college teaching. The students attending "C" University are enrolled in regional clusters of 25 to 32 students across the nation. The students, most of whom are school administrators or community college teachers meet once a month in seminars to work on their practicums and to participate in discussions held by "National lecturers" of considerable eminence who are flown in from their home campuses for the day. The students are responsible for the mastering of eight fields of competence and substantive examinations are required. Students are required to attend "C" University campus for two brief summer institutes and are required to write and defend a major research paper. "C" University is a private non-profit graduate level institution holding "candidate status" from its regional accreditation agency.

46. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a new employee.
47. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a present employee.

"D" University doctoral programs are available in almost any field. The students are required to submit their resumes and transcripts for university evaluation and a mutually agreed upon program is designed. Minimum requirements for all doctoral degree candidates include an "extensive" research paper in the candidate's area of specialty and an "acceptable" dissertation, project or thesis. Although candidates are not required to come to the "D" University offices, visits during the final stages of the program are encouraged as well as the personal receipt of the degree if at all possible. "D" University is authorized to grant degrees under state law and is currently a profit making institution. "D" University is currently considering its reorganization to non-profit status and the eventual seeking of regional accreditation status.

48. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a new employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a new employee.
49. Please respond to one of the following:
- () Little or no reservations--acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Some reservations but most likely would be acceptable at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Undecided concerning this degree's acceptability at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Many reservations concerning this degree--may not be accepted at this institution for a present employee.
 - () Total reservation--unacceptable at this institution for a present employee.

APPENDIX F

DOCTORAL PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS AS CLASSIFIED BY THE PANEL OF JUDGES USED IN THE STUDY

Traditional Characteristics:

1. . . .the granting institution should have achieved full regional accreditation as a minimum requirement.
2. . . .the granting institution should issue the traditional Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education. (research oriented)
3. . . .the granting institution should be established and recognized for its traditional programs.
4. . . .the granting institution should be associated with known institutions of higher education.
5. . . .the granting institution should utilize formal written and oral examinations prior to candidacy. (all but dissertation)
6. . . .the granting institution should use the traditional semester or quarter time-frame.
7. . . .the granting institution should be a non-profit educational institution.
8. . . .the granting institution should be involved in undergraduate as well as graduate studies.
9. . . .the granting institution should use the traditional grading system.
10. . . .the granting institution should maintain and utilize a traditional campus.
11. . . .the granting institution should offer the majority of its courses on a home campus.
12. . . .the granting institution should serve a regional rather than a national need for graduate study.

13. . . .the granting institution should utilize standardized and recognized entrance requirements.
14. . . .the granting institution should utilize age limits on degree candidacy.
15. . . .the granting institution should require at least fifty per cent of the course requirements taken at that institution.
16. . . .the granting institution should require at least two years equivalent study beyond an earned masters degree.
17. . . .the granting institution should require a minimum of at least three years of study beyond the granting of the bachelors degree.
18. . . .the granting institution should require the traditional one year of residence on campus.

Non-Traditional Characteristics:

1. . . .the granting institution may issue the Doctor of Arts or other new doctoral degrees. (teaching rather than research oriented)
2. . . .the granting institution should have announced future plans concerning achievement of regional accreditation as a minimum requirement.
3. . . .the granting institution may utilize the internship in lieu of required course work.
4. . . .the granting institution may utilize a high percentage of part-time faculty.
5. . . .the granting institution may utilize a "credit," "no credit" grading system.
6. . . .the granting institution may utilize an open time-frame for completion of its courses and requirements.
7. . . .the granting institution may utilize doctoral projects and theses in lieu of the traditional doctoral dissertation.

8. . . .the granting institution may utilize highly individualized student developed courses of study.
9. . . .the granting institution may utilize advanced placement with credit for previous educational experience and/or accomplishment in the field of study.
10. . . .the granting institution may utilize a summer residency in lieu of the traditional one year residence period.
11. . . .the granting institution need not require a residency period.

APPENDIX G

SUGGESTED POLICY REGULATING ACCEPTANCE OF COLLEGE CREDITS AND DEGREES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT OR PROMOTION

In recent years, there has been rapid growth of so-called non-traditional institutions in the United States and the development of external degrees within traditional colleges. Some of these institutions have regional accreditation while others do not. A few of the non-traditional programs have undergone close scrutiny by accrediting agencies and have been found to be of acceptable quality. Others are of marginal quality, and some have proven to be totally without merit.

For the protection of its own integrity, but more important for the protection of its faculty, the (institution or system) must make qualitative judgment regarding those credits or degrees to be recognized for initial appointment or promotion.

In order for college credits or degrees earned to be counted toward initial appointment or promotion at (institution or system), these credits or degrees must have been earned from a collegiate institution which has received accreditation from one of the following accrediting agencies: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, North Central

Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools or Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Degrees or college credits from recognized foreign institutions may be considered for initial appointment or promotion in rank, but must have prior approval in writing by the (institution or system).

This policy is not intended to preclude the consideration of certain non-traditional college credit equivalency activities for initial appointment or promotion as outlined in the (policies and procedures manual); however, due to the wide variety of programs and institutions now offering external doctoral degrees, (institution or system) intends to thoroughly investigate all non-traditional degrees prior to the acceptance of such a degree. It is further (suggested and/or required) that any current employee seek prior consultation from this administration before embarking in any graduate program of a "non-traditional" nature or seek a graduate degree from an institution of a "non-traditional" nature.

APPENDIX H

TABLE XXXVI

BREAKDOWN OF DATA ON RESPONDENTS AND INSTITUTIONS
OBTAINED FOR THE STUDY N = 348*

Item	Variable	Percent	Number of Observations
1	School superintendents	71.55	249
	Community/junior college presidents	12.36	43
	Baccalaureate granting college and university presidents	16.20	56
2	Public	86.21	300
	Private	13.51	47
3	Bachelors	2.87	10
	Masters	48.56	169
	Doctorate	43.39	151
	Other	4.31	15
4	External Degree	8.91	31
	Traditional Degree	87.64	305
5	1-100 Staff	26.72	93
	101-500 Staff	50.29	175
	501-1,000 Staff	14.66	51
	Over 1,000 Staff	7.76	27
6	Insufficient data collected to tabulate		

*Totals do not necessarily reach total N due to data omissions and double marking by respondents

TABLE XXXVII
 SUMMARY DATA OF QUESTIONS 7-49 OBTAINED
 FROM RESPONDENTS IN STUDY

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Observations
7	3.5043	1.0434	347
8	3.5751	1.0194	346
9	3.6220	1.1791	344
10	3.6988	1.1487	342
11	4.5000	0.6277	336
12	3.8528	0.8743	333
13	3.8811	1.0468	328
14	3.0480	1.2114	333
15	3.1906	1.2461	320
16	3.6776	1.0849	335
17	3.7035	0.8864	334
18	3.0209	0.9522	335
19	3.8108	0.8233	333
20	3.8053	0.8909	334
21	2.3503	0.7941	334
22	2.6467	1.0459	334
23	3.8263	1.0280	334
24	3.4196	0.9801	336
25	3.4238	0.9505	335
26	2.8328	0.9519	335
27	3.0598	1.0409	334
28	3.7492	0.7481	335
29	2.9253	1.0766	335
30	3.6765	0.9189	337
31	3.0658	0.8138	334
32	3.7507	0.7421	337
33	3.0534	1.1611	337
34	2.0746	0.7116	335
35	2.9434	1.1169	336
36	3.9404	0.7895	336
37	3.7611	0.7794	335
38	3.6994	0.8854	336
39	2.5625	1.0716	336
40	3.6447	0.9457	335
41	2.8842	1.0890	337
42	2.3208	1.1373	332
43	2.5559	1.1854	331
44	4.2199	0.9407	332
45	4.3384	0.9311	331
46	3.5516	1.1400	330
47	3.7842	1.1682	329
48	2.5576	1.1739	330
49	2.6870	1.2355	329

TABLE XXXVIII
RAW DATA OBTAINED FROM RESPONDENTS ON QUESTIONS 7-41

Question	Sample*	Blank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7	1	..	30	120	67	18	14
	2	1	15	14	6	5	2
	3	..	4	19	16	13	4
8	1	1	37	118	62	20	11
	2	1	14	18	5	5	..
	3	..	4	20	16	12	4
9	1	2	57	109	34	26	21
	2	1	14	18	5	1	4
	3	1	6	25	13	7	4
10	1	4	61	109	30	23	22
	2	1	14	22	3	2	1
	3	1	7	26	13	7	1
11	1	3	136	99	9	2	..
	2	2	17	20	2	2	..
	3	7	35	13	1
12	1	3	34	166	23	13	10
	2	2	17	20	2	2	..
	3	9	10	25	9	2	1
13	1	6	56	157	10	12	8
	2	4	20	11	2	6	..
	3	10	11	6	12	9	8

TABLE XXXVIII--Continued

Question	Sample*	Blank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
14	1	5	46	49	29	116	4
	2	3	5	3	6	22	4
	3	7	5	21	11	9	3
15	1	10	47	52	74	56	10
	2	6	4	5	3	18	7
	3	12	13	10	3	10	8
16	1	4	57	128	28	18	14
	2	2	6	22	6	4	3
	3	7	1	22	15	5	6
17	1	5	37	114	76	14	3
	2	2	10	6	20	5	..
	3	7	15	22	6	6	..
18	1	3	6	56	144	26	14
	2	2	2	27	5	4	3
	3	8	1	12	9	10	16
19	1	4	39	135	64	5	2
	2	2	9	11	18	2	1
	3	9	14	21	5	6	1
20	1	4	43	129	65	7	1
	2	2	8	13	4	14	2
	3	8	20	16	9	2	1

TABLE XXXVIII--Continued

Question	Sample*	Blank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21	1	3	4	6	109	114	13
	2	2	..	3	5	15	18
	3	9	..	1	16	16	14
22	1	4	14	43	45	139	4
	2	2	1	4	7	12	17
	3	8	5	11	14	13	5
23	1	4	68	108	41	25	3
	2	2	10	9	18	3	1
	3	8	19	13	7	6	3
24	1	3	18	154	38	24	12
	2	2	1	11	24	4	1
	3	7	2	13	16	11	7
25	1	4	41	67	123	13	1
	2	2	5	8	6	21	1
	3	7	8	11	18	10	2
26	1	3	10	34	100	96	6
	2	2	2	7	9	17	6
	3	8	7	16	13	10	2
27	1	4	17	62	83	78	5
	2	2	4	8	5	22	2
	3	8	10	17	10	7	4

TABLE XXXVIII--Continued

Question	Sample*	Blank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28	1	2	10	200	14	18	5
	2	3	3	32	3	2	..
	3	8	6	18	18	5	1
29	1	2	14	74	27	131	1
	2	3	1	8	5	23	3
	3	8	11	17	7	12	1
30	1	2	12	182	19	27	7
	2	2	16	18	3	3	1
	3	7	4	24	12	4	5
31	1	3	11	56	139	37	3
	2	2	..	11	10	17	3
	3	9	1	11	23	10	2
32	1	2	17	187	23	18	2
	2	2	5	30	3	..	1
	3	7	2	22	15	10	..
33	1	2	20	77	26	120	4
	2	2	4	9	3	19	6
	3	7	16	19	7	6	1
34	1	3	1	10	26	179	30
	2	2	..	2	5	23	11
	3	8	1	1	16	17	13

TABLE XXXVIII--Continued

Question	Sample*	Blank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
35	1	2	19	67	31	123	7
	2	2	3	11	2	21	4
	3	8	8	20	10	9	1
36	1	3	39	160	29	18	..
	2	2	11	23	5	2	..
	3	7	20	18	6	5	..
37	1	2	22	183	26	11	5
	2	2	5	26	7	3	..
	3	9	2	22	16	4	3
38	1	3	24	165	38	18	1
	2	2	6	12	4	17	2
	3	7	15	16	11	7	..
39	1	2	10	37	38	144	18
	2	2	..	5	2	19	15
	3	8	11	13	9	15	..
40	1	4	29	158	29	22	7
	2	2	10	24	1	6	..
	3	7	..	17	17	11	4

TABLE XXXVIII--Continued

Question	Sample*	Blank	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
41	1	2	13	56	104	49	25
	2	2	7	14	9	8	3
	3	7	..	10	7	18	14

*1 = school superintendents
 2 = junior/community college presidents
 3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

TABLE XXXIX
 RAW DATA OBTAINED FROM RESPONDENTS ON QUESTIONS 42-49

Question	Sample*	Blank	No Reservations	Some Reservation	Undecided	Many Reservations	Total Reservation
42	1	5	16	27	69	81	51
	2	3	3	1	9	11	16
	3	8	..	1	5	17	25
43	1	6	21	43	71	66	42
	2	3	3	1	13	10	13
	3	8	..	2	9	19	18
44	1	5	120	88	22	12	2
	2	3	28	9	3
	3	8	10	20	9	6	3
45	1	6	144	67	18	11	3
	2	3	31	6	3
	3	8	12	22	7	5	2
46	1	6	54	106	46	26	11
	2	3	8	22	7	2	1
	3	9	2	11	13	9	12
47	1	7	91	83	37	22	9
	2	3	11	23	3	2	1
	3	9	3	14	11	10	9
48	1	6	19	39	88	58	39
	2	3	3	2	10	14	12
	3	9	1	3	5	15	23

TABLE XXXIX--Continued

Question	Sample*	Blank	No Reservations	Some Reservation	Undecided	Many Reservations	Total Reservation
49	1	7	23	58	71	50	40
	2	3	3	3	10	14	10
	3	9	1	3	6	17	20

*1 = school superintendents
 2 = junior/community college presidents
 3 = baccalaureate granting college and university presidents

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Berleson, Bernard, Graduate Education in the United States, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Commission on Non-Traditional Study, Diversity by Design, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1973.
- Eells, Walter, Degrees in Higher Education, Washington, D. C., The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.
- Ferguson, George, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Fox, David, The Research Process in Education, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Houle, Cyril, The External Degree, San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1973.
- Oppenheim, Abraham, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, New York, Basic Books, 1966.
- Porter, Lee, Degrees for Sale, New York, Arco Publishing Company, 1972.
- Roscoe, John, Fundamental Statistics, Dallas, Texas, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Shaw, Marvin and Jack Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Summers, Gene, editor, Attitude Measurement, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1970.
- The College Blue Book, "Accreditation and Professional Planning," Los Angeles, California, College Planning Programs, Ltd., III(1968), 27.

Articles

- Arnstein, George, Ph.D., "Anyone?" American Education, X(July, 1974), 6-10.
- Bent, Harvey E., "The Meaning of the PHD Degree," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII(January, 1962), 13-19.
- Bollough, Vern L., "Ph.D. From Where," The Nation, CXCII(September 24, 1960), 180-191.
- Crider, Blake, "College Degrees by Correspondence," School and Society, LXIII(November, 1940), 425-438.
- Dear, E. C., "Doctor of Arts Graduate in Physical Education," Contemporary Education, XLV(February, 1974), 155-156.
- Dressel, Paul, "Graduate Programs with Off-Campus Learning," Journal of Higher Education, XLIII(July, 1972), 525-530.
- Edwards, A. L. and F. P. Kilpatrick, "The Scale Discrimination Method for Measuring Social Attitudes," American Psychologist, II(October, 1947), 332.
- Fagan, Edward, "Doctorate in English Education--Who Needs It?" English Education, V(May, 1974), 159-164.
- Ferber, Robert, "The Administration of the Ph.D. Degrees," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII(October, 1960), 389-391.
- Gephart, William J., Gary Saresky, and David Bost, "How Potential Employers Value Components of Traditional and External Doctorates," Phi Delta Kappan, LVI(February, 1975), 406-408.
- Hartsell, Charles W. and B. F. Farrar, "How Well Do You Know Your Home Study Student," Adult Leadership, XV(May, 1966), 9, 13.
- Meacham, Esther, "What is a Ph.D.," Journal of Home Economics, LV(May, 1963), 360.
- Mitchell, Donald, "Let's Get the Record Straight: A Case of Nova University's External Doctorate in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LV(June, 1963), 370-375.

Morland, Richard, "The External Doctorate in Education: Blessing or Blasphemy?" Phi Delta Kappan, LV (November, 1973), 163-168.

Pifer, A., "Is It Time for an External Degree?" College Board Review, LXXVIII(Winter, 1970-71), 5-10.

Tenner, Edward, "Don't Call Me Doktor!" Chronicle of Higher Education, X(March 31, 1975), 32.

Whaley, W. Gordon, "American Academic Degrees," The Education Record, XLVII(Fall, 1966), 525-537.

Publications of Learned Organizations

American Council on Higher Education, Accredited Institutions of Higher Education, Washington, D. C., American Council on Higher Education, 1974-1975.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Proceedings, 79th Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, December, 1974.

Public Documents

Public Law 92-318, Educational Amendment of 1972 to the Higher Education Act of 1965, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1972.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 11246, Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office.

Unpublished Materials

Bridgeport University, "Modmap" (Modular Multiple Alternatives Program), Program Description 1973-1974, Bridgeport, Connecticut, September, 1973.

California Western University, "Printed Materials," Santa Ana, California, 1975.

Fielding Institute, "Bulletin," Santa Barbara, California, 1975.

Laurence University, "Bulletin," Santa Barbara, California, 1973.

Nova University, "Bulletin," Fort Lauderdale, Florida,
1973.

Western Colorado University, "Bulletin," Grand Junction,
Colorado, 1973.

Newspapers

Boroff, David, "American Fetish--The College Degree,"
New York Times Magazine, February 14, 1960, p. 11.

Fort Worth Star Telegram, Parade Magazine, March 2, 1975.

Horvat, John, "Educator Sees Teacher Shortage," Fort Worth
Star Telegram, May 2, 1975.

Wall Street Journal, "No College Degree," Advertisement by
California Western University, February, 1975.