

Order Number 9417556

**A determination of the status of graduates of the Doctor of
Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State
University**

Moore, Jessica Elaine, D.A.

Middle Tennessee State University, 1993

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A Determination of the Status of Graduates of the
Doctor of Arts Degree in Physical Education at
Middle Tennessee State University

Jessica Elaine Moore

A dissertation presented to the
Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Arts
in Physical Education

December 1993

A Determination of the Status of Graduates of the
Doctor of Arts Degree in Physical Education at
Middle Tennessee State University

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Richard E. La Lance
Major Professor

PETER H. Cunningham
Committee Member

Bob Womack
Committee Member

Martha H. Whaley
Head of the Department of Health, Physical Education,
Recreation, and Safety

Mary Martin
Dean of the Graduate College

ABSTRACT

A Determination of the Status of Graduates of the Doctor of Arts Degree in Physical Education at Middle Tennessee State University

Jessica Elaine Moore

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University. One hundred and fifteen graduates of the doctoral program were surveyed through the use of a questionnaire constructed by the investigator. A 10-member panel of experts from the graduate faculty in the Department of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Safety at Middle Tennessee State University validated the survey. Ninety-four graduates of the Doctor of Arts program responded, representing a response of 82 percent.

The study was divided into three sections: (1) characteristics of the population, (2) information concerning doctoral preparation, and (3) career and professional information. Frequency of responses to the survey questions was analyzed and reported in terms of percentages.

The findings from the investigation revealed that the majority of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University were

Jessica Elaine Moore

currently employed in teaching positions at small colleges and universities--positions that were originally intended for graduates of this program. Additionally, most of the graduates expressed satisfaction with the Doctor of Arts degree and would recommend it to those who intend to pursue a career in college or university teaching. Conclusions and recommendations were made based on information acquired from the administration of this survey.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator would like to acknowledge and express sincere gratitude to the following individuals and institutions for making possible the writing of this dissertation and the completion of this degree:

1. The members of my committee: Dr. Richard E. LaLance, for graciousness in agreeing to serve as major professor; Dr. Peter H. Cunningham, for assistance and suggestions in the construction of the survey instrument and the treatment of data; and Dr. Bob Womack, for guidance and support during the completion of this project;

2. The members of the graduate faculty of Middle Tennessee State University for serving as role models and assisting in the development of the survey instrument used in this study: Dr. Guy D. Penny, Dr. Glen P. Reeder, Dr. Ralph B. Ballou, Dr. A. H. Solomon, Dr. Martha H. Whaley, Dr. Katherine Strobel, Dr. Jon L. MacBeth, Dr. Glenn A. Miller, and Dr. Powell D. McClellan;

3. Dr. Jack D. Arters, special thanks for being concerned about students in and out of the classroom and for being a wonderful example of a motivating teacher;

4. Paul, Diane, and Paulina Temple and members of the Three Swallows Foundation for providing financial assistance during two years of study;

5. Faculty, staff, and administration of Crowley's Ridge Academy, Crowley's Ridge College, and Harding University for their timeless labors and for providing a Christian atmosphere during the majority of my formal educational experience (special thanks to Mrs. Joy Gatlin, Dr. Mike Pruitt, Mrs. Kay Gowen, Mrs. Barbara Barnes, Mrs. Kathryn Campbell, and Mr. Phil Watkins for guiding my footsteps in my early impressionable years);

6. Mrs. Judy Clayton for assistance in typing this project; and

7. Finally, to my family--sisters, Hester and Marilee; nieces, Mari Katelyn and Jacy Olivia Jennings; and parents, E. J. and Metta Dean Moore, for the sacrifices they have made and the encouragement, support, and love they have given.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	vi
List of Appendices	ix
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Significance of the Study	4
Delimitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	6
Questions to be Answered	7
2. Review of the Related Literature	8
3. Methods and Procedures	20
Description of Subjects	20
Description of the Questionnaire	21
Treatment of Data	22
4. Results and Discussion	23
Characteristics of the Population	24
Doctoral Preparation	26
Career and Professional Information	32
5. Summary, Conclusions, and	
Recommendations	51
Summary	51

	Page
Conclusions	51
Characteristics of the Population . .	51
Doctoral Preparation	52
Career and Professional	
Information	54
Recommendations	59
APPENDICES	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Gender	24
2. Age	24
3. Size of Class Enrollment	25
4. Year of Doctor of Arts Graduation	26
5. State of Residence Upon Initial Enrollment in the Doctor of Arts Program	27
6. Middle Tennessee State University Was First Choice for Doctoral Degree	28
7. Enrollment in Other Doctoral Programs Before Enrollment in the Doctor of Arts Program	29
8. Enrollment in Another Graduate Degree Program Since Completion of Doctor of Arts Degree	29
9. Importance of Reasons for Decision to Pursue a Doctoral Degree	30
10. Importance of Elements in Decision to Pursue the Doctor of Arts Degree	32
11. Employment Immediately Before Pursuing the Doctor of Arts Degree	33
12. Employment Position Immediately Before Beginning the Doctor of Arts Degree Program	34
13. Current Employment	34
14. Current Employment Position	35
15. Teaching Experience Before Enrolling in the Doctor of Arts Program	36

	Page
16. Years of Teaching Experience Before Beginning the Doctor of Arts Degree . .	36
17. Teaching Experience Since Completion of the Doctor of Arts Degree	37
18. Years of Teaching Experience Since Completion of the Doctor of Arts Degree	38
19. State of Current Employment	39
20. Involvement in Work Load Responsibilities in Past Five Years for Those Teaching in Higher Education	40
21. Time Involved in Fulfilling Work Load Responsibilities in Last Five Years for Those Teaching in Higher Education	40
22. Returned to a Previously Held Position Upon Doctor of Arts Completion	41
23. Number of Times Graduates Had Changed Jobs Since Doctor of Arts Completion . .	42
24. Average Change in Salary When Comparing Salary Immediately Before Beginning the Doctor of Arts Program and Salary after Doctor of Arts Completion	43
25. 1992 Salary of Graduates	44
26. Professional Membership of Doctor of Arts Graduates	44
27. Professional Accomplishments Since Completion of the Doctor of Arts Degree	45
28. Graduates Who Have Seriously Considered a Career Change Since Completion of the Doctor of Arts Degree	46
29. Position Graduates Would Like to Spend the Majority of Working Time in Before Retirement	47

	Page
30. Student Enrollment at Institution of Current Employment	47
31. Recognition of Doctor of Arts Equality with Other Terminal Degrees in Terms of Promotion, Salary, and Tenure by Employer	48
32. Understanding and Appreciation of Unique Features of Doctor of Arts Degree by Colleagues and Administrators	49
33. Questions Pertaining to the Doctor of Arts Degree	50

APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. SURVEY OF MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY'S DOCTOR OF ARTS GRADUATES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION	62
B. PILOT STUDY COVER LETTER	67
C. PILOT SURVEY COVER LETTER	69
D. FOLLOW-UP SURVEY COVER LETTER	72

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

At Middle Tennessee State University in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, the Doctor of Arts degree is offered in chemistry, economics, English, history, and physical education. Since the inception of the program in the summer of 1970, the College of Graduate Studies of the university has conferred Doctor of Arts degrees upon 226 graduates, with 120 of those being in the field of physical education. No attempt previously has been made to follow the careers of these physical education graduates.

The Doctor of Arts degree was created as an alternative to the Doctor of Philosophy and as an answer to numerous complaints regarding the dismal state of preparation for college and university teaching (Carmichael, 1961; Jessup, 1944; Lindauer, 1978). It was developed to enable educators in institutions of higher learning to increase knowledge in their individual disciplines, to become proficient in instructional method and design, and to carry out research in the problems of communicating in the area of specialization (Lipson, 1981).

The Doctor of Arts degree was initiated at Carnegie-Mellon University in 1967, and the first four degrees were conferred in 1969 (Dressel, 1982). The degree gained impetus in 1970 when it received recommendation from the

Council of Graduate Schools in the United States and financial assistance, in the form of numerous grants to schools initiating the program, from the Carnegie Corporation (Dressel, 1982). Twenty-five other schools developed Doctor of Arts degree programs after that time (Hansen & Rhodes, 1982).

The latest published studies show 17 institutions of higher education offer the Doctor of Arts degree: Ball State University, Idaho State University, Illinois State University, Middle Tennessee State University, and Washington State University; George Mason University, Lehigh University, New York University, Nova University, and Syracuse University; SUNY-Albany and SUNY-Stony Brook; and University of Miami-Coral Gables, University of Michigan, University of Mississippi, University of North Dakota, and University of Northern Colorado. Subjects offered in Doctor of Arts programs are as follows: art, biological science, chemistry, civil engineering, community college teaching, dance, economics, education, English, foreign languages, history, humanistic studies, information science, literature, mathematics, music, physical education, and political science (Koriath & Merrion, 1989). Though New York University in Manhattan offered a Doctor of Arts degree in dance, Middle Tennessee State University has been the only school to offer the Doctor of Arts degree in physical

education (B. S. Pulling, personal communication, April 22, 1993).

The Tennessee Board of Regents permitted the College of Graduate Studies at Middle Tennessee State University to initiate the Doctor of Arts degree in 1970 (Martin, 1991). State law prohibited the conferring of a more traditional doctoral degree in hopes of promoting racial balance in Tennessee's colleges and universities. Since 1970, 116 graduates have been awarded Doctor of Arts degrees in English, history, economics, and chemistry; and 120 graduates have been awarded the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education. The 1971 Middle Tennessee State University Bulletin (Middle Tennessee State University, 1971) described the purpose of the Doctor of Arts degree as "to train senior college, community college, and junior college teacher/scholars" (p. 3).

When the Doctor of Arts degree was first established, many educators expressed fears that the degree was inferior to the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Dear, 1977; Erickson, 1974; Thompson, 1978). Questions were raised over the marketability of the degree graduates (Baldwin, 1974; Koenker, 1974; Strassenburg, 1971). Erickson (1974) maintained that Doctor of Arts degree graduates had little hope of employment in most institutions of higher education. Early studies of Doctor of Arts degree programs showed

little or no problem in the placement of graduates (Dressel & Thompson, 1978; Thompson, 1978).

This researcher proposed to investigate and determine the status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University. The researcher also proposed to examine and determine if these degree graduates in physical education are using the degree for the purpose for which it was designed. Additionally, the researcher proposed to determine if the pool of Doctor of Arts candidates has changed in the 17 years since the first Doctor of Arts degree in physical education was conferred. Data were obtained through the use of a questionnaire constructed by the investigator.

Statement of the Problem

The investigator proposed a study to determine the status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University.

Significance of the Study

Research investigating the current status of holders of the Doctor of Arts degree is not adequate. A follow-up study of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University has never been attempted.

This study provides information pertaining to the status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University. The results

of this research may be of benefit to administrators in higher education as they contemplate the addition of a new terminal degree to their graduate schools. It also may aid physical education instructors of undergraduate students in counseling their students about future educational plans. This study may suggest potential employment areas and possible future salary ranges for prospective Doctor of Arts students. Finally, the data obtained from this study may be used by admissions officers to attract potential students through providing evidence of successful employment of these graduates.

The investigator did not attempt to suggest an exhaustive listing of possible employment positions or salary scales for potential Doctor of Arts recipients. The study did not seek to evaluate Middle Tennessee State University's Physical Education Department or the Doctor of Arts program on the basis of the status of graduates or to make a correlation between the conferment of the Doctor of Arts degree with job potential and/or position.

The investigation identifies employment positions that have been held by holders of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education. It provides a salary range of Doctor of Arts degree graduates and will assist administrators in gaining information relating to the personal characteristics and demographics of former students. The research provides graduate faculty with knowledge about the professional

growth of former students. It may aid the Middle Tennessee State University Admissions and Records Office with the recruitment of future doctoral students and may provide motivation to those already enrolled.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was limited to the completed and returned questionnaires of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree program in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University between the years 1970 and 1992. Status of the graduates was determined by a survey instrument constructed by the investigator.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms and definitions were used:

Doctor of Arts degree (D.A.)--a doctoral program requiring at least two years of graduate study and designed to prepare students for careers as college teachers.

Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)--a doctoral program originally designed for public school administrators, but gradually extended to include a number of specialties in education.

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)--a doctoral program requiring between three and seven years of graduate study and designed to prepare students for careers as active scholars and researchers.

Graduate--an individual who has graduated from Middle Tennessee State University with a Doctor of Arts degree in physical education.

Respondent--a recipient of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University returning a usable questionnaire.

Status--a determination of the state of, position of, standing of, rank of, or situation of.

Usable questionnaire--a questionnaire that has applicable questions completed.

Questions to be Answered

Questions to be answered in this study include:

1. What are the personal characteristics of the graduates?
2. What are and have been the nature and extent of the graduates' teaching positions?
3. What is and has been the type of employment of non-teaching graduates?
4. What is the present employment status of the graduates?
5. What has been the professional growth of the respondents since graduation?

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Related Literature

Graduate education in the United States has received criticism since its inception in the late nineteenth century. Modeled after the German philosophy of emphasizing research, America's graduate schools sought to attract the thousands of scholars who were traveling to Germany to receive additional education (Berelson, 1960). German graduate schools presented their professors as desirable models for their students and equated mastery of a subject with teaching effectiveness (Dressel & Thompson, 1974). America's graduate schools sought to emulate Germany's preoccupation with research and philosophy and designed their programs to train researchers, not teachers (Dunham, 1970; Hofstadter & Smith, 1961).

Germany developed its graduate system from patterns laid down by early educators prior to the thirteenth century in Paris and Bologna, sites of the first universities (Spurr, 1970). Students gathered around doctors of civil and canon law in Bologna; while in Paris, masters instructed their students in the arts (Haskins, 1923). The term master, and frequently the term professor, used at Paris and later at Oxford was synonymous with the term doctor used in Italy and Germany (Spurr, 1970).

Several schools were credited with the establishment of the Doctor of Philosophy degree in America. Johns Hopkins University opened its Graduate School in 1876, and many perceived this date as being the birth of American graduate education (Berelson, 1960). But research has shown a graduate program existed at Harvard University in 1872 (Morison, 1936). Additional research has placed a Doctor of Philosophy program at Yale University in 1860 (Spurr, 1970).

The establishment of graduate education in America was followed by conflicting ideas relating to the nature of the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Some educators, including Harper of University of Chicago and Hall of Clark University, advocated an adherence to the German school of thought--mainly a degree that was research-oriented. Others, including Gilman of Johns Hopkins University, White of Cornell University, and Tappan of University of Michigan, wanted to emphasize teaching methodology (cited in Berelson, 1960). The research advocates gradually spread their influence, and the Doctor of Philosophy degree stressing research achieved the status it currently enjoys.

From its beginning, the Doctor of Philosophy degree has been the principal target in the controversies regarding American graduate education. In 1907, efforts were made to establish a teaching doctorate, and renewed attempts occurred in the 1920s, 1930s, 1950s, and 1960s (Abbott, 1971; Cardozer, 1968; Erickson, 1974).

In a report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Jessup (1944) observed that the doctorate was a ritual and showed nothing about teaching ability. Some observers blamed the problems in higher education on the Doctor of Philosophy degree fixation with research and the lack of training graduates received about effective teaching techniques (Abramson, 1975; Berelson, 1960; Wise, 1967). Many educators believed participation in research automatically improved the quality of teaching, but studies showed little or no evidence of relationship between the two (Aleamoni & Yimer, 1973; Friedrich & Michalak, 1983).

Carmichael (1961) charged the graduate school with being the most inefficient division of the university. Blegen and Cooper (1950) made the observation that "the American college teacher is the only high level professional man in the American scene who enters upon a career with neither the prerequisite trial of competence nor experience in the use of the tool of his profession" (p. 123). Other scholars warned that educators were reluctant to accommodate change and showed no commitment to improvement (Eurich, 1964; Hefferlin, 1969; Rudolph, 1962). Kristol (1968) chided that "the university has been . . . the least inventive (or even adaptive) of our social institutions since the end of World War II" (p. 50).

In a survey of university graduates, it was determined that 46 percent of the former students thought the teaching skills of their instructors needed to be improved (Dressel & Thompson, 1974). Many researchers came to the conclusion that university teachers had failed their students by being torn between conducting research, publishing, and teaching (Bloom, 1987; Boyer, 1987). These efforts were outgrowths of problems associated with the Doctor of Philosophy degree and the ineffectiveness of college teachers.

While many educators maintained that the Doctor of Philosophy degree was to be the degree of choice on university campuses, a need was felt to provide an alternate doctorate to better prepare educators for the classroom. The Doctor of Education degree was created at Harvard University, in 1922, as a non-research degree for administrators and specialists (Berelson, 1960; Dressel & Delisle, 1972). The degree was intended to be similar to the Doctor of Philosophy degree, yet was under the control of the Education Department instead of the Graduate School (Spurr, 1970). Many administrators thought the degree was superfluous because of its similarity to the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Both degrees had similar admission requirements, years of attendance, minimum residency requirements, and amount of course work required (Anderson, 1983). But supporters of the Doctor of Education degree emphasized the differences between the degrees, primarily

that the Doctor of Philosophy was a more scholarly degree stressing research, while the Doctor of Education was a more professional degree stressing practice. In spite of the acceptance of the new degree, many educators maintained their negative attitudes toward graduate school and cited a lack of teaching skills.

Because of the ongoing discussion and controversy concerning graduate education in the United States, in 1972, the National Board on Graduate Education delineated three basic purposes of graduate education (Batsche, 1991). First, graduate schools were to administer and supervise the education and training of professionals. Second, they were to produce new knowledge. And third, they were to transmit and preserve knowledge. Few guidelines to accomplish these objectives were given, and each institute was allowed to emphasize one area over the other two, if desired, as long as all three areas were included in some manner during student doctoral work.

The Doctor of Arts degree grew out of a need for improved teacher training at the collegiate level. In 1935, the Mathematical Association of America proposed a teaching doctorate (Erickson, 1974). In 1946, a double doctorate plan--one for teachers and one for researchers--was advised (Berelson, 1960). In 1955 and in 1959, DeVane of Yale University advocated the need for a degree for teachers (cited in Axelrod, 1959; cited in Strothmann, 1955). In

1965, Bowers advanced the idea of a "learned but nonresearch degree, the Doctor of Arts" (p. 127), and the next year the California Junior College Faculty Association called for the establishment of a degree to train college teachers (Wortham, 1967). Other educators calling for a reform of the higher education system were Byrnes (1966), Hefferlin (1969), Ladd (1970), Dunham (1970), Corson (1975), and Jencks and Riesman (1977).

Heeding the advice of these educators, Carnegie-Mellon University inaugurated the first Doctor of Arts degree program in 1967 (Thompson, 1978). The new degree gained impetus in 1970 when it received the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. The Carnegie report found that the Doctor of Arts degree was not inferior to the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Spurr, 1970). The Carnegie report also identified the kind of school that should offer the Doctor of Arts degree: developing institutions with commitments to teaching with no, or modest, Ph.D. offerings (Rice, 1991).

The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States (1970) recommended the establishment of Doctor of Arts degree programs to prepare graduate students for a "lifetime of effective teaching at the college level" (p. 4). Other endorsements were bestowed upon the Doctor of Arts degree by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities,

the National Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Bureau of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Lindauer, 1978).

The Carnegie Foundation also approved grants to help schools in the planning and development of Doctor of Arts degree programs (Dressel, 1982; Dressel & Delisle, 1972). Institutions that benefited from the grants were the following: Ball State University, Idaho State University, Stephen F. Austin State University, and Washington State University; Brown University and Lehigh University; Claremont Graduate School; Dartmouth College; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; University of Michigan and University of Washington; and State University of New York at Albany.

In a study of the first 10 years of the Doctor of Arts degree's existence, Dressel and Thompson (1978) reported on the acceptance of the degree and on the rapid expansion in the number of universities offering it and the number of fields of study. In 1970, Koenker began a series of studies to determine the status of the degree in American universities. Koenker found 3 schools offering the Doctor of Arts degree in 1970, 7 schools in 1971, 16 schools in 1972, and 21 schools in 1973 (Koenker, 1974). By the end of 1977, 23 institutions offered the degree in 13 disciplines,

5 applied fields, and 4 foreign languages (Dressel & Thompson, 1978).

A 1982 study by Hansen and Rhodes (1982) placed the number of Doctor of Arts degree conferring schools at 26. Because of several factors, a number of schools have dropped their Doctor of Arts programs since the 1982 study. The most recent study completed on the status of Doctor of Arts degree was conducted by Wheeler and Nelson in 1988 and found 18 schools offering the Doctor of Arts degree in 15 areas (cited in Koriath & Merrion, 1989).

Educators have commended the Doctor of Arts degree program for a number of reasons. Gosman (1972) claimed the degree was a certification of teachers. Nichols (1975) indicated the degree was better suited to community college needs than was the Doctor of Philosophy or the Doctor of Education. Dear (1977) concluded that the degree helped bridge the gap between administrators and faculty. Steinberg (1978), Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at Carnegie-Mellon University, asserted that the purpose of the Doctor of Arts degree was to prepare educational leaders in a specific field of study. Lipson (1981) added that the degree was developed to enable educators in institutions of higher learning to increase knowledge in their individual disciplines, to become proficient in instructional method and design, and to carry out research in their area of specialization. The degree

lends itself to the specific need of part-time students, allowing them to continue with or return to full-time positions (Thompson, 1978).

Along with the positive aspects of the Doctor of Arts degree, negative comments also have been noted (R. L. Bowen, 1991). Some Doctor of Arts degree programs had been structured to require work equal to that of the Doctor of Philosophy, but without the prestige (Dressel & Faricy, 1972). Some Doctor of Arts instructors were holders of the Doctor of Philosophy degree and favored a more traditional doctoral program (Hansen & Rhodes, 1982; Lipson, 1981; Thompson, 1978). Some educators expressed belief that the Doctor of Arts degree lacked the status of the Doctor of Philosophy degree (Dear, 1977; Erickson, 1974; Hansen & Rhodes, 1982; Thompson, 1978). Other areas of concern for the program have been the following: too little supervision of the internship, lack of able leadership, and little integration of all components of the program (Dressel & Thompson, 1978; Thompson, 1978). Some educators and doctoral students have expressed concern about the future of the degree and employment possibilities of its graduates (Baldwin, 1974; Koenker, 1974; Strassenburg, 1971; Thompson, 1978). Erickson (1974) stated the most pessimistic view--"there is, to be blunt, little hope for the employment of the D.A." (p. 36).

Little has been published concerning the employment of or the status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree program. Price (1971) predicted a favorable acceptance of the program. A survey of 224 colleges and universities found that while the Doctor of Philosophy degree was still the preferred degree at public and state colleges and universities, 42.5 percent of the surveyed department heads considered the Doctor of Arts degree more desirable for undergraduate teaching (Chance & Youra, 1972). Koenker (1976) found 8 of 14 surveyed schools offering multiple doctorates reported the placement of graduates of Doctor of Arts degree programs was better than the placement of other doctoral degree graduates.

As of 1978, Dressel and Thompson noted that almost all Doctor of Arts graduates were employed. Ball State University surveyed 900 holders of the Doctor of Arts degree in 1980. Of those surveyed, 613 doctoral graduates in the fields of history, chemistry, mathematics, biology, economics, music, government, and physics returned completed surveys. Questions concerning present employment of the graduates revealed that 22 percent were teaching in two-year colleges, 39 percent in four-year colleges, 23 percent in universities, and 16 percent in secondary schools or in non-educational capacities (Hunt & Wheeler, 1981). Universities offering the Doctor of Arts degree were also surveyed in 1980. The majority of administrators completing

the survey believed the degree was viable and that few of the graduates of their programs had any struggle finding employment in their area of expertise (Hunt & Wheeler, 1981). Institutions offering the Doctor of Arts degree were surveyed again by Ball State University in 1988. At that time, only one program had experienced more difficulty in placing its graduates than other more traditional doctoral programs experienced (Wheeler & Nelson, 1989).

Illinois State University surveyed graduates from its Doctor of Arts program in the fields of English and history in 1988. Results of surveys returned from holders of a Doctor of Arts degree in English revealed 89 percent held jobs related to the doctoral program emphasis, 89 percent indicated that the program was useful to them in their jobs, and 100 percent viewed the program as helpful to their personal growth and would recommend the degree to prospective students (Batsche, 1991). History graduates of the Doctor of Arts program indicated similar career success and satisfaction with the degree.

The University of Illinois at Chicago reported all graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in chemistry were employed in teaching positions (Matthews, 1991). However, in a negative report, the University of North Dakota Department of History complained of problems in the attainment of teaching positions for graduates (Beringer, 1991).

The reasons for establishing the Doctor of Arts degree in the 1960s and the reasons for maintaining it in the 1990s remain the same (Pulling, 1991). Criticism of university faculty teaching practices still exists, as do projections of future faculty shortages (W. G. Bowen, 1981; W. G. Bowen & Sosa, 1989; House, 1991; Sykes, 1991). Because of its generality and efficiency, the Doctor of Arts degree seems to be a logical answer to these problems.

The review of the related literature reveals a need for current studies concerning the status of the Doctor of Arts degree. The literature offers a limited number of studies related to the placement of graduates. No studies trace the careers of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education. Thus, little is known about the placement, career development, or current status of Doctor of Arts graduates in physical education.

CHAPTER 3

Methods and Procedures

The methods and procedures used in this study are accurately discussed in this chapter, which features descriptions of the subjects, questionnaire, and treatment of data.

Description of Subjects

The subjects for this investigation were students who received the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University from 1970 through 1992. The investigator obtained from the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies at Middle Tennessee State University a list of 120 Doctor of Arts physical education graduates. The investigator then requested from the university Alumni Office the current addresses of those graduates. Additional addresses were obtained from members of the university physical education graduate faculty. Of the 120 graduates, 2 were deceased, and current addresses could not be located for 3.

During May of 1993, the 115 subjects were sent a letter requesting their participation in the study. A study instrument, along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope, also was included, along with instructions to complete and return the questionnaire within two weeks. A follow-up letter and questionnaire were sent two weeks after the

original mailing. Returned questionnaires were not accepted after two weeks following the second mailing.

Description of the Questionnaire

A questionnaire was the principal instrument used to gather data for this study. Based on information obtained from a review of related literature, the investigator constructed an instrument that was developed through a pilot study and consultation with Dr. Richard E. LaLance, Dr. Peter H. Cunningham, and Dr. Bob Womack, members of the investigator's doctoral committee. Ten members from the graduate faculty in the Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Safety Department at Middle Tennessee State University served as subjects for the pilot study and were asked to evaluate the instrument for clarity, readability, and relevance.

The instrument is divided into three parts: Part 1 is composed of six questions relating to personal characteristics of the graduates. Part 2 consists of six questions pertaining to the graduates' reasons for attending Middle Tennessee State University and the nature and extent of the graduates' educational experiences while at the university and afterward, if applicable. Part 3 contains 22 questions relative to past and present teaching and non-teaching employment of the graduates.

Treatment of Data

The statistical treatment for this descriptive study permitted the investigator to compute frequencies and means of answered questions. The percentage distribution of the frequencies was calculated separately and contrasted for respondents who are involved in higher education and those who are not and a combined total.

The responses consist of the following: (1) yes or no answers; (2) numerical choice values (5--strongly agree or SA, 4--agree or A, 3--neutral or N, 2--disagree or D, and 1--strongly disagree or SD); and (3) subjective responses supplied by the respondents. Appropriate tables relevant to responses are constructed, analyzed, and explained in Chapter 4. The findings of the research, along with conclusions and recommendations, can be found in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4

Results and Discussion

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the status of recipients of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education. The results for this study were obtained during the spring of 1993 by means of a survey developed by the investigator. One hundred and fifteen questionnaires were sent to Middle Tennessee State University alumni with a Doctor of Arts degree in physical education. The specific purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss analysis of the collected data.

The analysis was organized into the following categories: (1) characteristics of the population, (2) information concerning doctoral preparation, and (3) career and professional information. Data collected from the respondents were examined and presented according to the frequency of answers and in valid percentages rounded to the nearest tenth.

Of the 120 graduates of Middle Tennessee State University's doctoral program in physical education, 2 were deceased, and current addresses were not located for 3. Of the 115 questionnaires administered, 100 were returned, although only 94, or 82 percent, were included in the analysis. The six questionnaires that were not included were returned after the final acceptance date.

Additionally, four surveys in the original mailing were returned as undeliverable.

Characteristics of the Population

Of the 94 graduates who responded to the survey, 68 (72.3 percent) were male, and 26 (27.7 percent) were female (see Table 1). The mean age of respondents was 46.3 years, with the youngest being 29 years and the oldest being 69 years (see Table 2). The mean age of respondents at completion of the Doctor of Arts degree was 36.3 years, with the earliest completion age of 27 years and the latest completion age of 53 years.

Table 1

Gender

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Male	68	72.3
Female	26	27.7

Table 2

Age

	Range	Mean
Current age	29-69	46.3
Age at Doctor of Arts completion	27-53	36.3

When dividing entering classes into five-year divisions, analysis of the data indicated that the size of the entering classes was stable (see Table 3). The largest

Table 3
Size of Class Enrollment

	Frequency	Valid percentage
1970-1974	23	24.7
1975-1979	20	21.5
1980-1984	27	29.1
1985-1989	20	21.5
1990-1991	3	3.2

entering class occurred in 1980 when 10 students enrolled in the doctoral program. An analysis of the respondents' year of graduation from the doctoral program showed a slightly more varied occurrence. Of the respondents, 18 (19.3 percent) graduated in the five-year period of 1978-1982, and 26 (28.0 percent) graduated during the 1988-1992 division (see Table 4).

Sixteen states were indicated as being the respondents' state of residence when they began their degree work. The majority of graduates resided in the southeast, with 40 (42.6 percent) residing in Tennessee and 23 (24.5 percent)

Table 4
Year of Doctor of Arts Graduation

	Frequency	Valid percentage
1973-1977	25	26.9
1978-1982	18	19.3
1983-1987	24	25.8
1988-1992	26	28.0

residing in North Carolina when they enrolled in the doctoral program (see Table 5).

Doctoral Preparation

Middle Tennessee State University was the first choice among the doctoral-degree-granting institutions that were considered for 74 (78.7 percent) of the respondents (see Table 6). The reasons most often given for selecting Middle Tennessee State University as the first choice among doctoral-granting institutions were as follows: (1) the teaching emphasis of the Doctor of Arts program, (2) a desire to remain close to home, and (3) the convenience of the summer schedule to fulfill the residency requirement. Of the respondents for whom Middle Tennessee State University was not the first choice among doctoral-granting institutions, the most often given reasons for not selecting it were as follows: (1) wanting to attend a school closer

Table 5
State of Residence Upon Initial Enrollment
in the Doctor of Arts Program

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Alabama	1	1.1
Arkansas	1	1.1
California	1	1.1
Florida	7	7.4
Georgia	2	2.1
Kansas	1	1.1
Kentucky	4	4.3
Maryland	1	1.1
Michigan	1	1.1
Nebraska	1	1.1
North Carolina	23	24.5
New Jersey	4	4.3
Ohio	1	1.1
Tennessee	40	42.6
Virginia	5	5.3
Vermont	1	1.1

Table 6
Middle Tennessee State University Was
First Choice for Doctoral Degree

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Yes	74	78.7
No	20	21.3

to home and (2) an interest in a doctoral degree in another field or area.

Of the respondents, 13 (13.8 percent) indicated that they had been enrolled in a doctoral program at another university before entering the Doctor of Arts program (see Table 7). These respondents reported several reasons for transferring to the Doctor of Arts program at Middle Tennessee State University. Among these were the following: (1) a change in area of interest, (2) a depletion of financial resources, and (3) the attraction of the summer semester's residency option so respondents could maintain their full-time positions during the fall and spring.

Of the respondents, 4 (4.3 percent) had attempted another graduate degree since completing the Doctor of Arts degree (see Table 8). These respondents indicated a wish to attain knowledge in another field as the primary reason for attempting another graduate degree.

Table 7
Enrollment in Other Doctoral Programs Before
Enrollment in the Doctor of Arts Program

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Yes	13	13.8
No	81	86.2

Table 8
Enrollment in Another Graduate Degree Program
Since Completion of Doctor of Arts Degree

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Yes	4	4.3
No	89	95.7

Using a five-point Likert-type scale, graduates were asked to rate the importance to them of nine reasons for deciding to pursue a doctoral degree. The reasons for deciding to pursue a doctorate and the frequency were as follows: desire to become a better teacher, 88 (93.7 percent); desire to improve status, 84 (89.3 percent); attraction of higher salaries, 73 (77.7 percent); secure tenure/advancement, 67 (71.3 percent); genuine, intrinsic desire to study, 68 (72.4 percent); attraction of new kinds

of positions, 64 (68.1 percent); stimulation of university atmosphere, 61 (64.9 percent); influence and persuasion of other person(s), 52 (56.0 percent); and desire to improve research ability, 37 (39.8 percent). Table 9 shows the average importance score for each of the nine reasons for pursuit of the doctoral degree, with one equaling strongly disagree and five equaling strongly agree. Ranking of reasons by average score results in an identical order as when ranking by number of respondents indicating importance.

Table 9
Importance of Reasons for Decision to
Pursue a Doctoral Degree

	Likert scale (1-5)
Desire to become a better teacher	4.436
Desire to improve status	4.447
Attraction of higher salaries	4.117
Secure tenure/advancement	4.085
Genuine, intrinsic desire to study	3.979
Attraction of new kinds of positions	3.851
Stimulation of university atmosphere	3.830
Influence and persuasion of other persons	3.559
Desire to improve research ability	3.086

Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of 11 elements in the decision to pursue the Doctor of Arts degree at Middle Tennessee State University. The characteristics or the mission of the Doctor of Arts degree was considered important in the decision to attend Middle Tennessee State University by 80 respondents (85.1 percent). Of the respondents, 77 (81.9 percent) considered location to be important in the decision process. Convenience and residency requirements were important for 65 graduates (70.6 percent). Other elements that were determinants in the decision to enroll in the Doctor of Arts program and the number of students who considered them important are as follows: reputation of Physical Education Department, 57 (60.7 percent); availability of assistantships, 56 (60.3 percent); cost of tuition, 56 (59.6 percent); recommendation of a teacher/acquaintance, 55 (59.2 percent); reputation of institution, 55 (58.5 percent); admission requirements, 52 (55.3 percent); reputation of individual staff member(s), 41 (43.6 percent); and presence of a particular faculty member, 38 (40.4 percent). Table 10 shows the average importance score for each of the 11 reasons for pursuit of the Doctor of Arts degree, with one equaling strongly disagree and five equaling strongly agree. Ranking of reasons by average score results in a slightly different order as when ranking by number of respondents indicating importance.

Table 10
Importance of Elements in Decision to
Pursue the Doctor of Arts Degree

	Likert scale (1-5)
Characteristics of the Doctor of Arts degree	4.447
Location	4.277
Convenience (residency requirements)	4.141
Availability of assistantships	3.785
Cost of tuition	3.734
Reputation of Physical Education Department	3.681
Admission requirements	3.638
Recommendation of a teacher/acquaintance	3.581
Reputation of institution	3.574
Reputation of individual staff member(s)	3.372
Presence of a particular faculty member	3.309

Career and Professional Information

Of the respondents, 86 (92.5 percent) were employed by an educational institution immediately before enrolling in the doctoral program. Of the respondents, 67 (72.1 percent) were employed in institutions of higher education immediately before pursuing the Doctor of Arts degree, and 7 (7.5 percent) were employed in non-educational positions (see Table 11).

Table 11
Employment Immediately Before Pursuing
the Doctor of Arts Degree

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Higher education	67	72.1
Secondary education	13	14.0
Elementary education	6	6.5
Non-educational	7	7.5

Of those subjects employed in an educational capacity before enrolling in the Doctor of Arts degree program, 37 (41.6 percent) were employed as instructors, 28 (31.5 percent) as assistant professors, and 6 (6.7 percent) as associate professors (see Table 12). Administrative positions were held by 2 (2.2 percent) of the respondents, and 16 (18.0 percent) were employed in other positions, such as coaches, athletic trainers, and specialists.

Of the respondents, 70 (76.9 percent) were employed in institutions of higher education when they completed the survey instrument (see Table 13). Of the respondents, 7 (7.7 percent) were involved in secondary education; 3 (3.3 percent) were employed in elementary education; 10 (11.0 percent) were employed in non-educational positions; and 1 (1.1 percent) was not currently employed.

Table 12

Employment Position Immediately Before Beginning
the Doctor of Arts Degree Program

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Instructor	37	41.6
Assistant professor	28	31.5
Associate professor	6	6.7
Administrator	2	2.2
Other	16	18.0

Table 13

Current Employment

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Higher education	70	76.9
Secondary education	7	7.7
Elementary education	3	3.3
Non-educational	10	11.0
Not currently employed	1	1.1

Of those graduates employed at the time they completed the questionnaire, 21 (22.8 percent) held the position of assistant professor; 27 (29.3 percent) were employed as an associate professor; and 17 (18.5 percent) were professors (see Table 14). Administrative positions were held by 5 (5.4 percent) of the respondents, and 22 (23.9 percent) were employed in other positions.

Table 14
Current Employment Position

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Assistant professor	21	22.8
Associate professor	27	29.3
Professor	17	18.5
Administrator	5	5.4
Other (including non-academic)	22	23.9

Analysis of the data indicated 66 respondents (70.2 percent) had experience in teaching at a four-year college or university, and 12 respondents (12.8 percent) had experience teaching at a two-year college before enrolling in the Doctor of Arts degree program (see Table 15). Of the respondents, 2 (2.1 percent) had no teaching experience before enrolling in the program.

Table 15
Teaching Experience Before Enrolling in
the Doctor of Arts Program

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Four-year college/university	66	70.2
Two-year college	12	12.8
Secondary education	51	54.3
Elementary education	22	23.4
No teaching experience	2	2.1

Respondents reported a mean of 9.1 years of teaching experience before enrolling in the Doctor of Arts program (see Table 16). The mean years of teaching experience for

Table 16
Years of Teaching Experience Before Beginning
the Doctor of Arts Degree*

	Mean
Four-year college/university	6.6
Two-year college	4.1
Secondary education	5.2
Elementary education	5.0
Average teaching experience	9.1

*For all those who taught in these categories.

respondents who taught in four-year colleges and universities was 6.6 years and 4.1 years for those teaching in a two-year college.

Respondents stated that 68 (72.3 percent) had taught in a four-year institution and 16 (17.0 percent) had taught in a two-year college since completing the Doctor of Arts degree (see Table 17). Of the respondents, 4 (4.3 percent) reported no teaching experience after completion of the degree.

Table 17
Teaching Experience Since Completion of
the Doctor of Arts Degree

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Four-year college/university	68	72.3
Two-year college	16	17.0
Secondary education	11	11.7
Elementary education	8	8.5
No teaching experience	4	4.3

Respondents reported a mean of 13.3 years of teaching experience since completion of the Doctor of Arts degree (see Table 18). A mean of 8.6 years was reported for those who had four-year college or university teaching experience and 5.8 years for those teaching in a two-year college.

Table 18

Years of Teaching Experience Since Completion of
the Doctor of Arts Degree*

	Mean
Four-year college/university	8.6
Two-year college	5.8
Secondary education	9.0
Elementary education	3.9
Average teaching experience	13.3

*For all those who taught in these categories.

Doctor of Arts graduates declared current residence in 19 states. Tennessee led all states, with 34 (37.8 percent) graduates in residence, and North Carolina was the home of 17 graduates (18.9 percent) (see Table 19).

When subjects employed as teachers by colleges and universities were asked to determine the approximate amount of time they devoted to work load responsibilities, 67 respondents (100.0 percent) reported teaching as being part of their duties (see Table 20). Of the respondents, 37 graduates (55.2 percent) stated they spent some of their work time in service activities; 20 (29.9 percent) described research as part of their responsibilities; and 34 (50.7 percent) reported they spent some of their time in other responsibilities.

Table 19
State of Current Employment

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Alabama	3	3.3
Arkansas	2	2.2
Colorado	1	1.1
Florida	3	3.3
Georgia	6	6.7
Guam	1	1.1
Indiana	1	1.1
Kentucky	4	4.4
Maryland	2	2.2
Missouri	1	1.1
North Carolina	17	18.9
New Jersey	3	3.3
New Mexico	1	1.1
New York	1	1.1
Ohio	1	1.1
Pennsylvania	1	1.1
South Carolina	3	3.3
Tennessee	34	37.8
Virginia	5	5.6

Table 20

Involvement in Work Load Responsibilities in Past Five
Years for Those Teaching in Higher Education

	Frequency	Percent
Teaching	67	100.0
Service activities	37	55.2
Research	20	29.9
Other responsibilities	34	50.7

Subjects with teaching responsibilities reported spending 71.6 percent of their time in teaching (see Table 21). Those with service responsibilities indicated they spent 15.7 percent of their time involved in service activities. Subjects with research duties reported spending 14.0 percent of their time in research. Respondents with

Table 21

Time Involved in Fulfilling Work Load Responsibilities
in Last Five Years for Those Teaching in
Higher Education

	Percent
Teaching	71.6
Service activities	15.7
Research	14.0
Other responsibilities	28.8

other responsibilities reported spending 28.8 percent of their time involved in the completion of those duties, primarily administrative work.

Of the respondents, 64 (68.1 percent) indicated that they returned to a previously held position after they completed the Doctor of Arts degree (see Table 22). Of the

Table 22
Returned to a Previously Held Position Upon
Doctor of Arts Completion

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Yes	64	68.1
No	30	31.9

subjects, 50 (53.8 percent) reported that they had not changed jobs since completing the degree, while 5 (5.4 percent) had changed jobs four or more times since graduation (see Table 23).

Respondents were asked to report by range their salary for the year immediately before beginning the Doctor of Arts degree and their salary for the year immediately after graduation from the program. The salary ranges were divided into five-year periods. A comparison of those periods suggests that subjects graduating during the years 1973-1977 advanced from the below-\$20,000 range to the \$20,000-\$24,999

Table 23
Number of Times Graduates Had Changed Jobs
Since Doctor of Arts Completion

	Frequency	Valid percentage
0 time	50	53.8
1 time	20	21.5
2 times	15	16.1
3 times	3	3.2
4 or more times	5	5.4

range (see Table 24). There was no change in average salary range for 1978-1982 and 1983-1987 graduates. Subjects graduating during the years 1988-1992 advanced two salary ranges, from \$20,000-\$24,999 to \$30,000-\$34,999. The average salary of Doctor of Arts degree graduates in physical education for 1992 was between \$30,000 and \$39,999 (see Table 25). Eight graduates earned salaries in excess of \$60,000.

Of the subjects, 58 (61.7 percent) reported membership in the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD). Of the subjects, 61 (64.9 percent) were members of their state Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AHPERD) (see Table 26). Subjects held memberships in 45 other professional organizations, such as the National Athletic

Table 24

Average Change in Salary When Comparing Salary Immediately Before Beginning the
Doctor of Arts Program and Salary After Doctor of Arts Completion

	1973-1977	1978-1982	1983-1987	1988-1992
Average salary before beginning Doctor of Arts Program	Below \$20,000	\$20,000-\$24,999	\$20,000-\$24,999	\$20,000-\$24,999
Average salary at Doctor of Arts completion	\$20,000-\$24,999	\$20,000-\$24,999	\$20,000-\$24,999	\$30,000-\$34,999

Table 25
1992 Salary of Graduates

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Below \$30,000	14	15.1
\$30,000-\$39,999	38	40.9
\$40,000-\$49,999	24	25.8
\$50,000-\$59,999	9	9.7
\$60,000 and above	8	8.6

Table 26
Professional Membership of Doctor of Arts Graduates

	Frequency	Valid percentage
AAHPERD	58	61.7
State AHPERD	61	64.9
NEA	18	19.1
Other	39	41.5

Trainers Association and the American College of Sports Medicine.

Of the respondents, 17 (18.1 percent) had written a professional book since completing the Doctor of Arts degree (see Table 27). Twenty-five (26.6 percent) had authored articles accepted in refereed journals, while 29 (30.9 percent) had written articles accepted in non-refereed journals; 55 (58.5 percent) had made professional presentations; and 22 (23.4 percent) had been involved in other professional activities, such as critiquing professional material and conducting clinics.

Table 27
Professional Accomplishments Since Completion of
the Doctor of Arts Degree

	Frequency		
	Number	Min.	Max.
Book authorship	17 (18.1%)	1	8
Article in refereed journal	25 (26.6%)	1	20
Article in non-refereed journal	29 (30.9%)	1	45
Presentation	55 (58.5%)	1	200
Other professional activities	22 (23.4%)	1	14

Of the respondents, 25 (27.2 percent) indicated they had seriously considered a career change since completion of

the Doctor of Arts degree (see Table 28). Higher salaries and a change to athletics were the primary reasons for considering a change.

Table 28

Graduates Who Have Seriously Considered a Career Change
Since Completion of the Doctor of Arts Degree

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Yes	25	27.2
No	67	72.8

Of the subjects, 61 (67.0 percent) stated they would like to spend the majority of their working time before retirement in college or university teaching (see Table 29). Other respondents indicated a desire to spend their time in non-educational positions, primarily those in the business field.

Of the graduates, 43 (52.4 percent) were currently working in an educational institution, with an enrollment between 1,000 and 7,499 (see Table 30). Respondents were employed in institutions covering all five size categories.

Of the graduates employed in higher education, four (5.5 percent) reported their institutions did not recognize the Doctor of Arts degree as being equal to other terminal degrees in terms of promotion, salary, and tenure (see

Table 29

Position Graduates Would Like to Spend the Majority
of Working Time in Before Retirement

	Frequency	Valid percentage
College/university teaching	61	67.0
Secondary/elementary teaching	7	7.7
Administration	9	9.9
Athletics	6	6.6
Non-educational	8	8.8

Table 30

Student Enrollment at Institution of Current Employment

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Below 1,000	10	12.2
1,000-7,499	43	52.4
7,500-14,999	13	15.9
15,000-24,999	12	14.6
25,000 and above	4	4.9

Table 31). A lack of a strong research background and lower requirements for the Doctor of Arts degree were mentioned as reasons for the institutions' failures to recognize the

Table 31

Recognition of Doctor of Arts Equality with Other
Terminal Degrees in Terms of Promotion, Salary,
and Tenure by Employer

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Yes	69	94.5
No	4	5.5

degree as being equal to other terminal degrees. Of the respondents, 58 (61.7 percent) said the unique features of the Doctor of Arts degree were understood and appreciated by colleagues and administrators (see Table 32).

Of the graduates, 68 (73.2 percent) were employed in a position that was closely related to the primary emphasis of the Doctor of Arts degree. Of the graduates, 84 (89.4 percent) believed their career goals were well served by the Doctor of Arts program, and 82 (87.3 percent) believed the Doctor of Arts degree was a viable alternative to the Doctor of Philosophy and the Doctor of Education degrees for those planning a career in college or university teaching. Of the respondents, 83 (88.3 percent) would recommend the Doctor of

Arts degree to those considering advanced graduate study in physical education, and 74 (78.7 percent) would pursue the

Table 32

Understanding and Appreciation of Unique Features of
Doctor of Arts Degree by Colleagues and
Administrators

	Frequency	Valid percentage
Strongly agree	16	17.0
Agree	42	44.7
Neutral	18	19.1
Disagree	13	13.8
Strongly disagree	5	5.3

Doctor of Arts degree instead of a Doctor of Philosophy or a Doctor of Education if they had to do it again. Table 33 shows the average importance score for each of the questions pertaining to the Doctor of Arts degree, with one equaling strongly disagree and five equaling strongly agree.

Table 33

Questions Pertaining to the Doctor of Arts Degree

	Likert scale (1-5)
Current position closely related to primary emphasis of Doctor of Arts degree	3.543
Career goals well served by Doctor of Arts program	3.903
Doctor of Arts degree viable alternative to Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degree for career in college/university teaching	4.426
Would recommend the Doctor of Arts degree to someone considering advanced graduate study in physical education	4.426
Would still pursue a Doctor of Arts degree instead of a Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education if had to do it all over again	4.245

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University. The study was conducted during the spring of 1993.

To obtain data for this study, the investigator constructed a questionnaire and surveyed 115 graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education. Ninety-four (82 percent) questionnaires were completed and returned in time to be included in the analysis of data. Six questionnaires were returned after the final acceptance date. A description of the graduates was obtained by a tabulation of frequencies that were analyzed to determine means and percentages of responses.

Conclusions

Characteristics of the Population

The majority of Doctor of Arts graduates in physical education (68 or 72.3 percent) are male. The average age of the subjects was 46 years. The average age of respondents at graduation from the doctoral program was 36 years. A large proportion of the subjects lived in southern states, primarily Tennessee and North Carolina, before beginning the doctoral program.

The average enrolling class in the physical education doctoral program consisted of four students. When combining the years of graduation from the doctoral program into five-year periods, the period 1988-1992 had the highest number of graduates (26 or 28.0 percent). The 1973-1977 and 1983-1987 periods followed closely behind with 25 graduates (26.9 percent) and 24 graduates (25.8 percent), respectively. The 1978-1982 period was slightly lower with 18 graduates (19.3 percent).

Doctoral Preparation

A substantial number of the graduates (74 or 78.7 percent) selected Middle Tennessee State University and the Doctor of Arts program as their first choice for pursuit of a doctoral degree. The graduates chose Middle Tennessee State University because of the emphasis and structure of the program; most of the graduates wanted to refine their teaching skills.

In addition, the graduates chose Middle Tennessee State University because of its location. Most of the students were from the south and wanted to remain close to home while pursuing a doctoral degree. The flexible schedule of the Doctor of Arts program attracted many students by allowing them to fulfill the residency requirements in consecutive summer sessions.

A few of the graduates (13 or 13.8 percent) entered another doctoral program before their enrollment in the

Doctor of Arts program. These graduates transferred to Middle Tennessee State University for several reasons.

Some of the students had depleted their financial resources and wanted to take advantage of the lower tuition and the availability of graduate assistantships offered by the university. Others were able to keep a full-time position while pursuing a doctoral degree, and the Doctor of Arts program allowed this flexibility. Some students experienced a change of interest during their earlier doctoral work and transferred to Middle Tennessee State University to focus on the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education.

Very few graduates (4 or 4.3 percent) had attempted additional graduate degrees since the completion of the Doctor of Arts degree. These people indicated a desire to acquire knowledge in other areas as the primary reason for seeking an additional graduate degree.

A majority of the graduates said they decided to pursue a doctoral degree for the following reasons: (1) desire to become a better teacher; (2) desire to improve status; (3) attraction of higher salaries; (4) to secure tenure or advancement; (5) a genuine, intrinsic desire to study; (6) attraction of new kinds of positions; (7) stimulation of a university atmosphere; and (8) the influence and persuasion of other persons. Fewer graduates (37 or 39.8 percent)

indicated a desire to improve research ability as a reason to pursue a doctoral degree.

Career and Professional Information

Most of the graduates (65 or 73.1 percent) were employed as instructors and assistant professors in colleges and universities before entering the doctoral program. A small number (6 or 6.7 percent) were employed as associate professors. Only seven graduates (7.5 percent) were employed in non-educational positions before beginning the doctoral degree.

After completion of the Doctor of Arts degree, a slightly higher number of graduates (70 or 76.9 percent) were employed in colleges and universities. These graduates held the positions of assistant professor (21 or 22.8 percent), associate professor (27 or 29.3 percent), and professor (17 or 18.5 percent). Also, a higher number of graduates (10 or 11.0 percent) were employed in non-educational positions. These subjects indicated that they sought employment in non-educational positions due to a change of interest and a desire to increase their financial status. The number of graduates currently employed in secondary and elementary education dropped slightly when compared to employment before beginning the doctoral degree.

The current employment status of graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University was similar to the 1980 Ball

State University study that surveyed Doctor of Arts degree graduates from all fields of study. The 615 doctorates reported 84 percent employment in college and university teaching, compared with the 76.9 percent employment rate determined in this study. Doctor of Arts graduates' success in finding employment in higher education repudiates Erickson's (1974) claim that graduates would be unmarketable.

Most of the Doctor of Arts graduates (64 or 68.1 percent) returned to a previously held position upon completion of their doctoral degree. Over half (50 or 53.8 percent) had not changed jobs since they completed their doctorate. A smaller number (20 or 21.5 percent) had changed jobs just once since ending their doctoral work. Some graduates (25 or 27.2 percent) had seriously considered a career change since they completed the Doctor of Arts degree. Most of those had done so because of a desire to improve their salaries or to move into the field of athletics.

The graduates had an average of 9.1 years of teaching experience before enrolling in the doctoral program. Since completing the Doctor of Arts degree, graduates reported an average of 13.3 years of teaching experience. Four graduates had no teaching experience since earning their doctorate.

Similar to state of residence before enrolling in the doctoral program, graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree were employed mainly in southern states. Subjects were employed in 19 states, with Tennessee and North Carolina leading the list with 34 graduates (37.8 percent) and 17 graduates (18.9 percent), respectively. This finding seems appropriate because many of the graduates returned to previously held positions.

Of those who taught in higher education, most considered teaching as their primary responsibility. Graduates were involved in other responsibilities, such as service activities and research, to a much lesser extent. These findings substantiate one of the main reasons graduates gave for pursuing the Doctor of Arts degree, notably to improve teaching skills.

Many of the graduates experienced an increase in salary as a result of completing the Doctor of Arts degree. The average graduate salary increased one salary level for graduation dates during 1973-1977 (from below \$20,000 to \$20,000-\$24,999) and two salary levels during 1988-1992 (from \$20,000-\$24,999 to \$30,000-\$34,999). For the years 1978-1982 and 1983-1987, the average salary remained in the \$20,000-\$24,999 level. The average salary for Doctor of Arts graduates in 1992 was in the range of \$30,000-\$39,999.

A majority of graduates (58 or 61.7 percent) were members of the American Alliance for Health, Physical

Education, Recreation, and Dance and their individual state organization (61 or 64.9 percent). Many (55 or 58.5 percent) had made professional presentations. A smaller number had authored books (17 or 18.1 percent), articles in refereed journals (25 or 26.6 percent), or articles in non-refereed journals (29 or 30.9 percent).

Because the Doctor of Arts degree does not emphasize research and a significant number of graduates work in positions that require little or no research, the percentages of graduates participating in research activities were low. It appears to the investigator that the number of graduates participating in professional activities was particularly low.

Many of the Doctor of Arts graduates (68 or 73.2 percent) were working in positions closely related to the primary emphasis of the Doctor of Arts degree. The majority (43 or 52.4 percent) who worked in education were employed by institutions with enrollments of 1,000 to 7,499. Most (61 or 67.0 percent) indicated they would like to spend most of their working time until retirement in college and university teaching.

While a majority (58 or 61.7 percent) thought their colleagues and administrators understood and appreciated the unique features of the Doctor of Arts degree, some (18 or 19.1 percent) did not think their colleagues and administrators understood or appreciated the degree. Four

respondents (5.5 percent) indicated their institutions did not recognize the Doctor of Arts degree equally with other terminal degrees in terms of promotion, salary, and tenure. These institutions cited the lack of research background and a lower standard for the Doctor of Arts degree as the reasons for this inequality.

When asked to consider statements relating to personal attitudes toward the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education, many graduates (84 or 89.4 percent) said their career goals had been well served by the program. Most graduates (82 or 87.3 percent) indicated that the Doctor of Arts degree was a viable alternative to the Doctor of Philosophy or the Doctor of Education degrees for those planning a career in college or university teaching. A majority (83 or 88.3 percent) would recommend the Doctor of Arts degree to someone considering advanced graduate study in physical education. Most (74 or 78.7 percent) of the graduates would still pursue a Doctor of Arts degree rather than a Doctor of Philosophy or Doctor of Education degree if they had to do it again.

An examination of the responses to these questions revealed graduate approval of and satisfaction with the Doctor of Arts degree. These findings seem appropriate since a majority of the graduates had experienced success in terms of fulfillment of employment and career goals.

Recommendations

Little information exists about the status of Doctor of Arts graduates in physical education. Increased knowledge on this topic will provide insight to the situation of Doctor of Arts graduates and will allow the determination of the marketability of these graduates in the area of higher education. The purpose of this study was to determine the status of the graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education at Middle Tennessee State University. Based on the responses to the survey instrument and the conclusions, the following recommendations are suggested by the investigator:

1. The Physical Education Department of Middle Tennessee State University should maintain a current portfolio on all Doctor of Arts graduates and correspond with them on a regular basis.

2. The graduate faculty in the Physical Education Department at Middle Tennessee State University should endeavor to publish current material regarding the status of the Doctor of Arts degree.

3. The Doctor of Arts program should emphasize greater participation in professional activities and should provide more opportunities for students to gain experience in these areas.

4. Middle Tennessee State University should promote the Doctor of Arts degree in physical education on a

national level in order to attract students from outside the southeast.

5. Since 29.9 percent of Doctor of Arts graduates consider research as part of their educational responsibility, the doctoral program should upgrade the opportunity for students to gain expertise in this area.

6. A follow-up study to determine the status of Doctor of Arts graduates should be conducted at least once every five years. Results should be disseminated through publication and/or presentation on a national scale. Several questions were not addressed by this study that should be included in future research: (a) amount of time between completion of the Doctor of Arts degree and first employment, (b) description of the first teaching position after completion of the Doctor of Arts degree, and (c) identification of specific graduate courses that were beneficial to the graduate and recommendations for new ones.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY'S DOCTOR
OF ARTS GRADUATES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY'S DOCTOR
OF ARTS GRADUATES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

SURVEY OF MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY'S DOCTOR OF ARTS
GRADUATES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION, 1977 - 1992

All questions will be strictly confidential and you will remain anonymous

Please complete the following questions to provide demographic data.

1. Are you: Male _____ Female _____
2. How old are you? _____
3. When did you enter the DA program? 19 _____
4. How old were you when you completed the D.A.? _____
5. When did you graduate from the doctoral program? 19 _____
6. In which state did you reside prior to entering the DA program? _____

The following questions pertain to your reasons for choosing MTSU and your educational experiences while a doctoral student.

7. Was MTSU your first choice among the doctoral degree granting institutions that you considered? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, why? _____
If no, why not? _____
8. Were you ever enrolled in a doctoral program at another university prior to entering the DA program? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, why did you leave? _____
9. Have you ever attempted another graduate degree since completing the DA degree?
Yes _____ No _____
If yes, why? _____

Using the scale given below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

SA – Strongly Agree A – Agree N – Neutral
D – Disagree SD – Strongly Disagree

10. The following elements were important in my decision to pursue the DA degree at MTSU:

Admission requirements	SA	A	N	D	SD
Availability of assistantships	SA	A	N	D	SD
Cost of tuition	SA	A	N	D	SD
Characteristics (mission) of the DA degree	SA	A	N	D	SD
Location	SA	A	N	D	SD
Convenience (residency requirements)	SA	A	N	D	SD
Presence of a particular faculty member	SA	A	N	D	SD
Recommendation of a teacher/acquaintance	SA	A	N	D	SD
Reputation of individual staff member(s)	SA	A	N	D	SD
Reputation of institution	SA	A	N	D	SD
Reputation of Physical Education Department	SA	A	N	D	SD

11. The following were important reasons for my decision to enter a doctoral program:

Desire to become a better teacher	SA	A	N	D	SD
Desire to improve my research ability	SA	A	N	D	SD
Desire to improve my status	SA	A	N	D	SD
Secure tenure/advancement	SA	A	N	D	SD
Attraction of higher salaries	SA	A	N	D	SD
Stimulation of university atmosphere	SA	A	N	D	SD
Influence and persuasion of other persons	SA	A	N	D	SD
Attraction of new kinds of positions	SA	A	N	D	SD
Genuine, intrinsic desire to study	SA	A	N	D	SD

12. The unique features of the DA degree have been understood and appreciated by colleagues and administrators with whom I have had contact since graduating SA A N D SD

Please complete the following questions to provide information about your career, both before and after completion of the DA.

13. Please indicate your position and the type of organization that you are associated with currently.

Position:	Organization:
<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> Higher education
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> Secondary education
<input type="checkbox"/> Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary education
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator	<input type="checkbox"/> Not currently employed
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-educational (specify) _____

14. Please indicate your position and the type of organization that you were associated with immediately prior to beginning the DA program.

Position:	Organization:
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor	<input type="checkbox"/> Higher education
<input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> Secondary education
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor	<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary education
<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-educational (specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	

15. Please identify the number of years of teaching experience you had in each of the following categories prior to your enrollment in the DA program.

<input type="checkbox"/> No experience	<input type="checkbox"/> 2-Year college
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> 4-Year college/university
<input type="checkbox"/> Secondary	<input type="checkbox"/> Total years of teaching experience _____

16. Please indicate the number of years of teaching experience you have had in each area since completion of the DA.

<input type="checkbox"/> No experience	<input type="checkbox"/> 2-Year college
<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary	<input type="checkbox"/> 4-Year college/university
<input type="checkbox"/> Secondary	<input type="checkbox"/> Total years of teaching experience _____

17. In what state are you presently employed? _____

DON'T GIVE UP NOW! JUST A FEW MORE QUESTIONS!

18. If you teach in a college/university setting, what has been the distribution of your workload the past five years?
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Research | <input type="checkbox"/> % Service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> % Teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> % Other (specify) _____ |
19. How many times have you changed jobs since completing the DA degree?
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I have not changed positions | <input type="checkbox"/> Three times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Once | <input type="checkbox"/> Four or more times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Twice | |
20. When you completed the DA degree, did you return to a position you held previously?
Yes ☐ No ☐
21. Please indicate your salary in 1992.
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below \$30,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000 - \$59,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000 - \$39,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Above \$60,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000 - \$49,999 | |
22. Please indicate your salary for the year immediately prior to beginning the DA degree.
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below \$20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000 - \$34,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000 - \$24,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$35,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000 - \$29,999 | |
23. Please indicate your salary for the year immediately following the completion of the DA.
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Below \$20,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000 - \$34,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20,000 - \$24,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Above \$35,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000 - \$29,999 | |
24. To what professional organizations do you currently belong?
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> National AAHPERD | <input type="checkbox"/> NEA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State AHPERD | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional AHPERD | |
25. Please indicate the number of publications and/or presentations you have been involved with since the completion of your doctoral degree.
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Book(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Refereed journal article(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Nonrefereed journal article(s) | |
26. Have you seriously considered a career change since you completed the DA?
Yes ☐ No ☐
If yes, why? _____
27. Please indicate the position in which you ultimately would like to spend the majority of your working time before you retire.
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> College/university teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Athletics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Secondary/elementary teaching | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-educational (specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administration | |

28. If you work in higher education, does your institution recognize the DA degree as being equal to other terminal degrees in terms of promotion, salary, and tenure?
 Yes _____ No _____
 If no, why not? _____

29. If you are currently employed by an educational institution, please indicate the student enrollment of your school.

_____ Below 1,000	_____ 15,000 - 24,999
_____ 1,000 - 7,499	_____ Above 25,000
_____ 7,500 - 14,999	

Using the scale given below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

- | | SA -- Strongly Agree | D -- Disagree | A -- Agree | SD -- Strongly Disagree | N -- Neutral |
|---|----------------------|---------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| 30. My current position is closely related to the primary emphasis of the DA degree | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 31. My career goals are well served by the DA program | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 32. I believe that for those planning careers in college or university teaching, the DA degree in physical education is a viable alternative to the PhD and the EdD | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 33. I would recommend the DA degree to someone considering advanced graduate study in physical education | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 34. If I had to do it all over again, I would still pursue a DA degree instead of a PhD or EdD | SA | A | N | D | SD |

Thank you for your time and your consideration of these questions. If you would like to offer any additional information that was not addressed in this survey, please write your suggestions on the bottom of this page. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please provide a stamped and self-addressed envelope with your completed survey. Also, if you have lost touch with one of your classmates and would like to have his/her current address, please enclose the name with your survey and I will make sure you receive it.

APPENDIX B
PILOT STUDY COVER LETTER

APPENDIX B
PILOT STUDY COVER LETTER

April 30, 1993

Dear Graduate Faculty Member:

You are being asked to participate in a pilot study to prepare an instrument that will be used to survey graduates of the DA program. This questionnaire will be included in my doctoral dissertation, and any help will be welcomed.

Please consider each item and feel free to make constructive comments concerning the following aspects of the instrument: content validity, readability, accuracy, relevancy, ambiguity, clarity, and ease of response. Any additional input concerning the modification of the instrument to improve validity or clarity will be greatly appreciated.

Please return this instrument to Dr. Richard LaLance ASAP, and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jessica Moore

APPENDIX C
INITIAL SURVEY COVER LETTER

APPENDIX C
INITIAL SURVEY COVER LETTER

Post Office Box 96, HPERS Department
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
May 5, 1993

Dear Middle Tennessee State University Graduate:

Greetings from the HPERS Department at MTSU! I hope your spring has been as pleasant as ours here in middle Tennessee and those of you who are teaching are preparing for a nice, relaxing summer.

Remember those long, fruitful days you spent working on your dissertation? Well, I am currently enjoying those days, and I need your help. I am a doctoral student in physical education at MTSU, and I am conducting a study of the graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in Physical Education at Middle Tennessee State University. I am attempting to determine some personal characteristics and the professional status and growth of DA graduates in physical education, and your participation in this study will assist me in my endeavors.

In completing the enclosed questionnaire, it is important that you answer all questions that pertain to you. Each item is essential. Of course, all information will be treated confidentially.

I am keenly aware of the value of the findings of this study to myself and to others, including MTSU administration, faculty, students, prospective students, and of course you, a graduate of the DA program. I shall always feel indebted to you for your time and thought in your completion of this survey form. A stamped and self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaire. Please complete and return the survey by May 19.

I suspect you will find this inquiry of personal interest. Results of the study may be included in future alumni publications. By the way, I hope you received the recent DA alumni newsletter. The HPERS Department plans to continue publishing the newsletter.

Middle Tennessee State University Graduate
Page 2
May 5, 1993

Thank you for your time and participation. I look forward to your early response.

Sincerely,

Jessica E. Moore

Dr. Richard LaLance
Major Professor

Enclosure: Survey, envelope

P.S. On April 23, over 100 friends, family members, faculty, and students attended a retirement dinner honoring Dr. Guy Penny and Dr. Glen Reeder. Dr. Penny and Dr. Reeder will be around until the end of June if you would like to send them congratulatory notes.

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY COVER LETTER

APPENDIX D
FOLLOW-UP SURVEY COVER LETTER

Post Office Box 96
HPERS Department
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
May 21, 1993

Dear Middle Tennessee State University Graduate:

Recently, I wrote regarding one aspect of preparing my doctoral dissertation. As you noted, I am endeavoring to survey graduates of the Doctor of Arts degree in Physical Education from Middle Tennessee State University.

If you have not had the opportunity to fill out the survey, would you please do so at this time? Enclosed you will find another copy and a stamped and self-addressed envelope.

Please complete and return the instrument by June 2. Accept my sincere thanks for your patience and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jessica E. Moore

Dr. Richard LaLance
Major Professor

Enclosure: Survey, envelope

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, C. M. (1971). A graduate student looks at the new Doctor of Arts degree. AAUP Bulletin, 57, 264-367.
- Abramson, E. W. (1975). Ph.D. manpower: Employment demand and supply 1972-85 (Report No. BLS-Bulletin--1860) Washington, DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.
- Aleamoni, L. M., & Yimer, M. (1973). An investigation of the relationship between colleague rating, student rating, research productivity, and academic rank in rating instructional effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64(3), 274-277.
- Anderson, D. G. (1983). Differentiation of the EdD and PhD. Education, 34(3), 53-58.
- Axelrod, J. (1959). Graduate study for future college teachers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Baldwin, T. O. (1974). The Doctor of Arts degree in physical science. Journal of College Science Teaching, 4(2), 99-102.
- Batsche, C. (1991). The status of the DA degree at Illinois State University. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 25-38). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Berelson, B. (1960). Graduate education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Beringer, R. E. (1991). Status of the DA program in the University of North Dakota Department of History. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 46-54). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Blegen, T. C., & Cooper, R. M. (Eds.). (1950). The preparation of teachers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Bowen, R. L. (1991). Welcome. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (p. 24). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Bowen, W. G. (1981). Graduate education in the arts and sciences: Prospects for the future. Change, 13(5), 40-44.
- Bowen, W. G., & Sosa, J. A. (1989). Prospects for faculty in the arts and sciences. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bowers, J. (1965). Doctor of Arts: A new degree. College English, 27(1), 123-128.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience. New York: Harper & Row.
- Byrnes, R. F. (1966). Effective teaching is our first need. The Challenge of circular change. Princeton, NJ: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Cardozier, V. R. (1968). The Doctor of Arts degree. Journal of Higher Education, 39, 261-270.
- Carmichael, O. C. (1961). Graduate education: A critique and a program. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Chance, C. W., & Youra, D. G. (1972). The Doctor of Arts degree in Washington--An attitudinal survey. Olympia, WA: Washington State Council on Higher Education.
- Corson, J. J. (1975). The governance of colleges and universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. (1970). The Doctor of Arts degree. Washington, DC: Author.
- Dear, E. C. (1977). First physical education Doctor of Arts. Improving College and University Teaching, 25(3), 156.
- Dressel, P. L. (1982). College teaching as a profession: The Doctor of Arts degree. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Dressel, P. L., & Delisle, F. H. (1972). Blueprint for change: Doctoral programs for college teachers (Monograph 8). Iowa City, IA: The American College Testing Program.

- Dressel, P. L., & Faricy, W. H. (1972). Return to responsibility. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dressel, P. L., & Thompson, M. M. (1974). College teaching: Improvement by degrees (Monograph 13). Iowa City, IA: The American College Testing Program.
- Dressel, P. L., & Thompson, M. M. (1978). The Doctor of Arts: A decade of development, 1967-77. Journal of Higher Education, 49(4), 329-336.
- Dunham, E. A. (1970). Rx for higher education: The Doctor of Arts degree. Journal of Higher Education, 41(7), 505-515.
- Erickson, K. (1974). The Doctor of Arts: A counterstatement. Today's Speech, 22(2), 33-37.
- Eurich, A. C. (1964). The commitment to experiment and innovate in college teaching. Educational Record, 45(1), 49-50.
- Friedrich, R. J., & Michalak, S. J. (1983). Why doesn't research improve teaching? Journal of Higher Education, 54(2), 145-163.
- Gosman, M. T. (1972). The Doctor of Arts: Make it new. The Journal of General Education, 24(3), 153-169.
- Hansen, D. W., & Rhodes, D. M. (1982). Staff development through degrees: Alternatives to the Ph.D. Community College Review, 10(2), 52-58.
- Haskins, C. H. (1923). The rise of universities. New York: Henry Holt.
- Hefferlin, J. B. (1969). Dynamics of academic reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hofstadter, R., & Smith, W. (Eds.). (1961). American higher education: A documentary history (Vol. 2). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- House, E. W. (1991). Label and perception. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 75-78). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Hunt, J. G., & Wheeler, D. L. (1981). Survey of the status of the Doctor of Arts degree in the United States 1980. Muncie, IN: Ball State University Graduate School.

- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1977). The academic revolution. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jessup, W. A. (1944). In M. Edwards (Ed.), Studies in American graduate education: A report to the Carnegie Foundation. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Koenker, R. H. (1974). Status of the Doctor of Arts degree. MATYC Journal, 8(3), 29-36.
- Koenker, R. H. (1976). Status of the Doctor of Arts degree (Research Rep. No. 143). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 123 989)
- Koriath, K. L., & Merrion, M. M. (1989). Preliminary findings from a survey on the dissertation in Doctor of Arts programs. Unpublished manuscript, Ball State University, Graduate School, Muncie, IN.
- Kristol, I. (1968, December 8). A different way to restructure the university. The New York Times Magazine, p. 50.
- Ladd, D. R. (1970). Change in educational policy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lindauer, I. E. (1978). A summary of the philosophy and history of the Doctor of Arts degree. Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 17(3), 25.
- Lipson, J. I. (1981). Experience with individualized instruction. Journal of College Science Teaching, 11(1), 42-44.
- Martin, M. (1991). Natural and applied sciences disciplinary session. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 73-74). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Matthews, C. N. (1991). The DA in chemistry at the University of Illinois, Chicago. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 42-45). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Middle Tennessee State University. (1971). Middle Tennessee State University bulletin (Vol. 44, No. 1). Murfreesboro, TN: Author.

- Morison, S. E. (1936). Three centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nichols, L. (1975, December). Contemporary problems in speech communication graduate education: The community-junior college level. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Communication Administrators, Houston.
- Price, J. E. (1971). Acceptability of the Doctor of Arts degree in physics. American Journal of Physics, 39(1), 1300-1302.
- Pulling, B. S. (Ed.). (1991). Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads. Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Rice, L. H. (1991). The Doctor of Arts in perspective. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 79-81). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Spurr, S. H. (1970). Academic degree structures: Innovative approaches. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Steinberg, E. R. (1978). Experiences with the Doctor of Arts degree; and some prescriptions. Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 17(3), 8-13.
- Strassenburg, A. A. (1971). College physics teacher preparation--How to do it? American Journal of Physics, 39(11), 1307-1310.
- Strothmann, F. W. (1955). The graduate school today and tomorrow. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education.
- Sykes, C. J. (1991). The Doctor of Arts degree at the crossroad. In B. S. Pulling (Ed.), Proceedings of the DA at the crossroads (pp. 17-23). Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University Press.
- Thompson, M. M. (1978). History and update of the Doctor of Arts degree and program. Colorado Journal of Education Research, 17(3), 2-6.
- Wheeler, D. L., & Nelson, J. (1989). Survey of the status of the Doctor of Arts degree in the United States 1988. Muncie, IN: Ball State University Graduate School.

- Wise, W. M. (1967). Who teaches the teachers? In C. B. T. Lee (Ed.), Improving college teaching (pp. 77-89). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Wortham, M. (1967). The case for a Doctor of Arts degree: A view from junior college faculty. AAUP Bulletin, 53, 372-377.