GRADUATE FAMILY SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS IN 1985

A Dissertation

Presented to the

Department of Family Sciences

Brigham Young University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Susan G. B. Middleton

December 1986

 Family Living Center
1230 SFLC
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation was made particularly difficult by some very challenging circumstances that arose in the author's life simultaneous with the writing of this paper. The author wishes to express her gratitude to each individual whose support and assistance literally made it possible to carry out the task.

First, I would like to extend my thanks to my chairman, Wesley R. Burr, for his willingness to step in as chair of my committee so very late in my doctoral program. I appreciate the confidence he placed in me in accepting this position, as well as the helpful suggestions and sensitively worded criticisms he made in response to the many drafts of the paper. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Darwin Thomas and Thomas Draper, for their helpful comments. In addition, I am grateful to Bruce A. Chadwick and Leland J. Hendrix for their invaluable counsel relative to the methodology and statistics of the study, for Kathy Barne's assistance in the typing and sending out of the surveys, Steven Bollman's assistance in contacting and encouraging the departments to complete their surveys, Barry Smith's help with the computer work, and Don Norton's assistance with the polishing of the paper. Thanks are also in order for Teresa Anderson's assistance with the typing of the initial

drafts of the paper, and April Budd's and Julie Westergren's careful typing and proofing of later drafts.

I would like to express my gratitude for the constant encouragement and assistance provided me by my mother, Naomi E. Burch, my dear friend, Norma J. Gould, and my three children, Bethany Lee, Benjamin Joseph, and Jonathan David.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

Introduction and Review of the Literature

During the 1983 annual conference of the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR), a special task force was created for the purpose of providing a forum for discussion about issues associated with the emergence of Family Science as a discipline. One need of the new discipline identified by the task force was information about family training programs, comparable to that which has been gathered on training programs in other fields.

This study addresses the need expressed by this group by providing evaluative and descriptive data on departments in the family field. This baseline data on the family discipline will not only benefit the discipline itself but also the general academic community, which currently has a significant amount of data, though primarily of the evaluative type, on most other disciplines.

Research Problem

The general purpose of this study is to provide the new family discipline with baseline data on its graduate departments. More specifically, this study provides

(a) descriptive data on the family discipline's graduate family departments, (b) evaluation of various aspects of graduate family departments by faculty as well as estimates of the percentage of time the faculty spend in various professional activities, (c) faculty rankings of the relative eminence of graduate family departments, and (d) some comparisons of the high- and low-ranked graduate family departments having doctoral programs.

Since the purpose of this study is to gather baseline data on graduate departments in the newly emerging family discipline, it was necessary to determine which departments are in Family Science and which are not. Because there is some controversy over whether departments in certain fields, such as child development and home economics, should be considered as belonging to the new family discipline, and in light of the fact that virtually all family departments that are not clearly in other disciplines have the word family in the department title (Burr, 1983), the decision was made to restrict the study to graduate departments that have the word family as part of the department title. This meant that family-oriented departments in other disciplines, such as psychology or sociology, were not included; departments of home economics or child development were not included, but a department of home economics and family ecology was.

The use of these criteria seemed like a justifiable way of dealing with the challenge of defining the population. If the researcher were to have started to include programs in other fields that have substantial family orientations, the task of identifying criteria for choosing which departments to include and which to exclude would have been extremely difficult.

The Emergence of Family Science as a Discipline

A series of events in the early 1980s has led some scholars to believe that the family field has become a bonafide discipline. The first event in this series occurred in March of 1981. Geoffrey Leigh sent a manuscript to Wesley Burr entitled "Famology: The Application of Theory to a Discipline." In this article, Leigh argued that the family field had matured to the point that it qualified to be a bonafide discipline. At the time Burr received Leigh's manuscript, he had been independently working on a paper in which he was developing the same thesis. Collaborating, they published an article on "Identity Problems in the Family Field" in the March, 1982 NCFR Report.

The major premise of this article was that there were four identity problems in the family field: (a) the diversity in names of family departments and the confusion relative to their identity which this has created on university campuses; (b) the confusion people experience

with regard to what they should call themselves when they graduate from a family department that is not a department of sociology, psychology, etc.; (c) the relative invisibility of the family field, as illustrated by the fact that professionals in the field do not seem to be identified, as are some lawyers, clergy, and psychiatrists, as the "family experts"; and (d) even when individuals in the family field are visible, there seems to be incongruity between the status they deserve, based on their knowledge base in the field, and the value of the contribution they can make to students and society.

Burr and Leigh (1982) proposed three alternative strategies for dealing with the field's identity problems: (a) keep the status quo by doing nothing about the problem, (b) select one of the existing department labels to designate the discipline and its departments, and (c) invent a new term to designate the discipline.

In an effort to get the perceptions of other family scholars on the issues they raised in their article, they included a questionnaire and invited colleagues to respond to their concerns and ideas. Burr and Leigh reported the results of their survey as Burr's presidential address in the 1982 meetings of NCFR (Burr and Leigh, 1982b, 1983).

They reported that of the 334 respondents to their survey, 72% indicated that they considered the difficulty in describing their professional identity to be a fairly

serious or a very serious problem; 68% thought that the variation in family department labels was a fairly serious or very serious problem; 84% thought that the relative invisibility of the field was at least a fairly serious problem; and 82% thought the status implications of the identity problem were at least fairly serious.

In terms of the three possible solutions to the problem, 75% of respondents thought it would be undesirable to stay with the status quo; 43% thought it would be desirable to select a name for the discipline and its departments from existing labels; and 63% thought it would be desirable or very desirable to try to find a new term for the discipline. The results of the survey suggested that Burr and Leigh were not alone in their feelings about identity problems in the family field.

Burr and Leigh (1982b, 1983) then evaluated the criteria for determining when a field becomes a separate discipline; and they concluded that the family field met the criteria sufficiently well to be considered a bonafide discipline. For some months following these meetings, Burr and Leigh were contacted by an average of 10 to 15 individuals a month who supported the concept of the new family discipline (Burr, 1984). From these conversations, new ideas began to take shape.

To keep scholars abreast of what was happening relative to the new discipline, Burr and Leigh published an

article in each of the 1983 editions of the NCFR Report. These articles led to the organization of two sessions in the 1983 annual meetings of NCFR on the movement for a new family discipline. In response to the need expressed by participants of these sessions for an organization that would promote dialogue about issues associated with the emergence of a family discipline, Bert Adams, president of NCFR, approved an ad hoc task force. It was decided that the main activity of the task force would be to circulate a newsletter that would publish papers, letters, and rejoinders that focused on the idea of the new family discipline. An announcement informing the membership of NCFR of the formation of the task force and inviting interested parties to extend their support to the new discipline by joining the task force was later published in the November 1983 edition of the NCFR Report.

During 1984, a paper by Kingsley Davis introduced several new developments in the dialogue and decision-making about the new discipline. Davis was apparently unaware of the events occurring in NCFR; but in a presentation at the 1984 annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, he suggested that the field of marriage and the family was showing several signs of being a special branch of science or a discipline in its own right. Some of the signs he pointed to included these: (a) it has a thriving professional association, (b) it has its

own professional journals, (c) it has a substantial literature, (d) it has a technical vocabulary, (e) it has some techniques of measurement of its own, and (f) it has a department or school of its own in many universities. However, because Davis felt it did not have as much independent explanatory power as disciplines like sociology or psychology, (i.e., its own theories for explaining the phenomena of marriage and the family), he termed it a "secondary discipline."

Burr (cited in Neubeck, 1985) responded to Davis' (1985) classification of the family science discipline as a secondary discipline. He suggested that the family discipline may in fact be in process of evolving from a secondary to a primary discipline. One of the areas in which this may be occurring is in an area which Davis suggested the field was weak in: the development of its own theories for explaining family phenomena.

Burr suggested that the family field could be seen as beginning to develop relatively unique perspectives to explain family phenomena. He cited the developmental perspective and the family strengths or family wellness orientation, as endemic to the family field. He also stated his belief that the family field has the potential to provide much more explanatory power in the future. He acknowledged, however, that we will have to wait to see

whether or not the field delivers enough unique theoretical formulations to be considered a primary discipline.

During 1984, Burr (1984) also published a paper that identified a series of events that had unfolded over several decades, which led up to his and Leigh's 1982 assertion (Burr and Leigh, 1982b) that a family discipline had emerged. He suggested three stages in the development of the field. The first stage, ending in 1946, was when scholars from many disciplines discovered that the family was an area worthy of their attention. Classes on the family began to emerge, a number of scholars began to do research on the family (Angell, 1936; Burgess and Cottrell, 1939), and scholarly treatises on the family began to appear (Waller, 1938).

The second stage began in 1946 when Ernest Groves predicted that a time would come when there would be an actual science of marriage and the family. The family specialists that would be a part of this science would not be sociologists, home economists or social workers, but individuals specifically committed to the gathering and dispensing of information concerning marriage and the family. The pioneering specialists of this science would of necessity be trained in other disciplines, but later generations of "family scientists" would have a background shared by no other scientist.

Groves identified two things that would need to occur to enable the family discipline to come forth: (a) a recognition that the time had come for the family discipline to take its position alongside other disciplines, and (b) the commitment of able men and women to the task--two occurrences that Burr asserted have come to pass (Burr, 1984). Groves indicated that the development of graduate family training programs would go hand-in-hand with the emergence of the science of marriage and the family. He also indicated that the emergence of the discipline would coincide with the development of several family-oriented professions, such as family life education, family extension, and marriage and family therapy--a phenomenon which Burr (1984) suggested has also occurred.

The third stage began in 1982 with the announcement by Burr and Leigh, in Burr's presidential address, of the birth of the new family discipline. In the 1984 annual business meetings of the NCFR Task Force for the Development of a Family Discipline, the 50 people in attendance unanimously voted that there existed a new family discipline.[1] In addition, five task groups were organized to deal with specific needs of the new

---

[1]Information from an unpublished report to members of the Task Force for the Development of a Family Discipline, dated October 29, 1984. (Also announced in the October 21, 1984 edition of the New York Times, pg. 64.)

discipline. One of the five groups was to supervise the gathering of baseline information on family departments, which will be used, in part, to develop a computer repository of information on family science departments.

Another group had the responsibility to identify a name for the new discipline that would have high support from others. In the 1985 annual meetings of NCFR, this group proposed that the new family discipline be known by the name "Family Science" (Ellis, 1985). The 89 family-oriented scholars in attendance unanimously adopted the recommendation. The task force subsequently recommended that (a) the new discipline, which has as its primary goals the "discovery, verification, and application of knowledge about the family," be referred to as family science; (b) first priority be given to changing the names of courses, majors, and programs that are housed in family departments to family science; (c) second priority be given to changing the names of these family departments to include the term <u>family science</u>.

Another significant event that occurred during the 1985 annual meetings of NCFR, relative to the new family discipline, was that the Board of Directors of NCFR approved the formation of a family discipline section within NCFR. The primary purposes of this section will be to "expand, strengthen, and enhance the Family Science discipline and profession."

Summary

In 1982 Burr and Leigh announced to the membership of NCFR that a new family discipline was born, in fulfillment of Grove's 1946 prediction that such a day would come. Today the discipline has gained a name, Family Science, and its own section within NCFR. There is evidence that some scholars view the formation of the discipline as an important part of the answer to the identity problems in the family field addressed by Burr and Leigh early in 1982 (Burr and Leigh, 1982, 1982b, 1983). There are still many ambiguities relative to the boundaries of the new discipline, which only the passage of time will clarify. For example, should the boundaries of the family discipline encompass child (human) development (an issue discussed by Burr and Leigh in their 1983 paper "Identity Problems in the Family Field")?

A current need of the new family discipline is the need for baseline data on its departments. This study will help the discipline by providing needed baseline data--both descriptive and evaluative data--on graduate family science departments. It will be interesting to observe the progress the field makes, relative to its graduate training programs, in the years to come.

Descriptions and Evaluations of Graduate Departments in Other Fields

There is a fairly substantial literature on graduate departments in other fields. The major objective of this research has been to evaluate graduate departments; and these evaluations have typically been made only on the basis of reputational rankings obtained from well-known scholars, chairs, or faculty at large, of departments (Hughes, 1934; Keniston, 1959; Cartter, 1969; Roose and Andersen, 1970).

Reputational Ranking Studies

In 1932, the American Council on Education (ACE) appointed a committee on graduate instruction. One issue considered by the newly formed committee was whether it should attempt to prepare a list of graduate schools in the United States offering adequate facilities and staff for work in the various fields. In response largely to protests against the omission of a number of graduate institutions in an earlier publication by ACE, The Handbook of American Universities and Colleges (cited in Hughes, 1934), the Committee on Graduate Instruction decided in favor of compiling a comprehensive list of graduate schools, along with quality-ratings of departments derived from the evaluations of 100 well-known scholars in each field. This study was one of the very earliest recorded

significant attempts to assess the quality of academic departments (Hughes, 1934).

The next major attempt to evaluate graduate programs was made by Keniston in 1959. He obtained rankings similar to those of Hughes (1934) by asking department chairs in 25 leading universities to rate the departments of other universities in their own fields.

Keniston's study (1959) was followed by the ACE's 1964 project (Cartter, 1966), without question the most controversial department evaluation study conducted to date. Cartter (1966) obtained ratings from a wide range of chair-nominated scholars on effectiveness of graduate programs and faculties in 29 fields and 106 different universities.

Raters were asked to characterize the faculty as distinguished, strong, good, adequate, marginal, or not sufficient to provide adequate doctoral training. They also ranked the "effectiveness of doctoral program," classifying each as extremely attractive, attractive, acceptable, or not attractive. Cartter also asked the raters to indicate the changes they would anticipate in the relative positions of departments in their fields in the following 5-10 years.

From these ratings, he rank-ordered the departments within each field. The fact that he obtained a high correlation (r=.90) between the variables "quality of

faculty" and "effectiveness of doctoral program," suggests that they may in fact be a single variable.

Cartter made a great effort to evaluate the validity of the peer rankings he employed. To this end, he compared the peer rankings with rankings by panels of experts, faculty salary levels, library resources, attraction of recipients of fellowships to highly rated programs, and faculty research productivity. The results of his comparisons for the most part were consistent with the rankings obtained via peer ratings.

In the preface to An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Cartter, 1966), Cartter indicated that the ACE, in the planning phase of the project, had agreed to repeat the study within five years to avoid "fixing" the reputations of graduate programs. This commitment was fulfilled in 1970 with the publishing of A Rating of Graduate Programs, by Roose and Andersen (Roose and Andersen, 1970).

The Roose-Andersen study was essentially a replication of Cartter's 1966 study in methodology. However, the 1966 and 1970 studies did differ in several ways. First, to avoid the controversy that Cartter's reputational rankings as a measure of quality of graduate programs had produced, Roose and Andersen avoided the use of the word "quality" and otherwise evaded the quality question as much as possible. In addition, they rank-ordered only those

departments that would have appeared in Cartter's distinguished and strong categories. And finally, they asked raters to estimate the amount of change that had taken place in the last five years in relative positions of departments in their fields, rather than asking for an estimate of future change, as Cartter had done.

Criticisms of Reputational Ranking Studies

Dolan (1976) has undoubtedly been the most vocal opponent of reputational studies, which he believes have reduced quality to "what the experts rank." Dolan sees ranking as little more than a sophisticated form of gossip or a popularity contest. He alleges, in addition, that the graduates of the top-ranked schools are essentially ranking themselves, since they make up such a large proportion of the respondents.

He is also critical of reputational studies because he believes they tend to reflect and reinforce a traditionalist view of higher education. The traditionalist view, Dolan asserts, discourages diversity and innovation in graduate programs and stresses the importance of research, virtually ignoring the importance of the teaching function. Dolan has been especially critical of the ACE-sponsored reputational ranking studies, because the prestige of the ACE and the scope of these studies, he believed, could well have an immeasurably adverse impact on educational institutions,

administrations, state legislators, and even consumer awareness.

Reputational ranking studies have been criticized by many other scholars as well (Webster, 1981, and Lawrence & Green, 1980). A primary concern with regard to the rankings has been their lack of consensus on the definition of quality. Because the definition of quality seems to vary from rater to rater, from program to program, and from discipline to discipline, opponents argue, it is virtually impossible to develop normative standards or to compare programs and institutions.

Another frequently expressed concern of critics of reputational rankings is that they may be subject to four rater biases. First is "the halo effect"--the tendency of raters, when they know little about a department, to judge a specific department in an institution on the basis of their perception of the prestige of the institution as a whole.

There is little support for the existence of the halo effect. Although Abbott (1972) found that university prestige accounted for more of the unexplained variance with sociology departments than any other variable, suggesting that reputational rankings may be subject to the halo effect; the validity of Abbott's index of university prestige is uncertain. Neither Cartter (1966) nor Roose and Andersen (1970) were willing to aggregate department

scores to arrive at university-wide ratings, because (a) they did not know how to weight departments of different fields, and (b) all universities did not have departments in all the fields under study. In spite of these problems, Abbott computed university rankings from the Roose and Andersen data.

In addition, it is not uncommon in studies where the rankers are experts in their fields (e.g., Roose and Andersen, 1970) for departments to receive rankings that either greatly exceed or fall far short of those that would be expected for the institutions in which they are located.

A second source of rater bias has been termed "reputation lag"--the possibility that a department's reputation may lag years behind reality. It may take time for others in the field to become aware of either positive or negative changes that occur in a department and to adjust their perceptions of the department accordingly. Webster (1981) suggests that this type of rater bias probably is not a problem today, because most disciplines have a variety of publications that keep individuals up to date regarding such things as faculty appointments, faculty departures, and other news relevant to their fields.

A third source of rater bias, "degree of rater association with the rated institution," refers to the tendency of raters to assign a high rank to the institution where they are either currently employed or where they

earned their highest degree. This situation may be complicated by the fact that those institutions that produce the greatest number of doctorates also produce the greatest number of raters--one of Dolan's primary concerns. However, Roose and Andersen (1970) and Clark, Hartnett, and Baird (1976) found little evidence for this form of rater bias.

Fourth, an institution's size may affect reputational rankings. Abbott (1972) and Cox and Catt (1977) found a significant though rather weak correlation between faculty size of department, the variable they used to represent size of institution, and the Roose-Andersen ranks ($r = -.24, -.25$).

Support for Reputational Ranking Studies

Reputational ranking studies have also had their supporters/defenders. Although Clark et al. (1976) has been opposed to using peer ranking studies as the exclusive measure of quality of a graduate department, she does feel that they have their place. She suggests that peer rankings should be viewed as one useful measure of quality of graduate departments.

Blackburn and Lingenfelter (1973), in their literature review of reputational studies, have defended at least the ACE-sponsored rankings. They assert that rater bias in the ACE studies had been largely eliminated by careful selection procedures and that professional peers are quite

capable and sufficiently competent to evaluate the central criterion in reputational studies: scholarly work. In addition, they assert that although scholarly productivity is not a sufficient condition of general excellence, it is most definitely a necessary condition for a good doctoral program.

A final argument by Blackburn and Lingenfelter, in defense of reputational ranking studies, is that, like it or not, subjectivity is inescapable in program quality research, regardless of the method employed. This argument is consistent with Cartter's view that quality can be no more than someone's subjective assessment, because quality is essentially an attribute of value or, in other words, a matter of opinion.

Regardless of the arguments pro and con in the reputational ranking controversy, this approach to assessing quality of graduate programs will, in all likelihood, continue to be used because of the high face validity of the measure (Lewis, 1968; Blackburn and Lingenfelter, 1973). Along these lines, Lewis (1968) has observed that it is primarily the prestige of a department that has meaning to the consumer-student and to those individuals responsible for the dispensing of research and training grants.

Because this measure of quality of graduate departments appears to have meaning to some individuals, in

spite of its weaknesses, and because it has been used so extensively in studies of graduate departments in other fields, the decision was made to have faculty rank family science departments in this study. It will be possible to explore the effects of two of the forms of rater bias--degree of rater association with the rated institution and size of department; good measures of the halo effect and reputation lag do not exist currently.

Objective Correlates of Reputational Rankings

Much research has sought to identify the departmental characteristics that predict the rankings (Lewis, 1968; Siebring, 1969; Hagstrom, 1970; Elton and Rogers, 1971; Abbott, 1972). In 1970, Hagstrom of the University of Wisconsin, conducted a study aimed at identifying the correlates of departmental prestige. Data were obtained from probability samples of faculty in university departments in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology, American Men of Science (career data), and the 1966 edition of Science Citation Index. Finally, information about the departments under study, as well as the departments from which sampled faculty members had received their baccalaureate and doctorate degrees, was taken from Cartter's An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (1966) and Astin's Who Goes Where to College (1965).

Hagstrom (1970) found a strong positive correlation between department prestige and department size (r=.57), faculty research productivity (r=.36), quality of faculty doctoral institution (r=.51), and undergraduate selectivity of students (r=.42). In addition to the correlates mentioned above, Hagstrom also found a weak relationship between prestige and faculty morale, defined as dissatisfaction professors feel with regard to their influence on departmental decisions affecting them (r = .26). With regard to faculty research productivity, "citations to published works" proved to be a better predictor of departmental prestige than "quantity of articles published." Hagstrom also found a weak relationship between "research opportunities," defined as mean time spent on research, and the rankings (r=.25).

In 1971, Elton and Rogers studied the relationship between reputational rankings of physics departments, appearing in the Cartter study, and a number of randomly selected variables. They found that the number of faculty in a department, number of PhDs awarded in a five-year span of time, and number of graduate students were positively correlated with Cartter's rankings of physics departments.

Abbott's (1972) study of prestige of sociology departments sought to ascertain the effects of department research productivity, doctoral output, and size of faculty on the Roose-Andersen (1970) quality ratings. Doctoral

output was operationally defined as the number of doctorates conferred by a department between 1964 and 1968. Size of faculty was defined as the number of full-time and joint faculty reported by a department for 1969. An index of the last variable, department research productivity, was obtained from an article by Glenn and Villemez (1970). This index is based on a weighting of all books, articles, and research notes reviewed in The American Sociological Review (ASR), as well as in a number of other sociology-oriented journals. The weights were derived from the responses of a sample of sociologists who were asked to assign weights to each kind of publication. Weights were adjusted for prominence of journal. Abbott found faculty research productivity, doctoral output, and faculty size to be positively correlated with the rankings.

Lewis (1968) examined the relationship between reputational rankings and productivity of doctoral graduate students and faculty of 17 sociology departments included in Cartter's study in an attempt to "begin to answer the nagging question of how closely the subjective ranking of phenomenon approximates its objective ranking." Productivity was defined as the number of articles a department's graduates and faculty members had published in the American Sociological Review in 1965 and 1966. Productivity of doctoral graduates and of faculty of these departments was intended to reflect Cartter's effectiveness

of graduate training and quality of faculty respectively. Lewis found a high level of agreement between the subjective rankings and his objective measures of quality for some institutions, notably Harvard, Wisconsin, and North Carolina.

There were also some rather outstanding inconsistencies. In attempting to account for these inconsistencies, Lewis discovered that sociology departments whose prestige was significantly higher than would seemingly be warranted by graduate or faculty productiveness had one or two eminent faculty members in their departments, they were located in private or relatively small institutions, or both. On the basis of this information, he reasoned that a department that is not especially strong, according to objective criteria, may be accorded sufficient prestige by virtue of the fact that it has one or two "star" faculty members in its ranks. Conversely, a department located in a large public university that can boast no eminent faculty may be down-rated, even though it has a competent and effective faculty.

Siebring (1969) studied the relationship between reputational rankings and rankings based on the number of faculty who had been elected to the National Academy of Science (NAS) in each physics, chemistry, and math department studied. Siebring found a strong positive

correlation between Cartter's reputational rankings and his own rankings based on NAS membership. He suggested that the same relationship would likely not be found in most other fields, inasmuch as they typically have no more than one member of NAS.

Much research, then, has focused on identifying the characteristics of graduate departments in other fields that differentiate between high- and low-ranked departments. This information may be of value to departments seeking to improve the quality of their departments. It may also provide clues to what faculty are basing their rankings of departments on. For these reasons it was decided to compare high- and low-ranked family science departments in this study.

Departments were compared on many of the characteristics that scholars in other fields have studied relative to the peer rankings (e.g., size of department, selectivity of undergraduate students, faculty morale, and doctoral output), and on other characteristics of departments obtained for this study.

Literature in other fields also indicates that faculty productivity is an important variable in distinguishing between high-ranked graduate departments and other graduate departments. Therefore, it was originally intended to obtain information on the scholarly productivity of faculty from their vitaes, which departments were supposed to

return with their completed department survey. However, this variable was dropped from the study because approximately half of the participating departments failed to return the vitaes, and others returned vitaes for only some of their faculty. The faculty survey, however, does provide data on a related variable; the percent of professional time faculty estimate they spend in research and scholarly writing.

Clark and Multiple Criteria Evaluation of Graduate Departments

In 1973, Clark, then with Educational Testing Services, decided to "go ask the experts" for their ideas regarding which aspects of graduate programs they felt were most closely related to educational quality in three different types of programs: those designed to train researchers, those designed to train teachers, and those designed to train professional practitioners. This study grew out of concern among many individuals, including graduate school deans, about the limitations of reputational rankings as the only widely used measure of quality of graduate departments (Clark, 1973).

Fifty-three graduate school deans rated the importance of a variety of faculty, student, and program characteristics relative to these three types of graduate programs. In addition, they rated the adequacy of a number

of possible ways to measure the program characteristics they had identified as important.

From the responses of the graduate school deans, Clark identified 30 doctoral program characteristics that deans viewed as important for each of the three types of graduate programs, along with their estimates of the adequacy and feasibility of several indicators of each characteristic. The 30 program characteristics identified in this study include characteristics of faculty, students, physical and financial resources of the graduate departments/ universities, and general operations.

In 1976 Clark et al. conducted a study of 73 chemistry, history, and psychology graduate departments, using the criteria and measures identified by Clark's deans (1973). This study gave equal attention to quantitative aspects of programs, program purposes, and perceptions and judgments of program participants in an effort to take a broader view of educational quality and to improve its assessment.

Program participants, who included department chairs, faculty, students, and alumni, were asked to characterize their departments by responding to a number of statements regarding people, programs, and policies, evaluate their programs with respect to their personal needs and interests, and rank graduate departments in their fields of study. From the data, profiles were constructed comparing

individual doctoral programs with all other doctoral programs under study in the same field.

Clark et al. (1976) found faculty self-ratings of adequacy of library and lab facilities, quality of faculty environment, faculty scholarly productivity, and size of department (defined as number of doctoral students) to be related to the peer quality rankings.

One interesting finding was that the overwhelming majority of doctoral programs identify the preparation of researchers/scholars as their primary goal. This finding resulted in lack of data that might reveal indicators that could assess other purposes of doctoral programs.

Clark's 1973 study and the Clark et al. (1976) study represent a big step toward the fulfillment of the need of the academic profession, addressed by Dolan (1976), to clearly identify the criteria to be examined for graduate department evaluation studies. Clark provided a useful framework for evaluating graduate departments; one that has expert and face validity. For this reason her framework was used in the present study.

Clark's deans (1973) also indicated that they thought it would be important to examine the perceptions of recent graduates and current students of graduate departments. With regard to information from recent graduates, the majority of the participating family departments indicated on their departmental survey that they did not have current

addresses or phone numbers of their alumni. Thus this source of data on departments was dropped from the study.

Information from current students of the departments was not obtained because it is difficult to obtain this information without the aid of paid campus research coordinators who deliver the surveys to the students and pick them up when they are completed (Clark et al., 1976).

Studies of Graduate Education in the Family Field

The prior research about family-oriented departments was also examined in an attempt to identify additional types of data on the new family discipline that would be useful. It was discovered that relatively little research has been conducted on these departments.

In 1958, Christensen conducted an in-depth study of the perceptions of marriage and family life educators who taught college courses, either at the undergraduate or graduate level, or high school courses in the family. The names of faculty were obtained from the NCFR office. He asked family life educators to indicate the amount of freedom they felt they had in deciding on course content and the manner in which they taught classes; the vast majority indicated they either had complete freedom or a lot of freedom.

One of the most interesting findings in Christensen's study related to the "most logical academic department for

the teaching of marriage and family courses." The largest number of respondents (193) indicated that these courses should be taught in family life departments. A smaller number indicated that they should be offered in a sociology (144) or home economics department (87). This is particularly interesting because, as Christensen pointed out, there were only very few departments of family life in this country when he conducted his study. Christensen concluded that the respondents seemed to be expressing a desire for the formation of more departments of this kind.

In 1959 Landis reported on marriage and family course offerings in American colleges, junior colleges, and universities. Of the 630 schools that responded to his questionnaire, 82% indicated that they offered one or more courses in marriage and the family, for a total of 1,027 different marriage and family courses.

In 1961, Neubeck reviewed academic programs in the marriage counseling area. A survey was sent to and returned by 21 graduate departments known to offer some work in the field, including departments of social work, home economics, and family relations. In addition, the survey was sent to 63 graduate professional schools of social work, of which 37 responded.

Neubeck reported, on the basis of his research, that only eight colleges had a graduate program leading to a degree with a major in marriage counseling. Seven

institutions allowed a student to minor in marriage counseling. Sixteen institutions offered an "incidental" course in marriage counseling, and 41 institutions offered a course that included some discussion on marriage counseling. Seven percent of the institutions reported that they had a social work curriculum that included courses in marriage counseling, and 5% reported they offered a marriage counseling curriculum in social work. The departments that reported offering marriage counseling courses included departments of home and family life education, education, human development and family relations, sociology, school of social work, psychology, child welfare, educational psychology, and home economics.

In 1982, Love compiled a list of graduate family-oriented departments, for use by prospective graduate students. She briefly summarized information on size of department and university, whether the department offered a master's or doctorate degree or both, admission requirements, graduate course offerings, special programs, financial aid available to students, benefits available to graduate students, and career options for graduates of the department.

In the spring of 1984, Roleder and a team of five scholars combined efforts to study several aspects of family programs. Roleder visited family-oriented departments at 18 universities. During this tour he

interviewed 120 scholars and left forms to be completed by selected faculty members on which they were asked to indicate the best 10 of 53 university departments offering an MS or PhD in "family living, family relations, family development, etc." in five areas: theory/research, training family life educators, training marriage and family therapists, publishing family theory and research, and producing educational materials. Fifty-five forms were returned, for a response rate of 46%. Roleder's tour provided the data for a number of studies.

As part of the Roleder study, Burr, Schvaneveldt, Roleder, and Marshall (1984) analyzed the ranking data and computed an overall eminence ranking by combining the rankings for the five areas. Day, Peterson, and Roleder (1984) used the Roleder data to study professional networks and hiring patterns of top-rated family science programs. Peterson, Day, and Roleder (1984) used the Roleder data to determine (a) the theoretical orientations of members of the faculties of the participating family-oriented departments, (b) whether these faculty members identified with one framework or used a variety of perspectives, and (c) whether the faculty members surveyed attempted to sway graduate students toward their own theoretical orientations.

Finally, Edmonds (1984) used the Roleder data, in addition to data she had collected from 10 additional

universities, to study internships in family programs. These scholars cautioned that the relatively low response rate, small sample size, accidental nature of the sample, and absence of data on the respondents limited the generalizations that could be made from the data.

The examination of the prior research on family-oriented departments resulted in the addition of two items to the department survey: one item asks departments to identify their course offerings; the other asks them to specify their graduate degree programs.

Focus of the Study

Analysis of the literature on graduate departments in other fields of study, and relative to family-oriented departments led to the determination that this study would provide the following types of data: (a) information on graduate family science departments from the departments themselves, most of which Clark's deans (1973) deemed to be important data to have on graduate departments; (b) data on faculty perceptions of specific aspects of their departments, as well as the percentage of time they spend in six professional activities, also deemed by Clark's deans (1973) to be important aspects of departments to evaluate; (c) peer ranking data, the major form of data available on graduate departments in other fields; and (d) a comparison of high-ranked family science doctoral departments with other family science doctoral departments

on data from the department and faculty surveys, in an effort to determine how high-ranked doctoral departments differ from low- or non-ranking doctoral departments--a concern of many studies in other fields.

Chapter II

Methodology

This chapter describes the procedure followed to identify family science departments and to gather data about them. In addition, issues associated with the response rate to the surveys and generalizability of the findings are discussed.

Sources of Data

There were two sources of data for this study. The first was all the family science departments that could be identified as having graduate family training programs. The second source of data was a randomly selected sample consisting of approximately 40% of all of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the family science departments (n=205).

For the past several years, a number of scholars have been trying to identify existing and newly emerging family graduate programs. In 1982, one of these scholars, Love, compiled a list of 71 U.S. and Canadian graduate family-oriented programs from three sources: (a) Student Perspectives; the Index of Majors 1979-1980, published by

the College Board, (b) information provided by NCFR, and (c) an announcement "call" in two of NCFR's newsletters.

Department surveys were sent to all 71 departments listed in Love's A Guide to Graduate Family Programs, inasmuch as data on all departments having any type of family-oriented major were being sought by another study. Each department whose name, as indicated on their returned department survey, had the word family in the department title was included in the present study. In addition, departments that did not return a department survey but that met the criteria in 1982 for inclusion in the present study were contacted by telephone to confirm that the name of their department still met the criteria for inclusion in the listing of family science departments (see Appendix A).

Other steps were taken to identify additional family science departments. First, the NCFR office was contacted for any additional names of graduate family science departments they might have become aware of; and second, publications in the field were examined for names of graduate family science departments.

In addition, a number of departments that had seen or heard about Love's guide or who had heard about the proposed computer repository of graduate family departments wrote to either Love or Burr requesting inclusion in Love's forthcoming revised guide or in the computer repository. These were home economics, nursing, and sociology

departments. Although these departments will appear in Love's guide and will be represented in the computer repository, they were not included in the present study because they were something other than family science departments, as defined in this study. These procedures identified 47 departments that met the criteria for inclusion in this study (see Appendix A).

Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were developed for this study; a department survey and a faculty survey. Most of the measures selected for study were taken from Clark's 1973 study in which deans of graduate schools identified the aspects of graduate programs they felt were most closely related to educational quality, as well as from the Clark et al. (1976) study, which provided a test of the findings of the 1973 study. Two measures that were not taken from Clark's studies--course offerings and graduate degree programs of departments--were included in the study because they were judged to provide useful descriptive data on graduate departments.

Other measures were included because of their relevance to other projects that will be using the data of this study. Data on the latter will not be discussed in this paper.

The Department Survey

The department survey (see Appendix B) sought general information from departments on the departments themselves, including information on tenured and tenure-track faculty members, students, graduate majors offered, and the university itself. The department survey was revised a number of times on the basis of feedback from a number of individuals in the field, including a number of individuals who were either then serving as chairs of their departments or who had previously served as chairs.

The Faculty Survey

The faculty survey (see Appendix C) asked the faculty of family science departments for their judgments regarding various elements of their departments, such as their satisfaction with freedom of faculty members to plan courses and the adequacy of their university library's family science-oriented holdings. In addition, faculty members were asked to report the percentage of their time they spend in six professional activities and to rank what they believe to be the 10 "best" graduate family departments. Faculty ranked family science graduate departments using an alphabetical listing of the departments. All the items on the faculty survey, with the exception of the item that asks faculty members to rank order the 10 best family science departments, were taken

from the faculty instrument used by Clark et al. in their 1976 study of quality in three disciplines.

The format of some of the questions was revised a number of times on the basis of feedback from individuals in the field. In addition, the faculty survey was pretested with a small sample of faculty members and modified on the basis of their responses.

The rankings in the present study were obtained in a different manner than in the Burr et al. study (1984). In the present study, faculty were asked only to rank the top-10 departments. In the Burr et al. (1984) study, faculty were asked to rank the top-10 departments in each of five areas. These five sets of rankings were then combined to arrive at an overall top-10 rating of departments.

There are advantages and disadvantages to both approaches to rating departments. A summed index, such as that used by Burr et al. (1984), is generally believed to provide greater reliability and assurance of representativeness of components of the general factor of which they are a part (Guilford, 1954). On the other hand, if little is known about the relative importance of factors that contribute to the factor in question, perhaps a single index offers a superior measure because mere summation of components may introduce distortion.

Because little is known about the relative importance of the five dimensions in Burr's study to quality of

departments and because of the difficulty Burr et al. (1984) experienced in arriving at an overall ranking, it was decided to simply ask faculty rankers to indicate which departments they considered to be the 10 "best" departments.

In the early peer ranking studies, ratings of graduate departments were conducted by well-known scholars, identified by the professional associations of the fields under study (Hughes, 1934) or the chairs of departments (Keniston, 1959). It was assumed that these individuals would know more about the various departments in their fields, and thus their ratings would be a more valid measure of quality of graduate departments. However, Cartter (1966) found little differences in the way department chairmen, distinguished senior scholars, and junior scholars rated departments. He also felt, based on his analysis of Hughes' (1934) and Keniston's (1959) studies, that a broad sample that includes scholars of different ages and ranks would be less subject to distortion from such things as over- or under-representation of special fields within a discipline or of geographical location of raters.

With regard to the former, department chairs in any academic discipline tend to come from one or two specialized subject areas within their fields, a fact that may lead to distortion of the ratings of departments by

these individuals (Cartter, 1966). With regard to the latter, there is evidence that distinguished scholars may be concentrated in specific geographical regions of the country, a fact that also could lead to distortion of department ratings (Cartter, 1966).

On the basis of this information and following the precedent started by Burr et al, in their 1984 ranking of family-oriented departments, it was decided to use a randomly selected sample of all faculty members of participating departments, including chairs, senior, and junior scholars.

Kent State did not get listed on the ranking sheet because of a mix-up related to the name of its department. Abilene Christian University, Arizona State University, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, East Michigan University, and Northern Illinois University were listed on the ranking sheet by mistake. They do not have family science departments as defined by this study.

The rankings are based on the mean of the votes received from faculty respondents. As in the Burr et al. (1984) study, only departments that received at least 10 votes were included in the computing of the rankings. This requirement was made because as Burr et al. (1984) observed, "an occasional single ranking of #1 would have a mean of 1 and that program would appear as the most eminent program when only one person was of that opinion."

It was possible in this study to evaluate whether or not two of the four forms of rater biases--degree of rater association with the rated institution, and size of institution--may have influenced the rankings of this study. To evaluate the effects of the former, the raw rankings were compared with rankings controlled for university of highest degree of rankers and university of current employment. To evaluate the latter, t-tests were run comparing high- and low-ranked departments on faculty size, the measure used by Abbott (1972) and Cox and Catt (1977) to represent size of institution.

There are at present no good measures of either the halo effect or reputation lag. With regard to the former, the validity of aggregating department scores to obtain a measure of the eminence of a university has been questioned (Cartter, 1966; Roose and Andersen, 1970). With regard to reputation lag, no one has found a way to actually measure whether this variable biases reputational rankings.

Data Collection Procedure

The data for this study were collected in two stages. The department surveys were sent to the chairs of the 50 departments on February 11, 1985, along with the cover letter explaining the purposes of the study (see Appendix D).

The deadline for return of the questionnaire was set for March 30, 1985. However, at the end of that time only

19 departments had returned their questionnaires. When contacted, many departments indicated that they simply needed more time to gather the information requested in the survey. As a result, a new deadline of July 15, 1985, was set. Departments that had not returned their completed surveys by the first deadline were contacted by telephone in an attempt to solicit their assistance. A second copy of the survey was sent to departments that reported they had not received it or had lost it.

Information secured from the first return of department surveys, coupled with feedback received from telephone contacts with departments, indicated that most departments were not able to provide information on their alumni. Many departments indicated that they do not keep up-to-date information on their alumni. One department that supplied alumni information commented, "Talk about academic detective work! We simply do not keep track of former students, and tracking them down was exceedingly difficult." One department indicated that it could not release alumni information because of confidentiality laws. As a result of this information, it was decided to drop alumni data from the study.

A letter of reminder was sent to all departments that had not returned their surveys by June 11, 1985 (see Appendix E). Two other purposes of this letter were (a) to notify participating departments of the new deadline of

July 15th and (b) to inform departments that they need not supply data on their alumni. Forty-one, or approximately 87% of the departments contacted, returned the completed survey.

The names of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the family science departments under study were randomly selected from lists of faculty provided by the departments on the department survey. The faculty surveys were sent to participating faculty members July 15, 1985. The sample consisted of 205 family science faculty, or approximately 50% of the tenured or tenure-track faculty of each of the participating departments. When departments had three or fewer total faculty, surveys were sent to all the faculty. In the case of an odd number of faculty (e.g., North Dakota with seven faculty), surveys were sent to half, plus one.

Faculty surveys were not sent to the faculty of five departments that returned department surveys: The University of Guelph, Michigan State University, Texas Tech, Iowa State, and the University of Kansas. In the case of the University of Guelph, the faculty information section of the department survey was not completed. Data on faculty members from Guelph, reported in this study, were obtained from a brochure located well after the faculty surveys had been mailed out. The department surveys from Michigan State, Texas Tech University, Iowa

State University, and the University of Kansas were received after the mailing date for faculty surveys.

The faculty questionnaires were accompanied by a cover letter similar to the letter that accompanied the questionnaire sent out to departments (see Appendix F). The deadline for return of these questionnaires was set for August 23, 1985. Questionnaires that had not been returned by participating faculty members by August 23, 1985 were not included in the study.

Eighty-seven faculty members from 29 departments completed the survey, for a response rate of 42%. An important question to consider with regard to the faculty surveys is why so few faculty members completed the faculty survey. One possible explanation is that many faculty members were not on campus when the surveys went out in the summer. There is some evidence for this explanation. A number of faculty surveys came in much later than the August 23 deadline, with a note attached saying that the respondents had been off campus during the summer.

Another possible explanation is that many faculty members may oppose the use of peer rankings as an evaluative measure of departments. Three faculty respondents who did not complete the ranking page of the faculty survey commented on their survey form that they were opposed to peer rankings of departments. There is some evidence in the literature outside of the field for

this explanation. Whereas Cartter (1966) and Roose-Andersen (1970) each reported a response rate of approximately 80% in their peer ranking studies, only 62% of a sample of a ranking study conducted in 1982 returned surveys (Jones, Lindzey, and Coggesshall, 1982); and Burr et al. (1984) had only a 46% response rate. Jones et al. (1982) attributed their low response rate in large part to what they termed "a growing dissatisfaction, in the years since the Cartter (1966) and Roose-Andersen (1970) studies, with educational assessments based on reputational measures."

A third possible explanation for the low response rate may be that faculty may just not have been given sufficient time to complete and return the survey. Had they been given an additional three weeks or so, perhaps this alone would have increased the response rate.

A final possible explanation for the low response rate may be the fact that only one copy of the faculty survey was sent to each of the faculty members in the sample; and in addition, they were not contacted to remind them of the survey. Cartter (1966) contacted faculty members multiple times by mail. Jones et al. (1982), on the other hand, did not follow up with a card or letter of reminder.

The rate of response to the faculty survey raises the question whether the sample is different from family science faculty in general. For this reason, Chi Square

tests were used to compare faculty respondents with all of the faculty of participating departments on the two dimensions that data were available on; rank and geographical location. The Chi Square test is used with frequency data to determine whether there is a significant difference between the frequencies observed in two groups. It was reasoned that if the proportions were found to be similar, this would at least provide some evidence that the sample is similar to the faculty population. This would, in turn increase confidence in the findings.

The country was divided, for purposes of analysis, into four regions: North Central, Northeast, South, and West, a system frequently used by the U.S. Census Bureau (see Table 1). The Universities of Manitoba and Guelph were included in the North Central sector, and the University of Alberta was included in the Western sector. Alpha was set at .20. The rationale for using a larger alpha than that which is standardly used (i.e., .05) was that in most tests of hypothesis the researcher is hoping to reject the null hypothesis. Thus a small alpha is used, making it more difficult for the researcher to do that which he or she wants to do--reject the null hypothesis. In the present situation, however, just the opposite is true. The researcher would like not to have to reject the null hypothesis that the sample and the parent population are similar on the dimensions tested. In this

Table 1

Geographical Divisions of the United States

North Central	Northeast
Illinois	Connecticut
Indiana	Maine
Iowa	Massachusetts
Kansas	New Hampshire
Michigan	New Jersey
Minnesota	New York
Missouri	Pennsylvania
Nebraska	Rhode Island
North Dakota	Vermont
Ohio	
South Dakota	
Wisconsin	
West	**South**
Alaska	Alabama
Arizona	Arkansas
California	Delaware
Colorado	Florida
Hawaii	Georgia
Idaho	Kentucky
Montana	Louisiana
Nevada	Maryland
New Mexico	Mississippi
Oregon	North Carolina
Utah	Oklahoma
Washington	South Carolina
Wyoming	Tennessee
	Texas
	Virginia
	Washington D.C.
	West Virginia

Note. From "County and City Data Book, 1983: A Statistical Abstract Supplement" (p.xvi) by U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1983.

case, a conservative approach requires a higher alpha level.

The results of this testing are shown in Tables 2 and 3. A significant difference between faculty respondents and the parent population was found in the proportion of faculty who are professors, associate professors, and assistant professors ($x=4.57$, $p=.10$). An analysis of Table 2 reveals that the proportion of professors in the sample is somewhat higher than in the parent population and that the proportion of associate professors is somewhat lower. Relative to geographical location, although Table 3 suggests that the South is somewhat overrepresented in the sample and the North Central region is somewhat underrepresented, the difference was not large enough to be statistically significant.

Because the sample and the parent population were found to differ in terms of the proportion of faculty who are professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, the data obtained from faculty should be viewed as suggestive only. Caution should be exercised in generalizing to the population of family science faculty.

Table 2

The Distribution of Faculty Sample Respondents and the Population of all Faculty Members of Participating Departments by Rank

	Respondents--Total Faculty Population	
Rank	Respondents No.	Total Faculty Pop. No.
Professor	37	186
Associate Professor	21	188
Assistant Professor	23	145
TOTAL	81	519

$X^2 = 4.57$, 2 degrees of freedom, $P = .10$

Table 3

The Distribution of Faculty Sample Respondents and the Population of all Faculty Members of Participating Departments by Geographical Location

	Respondents--Total Faculty Population	
Geographical Location	Respondents No.	Total Faculty Pop. No.
North Central	27	214
Northeast	12	65
South	33	155
West	15	85
TOTAL	87	519

$X^2 = 4.24$, 3 degrees of freedom, $P = .24$

Chapter III

Results

The findings are reported in four sections. In the first section the information about departments, supplied by the departments themselves, is presented. Whenever feasible, the departments have been placed in rank order on the tables, from the department having the highest value on a measure (e.g., number of faculty members) to the department having the lowest value on that measure.

In the second section, the perceptions of faculty respondents with regard to their departments, as well as the amount of time they spend in various professional activities, is presented. Because of the low response rate, no attempt is made to rank departments based on the faculty perception items. In six cases only one faculty member from a department returned a completed faculty survey form. It seemed inappropriate to this author to make a judgment about a department based on one individual's perception of that department.

The results of the faculty ranking of family science departments are presented in the third section; the

comparison of high- and low-ranked departments appears in the fourth section.

Characteristics of Departments

The information that follows on different aspects of departments is important and useful for a number of reasons. First, it is desirable that scholars of the new discipline know what is happening in the various graduate training programs in the field. In addition, the data may prove to be helpful to policymakers who must make decisions on such matters as hiring new faculty, recruiting students, and improving departments in general. This information also has relevance to prospective students who are "shopping around" for a graduate training program that fits their needs and capacities.

Size of Departments

Department size based on number of faculty members. Forty-one of the 41 responding departments provided information on number of tenured or tenure-track faculty members in their department (see Table 4). Only faculty members who were identified as professors, associate professors or assistant professors were considered in the computation of the number of faculty members in the departments. There are 519 faculty members across the forty-one reporting universities. Departments range in size from West Virginia University's 2 faculty members to

Table 4

Number of Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty by Department[a]

University	No. of Faculty
The Pennsylvania State University	34
Brigham Young University	29
University of Kansas	26
University of Guelph	22
Michigan State University	22
Texas Tech University	21
University of Connecticut	19
University of Delaware	19
Iowa State University	18
San Diego State University	18
Purdue University	17
Virginia Polytech Institute	17
University of Kentucky	16
University of Georgia	13
Kansas State University	13
Kent State University	13
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	13
Oklahoma State University	13
Colorado State University	12
Florida State University	12
University of Minnesota	12
University of Nebraska	12
University of Tennessee	10
Utah State University	9
University of Akron	9
Ohio State University	9
University of Wisconsin-Madison	9
University of Missouri-Columbia	8
Syracuse University	8
University of Texas at Austin	8
University of Manitoba	7
North Dakota State University	7
University of Alberta	6
Auburn University	6
University of Illinois	6
Oregon State University	6
The University of Arizona	5
East Carolina University	5
Teachers College, Columbia University	4
University of Wisconsin-Stout	4
West Virginia University	2
TOTAL	519

[a]Only includes faculty who are assistant, associate, or full professors Mean = 12.66, Median = 12.00, SD = 7.21

Penn State's 34. The mean number of faculty is 12.66 (SD=7.21).

Department size based on enrollment in master's programs. Thirty of the 40 departments offering the master's degree provided information on the number of students enrolled in their master's program(s) in 1983-84 (see Table 5). There is a great deal of variability in the size of master's programs. Departments ranged from Syracuse, with 8 master's students, to the University of Nebraska, with 175. The department with the 2nd highest enrollment is Purdue, with 83 master's students, far below Nebraska's reported enrollment. The mean enrollment in master's programs is 35.00 (SD=31.64).

Department size based on enrollment in doctoral programs. Twenty of the 27 departments having doctoral programs provided information on the number of students enrolled in their doctoral programs from 1983-84. As Table 6 indicates, the number of students enrolled in doctoral programs in 1983-84 ranged from the University of Guelph, with 2 doctoral students, to Virginia Polytech Institute, with 73. The mean enrollment in doctoral programs in 1983-84 was 32.25 (SD=21.60).

Ratio of graduate students to graduate faculty. From information supplied by departments on the number of faculty members involved with graduate students and the number of graduate students enrolled in graduate programs

Table 5

Number of Master's Students 1983-84
by Department

University	No. of MS Students
University of Nebraska	175
Purdue University	83
Michigan State University	74
Brigham Young University	55
Oklahoma State University	52
West Virginia University	42
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	41
Utah State University	39
University of Kentucky	34
University of Guelph	33
Colorado State University	32
Iowa State University	32
Ohio State University	31
University of Connecticut	29
University of Illinois	25
University of Manitoba	25
University of Wisconsin-Stout	24
University of Minnesota	22
University of Alberta	20
East Carolina University	20
Virginia Polytech Institute	20
The University of Arizona	19
North Dakota State University	19
University of Texas at Austin	19
University of Missouri-Columbia	17
University of Tennessee	17
University of Georgia	16
Florida State University	15
Oregon State University	11
Syracuse University	8
University of Akron	-
Auburn University	-
Teachers College, Columbia University	-
University of Delaware	-
Kansas State University	-
University of Kansas	-
Kent State University	-
The Pennsylvania State University	-
San Diego State University	-
University of Wisconsin at Madison	-
Texas Tech University	N/A

Mean = 35.00 Median = 25.00, SD = 31.64

- = Data not provided N/A = Not applicable

Table 6

Number of Doctoral Students 1983-84
by Department

University	No. of Doctoral Students
Virginia Polytech Institute	73
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	67
Purdue University	63
Florida State University	53
University of Minnesota	51
Michigan State University	46
University of Wisconsin at Madison	44
Ohio State University	40
University of Georgia	28
Iowa State University	28
Oklahoma State University	28
Oregon State University	25
University of Tennessee	25
University of Missouri-Columbia	22
Brigham Young University	20
University of Connecticut	16
Syracuse University	7
Utah State University	4
University of Alberta	3
University of Guelph	2
Teachers College, Columbia University	-
University of Delaware	-
Kansas State University	-
University of Kansas	-
The Pennsylvania State University	-
Texas Tech University	-
University of Akron	N/A
The University of Arizona	N/A
Auburn University	N/A
Colorado State University	N/A
East Carolina University	N/A
University of Illinois	N/A
Kent State University	N/A
University of Kentucky	N/A
University of Manitoba	N/A
University of Nebraska	N/A
North Dakota State University	N/A
San Diego State University	N/A
University of Texas at Austin	N/A
West Virginia University	N/A
University of Wisconsin-Stout	N/A

Mean = 32.25, Median = 28, SD = 21.60

- = Data not provided N/A = Not applicable

in 1983-84, the ratio of graduate students to graduate faculty was computed for 29 departments. Table 7 reports this information. Kentucky and Pennsylvania State[2] had the lowest ratio of graduate students to graduate faculty, with 2.1 graduate students to 1 faculty member; and West Virginia the highest, with 21 graduate students to 1 faculty. The mean ratio of graduate students to graduate faculty is 6.23:1 (SD=3.87).

Number of graduating master's students. Information on the number of students graduating from master's programs in 1983-84 was provided by 31 of the 40 departments having master's programs (see Table 8). Departments ranged in the number of master's students graduating from the University of Georgia, with 1 graduating master's student, to Michigan State University, with 27. The mean number of graduates from master's programs was 8.48 (SD=6.54).

Number of graduating doctoral students. Twenty-one of the 27 departments having doctoral programs provided information on the number of students graduating from their doctoral programs in 1983-84 (see Table 9). Two departments, Utah State University and Iowa State University, reported no graduates. Beyond these

---

[2]Pennsylvania State University reported the number of students enrolled in its graduate programs in 1983-84 without differentiating between master's and doctoral students. Thus, although the number of master's students and the number of doctoral students could not be reported, it was possible to compute the ratio of graduate students to graduate faculty.

Table 7

Ratio of Graduate Students to
Graduate Faculty by Department 1983-84

Department	No. of Grad Students	No. of Faculty Involved W/Grad Students	Ratio
Kentucky	34	16	2.1:1
Penn. State	71	34	2.1:1
Connecticut	45	19	2.4:1
Syracuse	15	6	2.5:1
Colorado	32	12	2.7:1
North Dakota	19	7	2.7:1
BYU	75	22	3.4:1
Manitoba	25	7	3.6:1
Univ. of Arizona	19	5	3.8:1
East Carolina	20	5	4:1
Illinois	25	6	4.2:1
Tennessee	42	10	4.2:1
Georgia	44	10	4.4:1
Utah State	43	9	4.8:1
Virginia Polytech	93	17	5.5:1
Wisconsin at Madison	44	8	5.5:1
Alberta	23	4	5.7:1
Michigan	120	21	5.7:1
Oregon	36	6	6:1
Wisconsin-Stout	24	4	6:1
Florida State	68	11	6.2:1
Missouri-Columbia	39	6	6.5:1
Minnesota	73	11	6.6:1
Ohio State	71	9	7.9:1
Oklahoma	80	10	8:1
North Carolina	108	13	8.3:1
Purdue	146	17	8.6:1
Nebraska	175	9	19.4:1
West Virginia	42	2	21:1
Akron	-	-	-
Auburn	-	-	-
Columbia	-	-	-
Delaware	-	-	-
Guelph	-	-	-
Iowa	-	-	-
Kansas State	-	-	-
Univ. of Kansas	-	-	-
Kent State	-	-	-
San Diego	-	-	-
Texas Tech.	-	-	-
Texas at Austin	-	-	-

Mean = 6.23:1, Median = 5.5:1, SD = 3.87
- Insufficient data to compute ratio

Table 8

Number of Students Graduating from Master's Programs in 1983-84 by Department

University	No. of Graduating MS Students
Michigan State University	27
University of Kansas	26
University of Kentucky	16
Oklahoma State University	16
Virginia Polytech Institute	16
Brigham Young University	13
University of Connecticut	12
Purdue University	12
University of Wisconsin-Stout	12
San Diego State University	11
Iowa State University	10
Syracuse University	10
The University of Arizona	8
Colorado State University	7
University of Alberta	6
University of Missouri-Columbia	6
Ohio State University	6
The Pennsylvania State University	6
Auburn University	5
East Carolina University	5
North Dakota State University	5
University of Minnesota	4
Utah State University	4
Florida State University	3
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	3
University of Tennessee	3
The University of Texas at Austin	3
University of Wisconsin at Madison	3
Oregon State University	2
West Virginia University	2
University of Georgia	1
Teachers College, Columbia University	-
University of Nebraska	-
Kent State University	-
University of Guelph	-
Kansas State University	-
University of Delaware	-
University of Akron	-
University of Illinois	-
University of Manitoba	-
Texas Tech University	N/A

Mean = 8.48, Median = 6, SD = 6.54

- = Data not provided N/A = Not applicable

Table 9

Number of Students Graduating from Doctoral Programs in 1983-84 by Department

University	No. of PhD Graduates
University of Kansas	18
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	17
University of Georgia	16
University of Minnesota	10
Florida State University	8
Ohio State University	8
University of Tennessee	8
The Pennsylvania State University	7
Brigham Young University	6
Oklahoma State University	6
Teachers College, Columbia University	5
Michigan State University	5
Virginia Polytech Institute	5
Purdue University	4
Syracuse University	4
University of Wisconsin at Madison	4
University of Connecticut	2
University of Missouri-Columbia	2
Oregon State University	1
Iowa State University	0
Utah State University	0
University of Alberta	-
University of Delaware	-
University of Guelph	-
Kansas State University	-
Texas Tech University	-
University of Akron	N/A
The University of Arizona	N/A
Auburn University	N/A
Colorado State University	N/A
East Carolina University	N/A
University of Illinois	N/A
Kent State University	N/A
University of Kentucky	N/A
University of Manitoba	N/A
University of Nebraska	N/A
North Dakota State University	N/A
San Diego State University	N/A
The University of Texas at Austin	N/A
West Virginia University	N/A
University of Wisconsin-Stout	N/A

Mean = 6.48, Median = 5, SD = 5.16

- = Data not provided N/A = Not applicable

universities, departments ranged in the number of graduating doctoral students from Oregon State University, with 1 graduate, to the University of Kansas, with 18. The mean number of students graduating from doctoral programs in 1983-84 was 6.48 (SD=5.16).

Nature of Faculty in Family Science Departments

Percentage who are full professors. Table 10 reports the percentage of faculty members in departments who are full professors. Departments range, in terms of the percentage of faculty members that are full professors, from the University of Illinois, West Virginia, and Auburn Universities, which have no full professors, to the University of Arizona, with 80% full professors. The mean percentage of faculty that are full professors is 34.56% (SD=18.76%).

These data, as well as the data on percentage of faculty that are associate or assistant professors, or who have the PhD or equivalent, should be viewed in conjunction with the number of faculty members individual departments have. To illustrate the importance of considering these variables simultaneously, the University of Arizona with 80%, has the highest percentage of faculty who are full professors. However, it only has five total faculty members. On the other hand, the 3rd highest ranked department in terms of percentage of faculty who are full professors, the University of Kansas, has only 69% full

Table 10

Percentage of Faculty Who Are Full Professors by Department

University	No. of Faculty	% Full Prof.
The University of Arizona	5	80
Teachers College, Columbia University	4	75
University of Kansas	26	69
University of Wisconsin-Madison	9	56
Brigham Young University	29	55
University of Alberta	6	50
University of Minnesota	12	50
Oregon State University	6	50
University of Wisconsin-Stout	4	50
Pennsylvania State University	34	47
University of Georgia	13	46
University of Akron	9	44
Iowa State University	18	44
Utah State University	9	44
Michigan State University	22	41
East Carolina University	5	40
University of Tennessee	10	40
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	13	38
University of Texas at Austin	8	38
Florida State University	12	33
Ohio State University	9	33
San Diego State University	18	33
University of Connecticut	19	32
University of Delaware	19	32
Kansas State University	13	31
University of Manitoba	7	29
Virginia Polytech Institute	17	29
Colorado State University	12	25
University of Nebraska	12	25
Syracuse University	8	25
Texas Tech University	21	24
Purdue University	17	23
University of Guelph	22	18
Kent State University	13	15
Oklahoma State University	13	15
North Dakota State University	7	14
University of Kentucky	16	12
University of Missouri-Columbia	8	12
University of Illinois	6	0
West Virginia University	2	0
Auburn University	6	0

Mean=34.56%, Median=33%, SD=18.76%, - = Data not provided

professors; but this represents 18 faculty members in the department who are full professors. So, although Kansas' percentage of faculty members who are full professors is lower than the University of Arizona's, its actual number of full professors is more than 4 times as many as at Arizona.

Percentage who are associate professors. Departments vary in the percentage of associate professors they have from Utah State, which has 11% associate professors, to West Virginia, which has 100% (see Table 11). The next eight departments below West Virginia have only 50% to 57% associate professors, however, these universities have a mean of 9.62 faculty members, as compared with West Virginia's 2. The mean percentage of associate professors for departments is 37.68% (SD=15.31%).

Percentage who are assistant professors. Table 12 reports the percentage of faculty members in each department who are assistant professors. Departments vary in the percentage of assistant professors they have from University of Arizona, Columbia University, University of Kansas, West Virginia, and University of Wisconsin-Stout, who have 0%, to Auburn, with 83%. The mean percentage of assistant professors for departments is 27.56% (SD=19.39).

Again, it is important to view this information against the information on number of faculty. Although Auburn has the highest percentage of faculty who are

Table 11

Percentage of Faculty Who are Associate Professors by Department

University	No. of Faculty	% Assoc. Prof.
West Virginia University	2	100
University of Manitoba	7	57
San Diego State University	18	56
Colorado State University	12	50
Florida State University	12	50
University of Missouri-Columbia	8	50
Syracuse University	8	50
University of Texas at Austin	8	50
University of Wisconsin-Stout	4	50
Texas Tech University	21	48
Purdue University	17	47
Kansas State University	13	46
Iowa State University	18	44
North Dakota State University	7	43
University of Minnesota	12	42
University of Nebraska	12	42
Virginia Polytech Institute	17	41
East Carolina University	5	40
University of Connecticut	19	37
University of Delaware	19	37
University of Guelph	22	36
Michigan State University	22	36
University of Akron	9	33
University of Alberta	6	33
University of Illinois	6	33
Oregon State University	6	33
Brigham Young University	29	31
University of Georgia.	13	31
University of Kansas	26	31
University of Kentucky	16	31
Oklahoma State University	13	31
University of Tennessee	10	30
Teachers College, Columbia University	4	25
Univ. of North Carolina at Greensboro	13	23
Ohio State University	9	22
University of Wisconsin at Madison	9	22
The Pennsylvania State University	34	21
The University of Arizona	5	20
Auburn University	6	17
Kent State University	13	15
Utah State University	9	11

Mean=37.68%, Median=36.5%, SD=15.31%, - = Data not provided

Table 12

Percentage of Faculty Members Who are Assistant Professors by Department

University	No. of Faculty	% Assist. Prof.
Auburn University	6	83
Kent State University	13	69
University of Illinois	6	66
University of Kentucky	16	56
Oklahoma State University	13	54
University of Guelph	22	45
Ohio State University	9	44
Utah State University	9	44
North Dakota State University	7	43
University of Missouri-Columbia	8	38
Univ. of North Carolina at Greensboro	13	38
University of Nebraska	12	33
University of Connecticut	19	32
University of Delaware	19	32
The Pennsylvania State University	34	32
University of Tennessee	10	30
Purdue University	17	29
Texas Tech University	21	29
Virginia Polytech Institute	17	29
Colorado State University	12	25
Syracuse University	8	25
University of Georgia	13	23
Kansas State University	13	23
Michigan State University	22	23
University of Akron	9	22
University of Wisconsin at Madison	9	22
East Carolina University	5	20
University of Alberta	6	17
Florida State University	12	17
Oregon State University	6	17
Brigham Young University	29	14
University of Manitoba	7	14
University of Texas at Austin	8	12
Iowa State University	18	11
San Diego State University	18	11
University of Minnesota	12	8
The University of Arizona	5	0
Teachers College, Columbia University	4	0
University of Kansas	26	0
West Virginia University	2	0
University of Wisconsin-Stout	4	0

Mean = 27.56%, Median = 25%, SD = 19.39

assistant professors, in actual numbers, it does not rank highest. The University of Kentucky, for example, with 56% of its 16 total faculty members (9), leads Auburn in actual number of faculty who are assistant professors, with its 83% of 7, or 5 assistant professors.

Percentage with the PhD. Forty-one departments provided information on percent of faculty having the PhD or an equivalent degree (see Table 13). Approximately 71% or 29 of the reporting departments indicated that 100% of their faculty members had a doctorate degree. The remaining 12 departments range in the percentage of faculty members who hold a doctorate degree from BYU, with 96%, to Kent State, with 62%. The mean percentage of faculty with the PhD or an equivalent degree is 94.07% (SD=9.12).

Nature of Graduate Students in Family Science Departments

Undergraduate GPA of master's students. Eighteen of the 40 participating departments having master's programs provided the mean undergraduate GPA of their master's students (see Table 14). The mean undergraduate GPA of master's students in the participating departments ranged from 3.00 at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro to 3.59 at Iowa State University. The mean undergraduate GPA of master's students across departments is 3.34 (SD=.18).

Undergraduate GPA of doctoral students. Thirteen of the 27 departments having doctoral programs provided the mean undergraduate GPA of their doctoral students (see

Table 13

Percentage of Faculty with the PhD or Equivalent

University	No. of Faculty	% With Doctorate
University of Akron	9	100
University of Alberta	6	100
The University of Arizona	5	100
Auburn University	6	100
Teachers College, Columbia University	4	100
East Carolina University	5	100
University of Guelph	22	100
University of Illinois	6	100
Iowa State University	18	100
Kansas State University	13	100
University of Kansas	26	100
University of Manitoba	7	100
Michigan State University	22	100
University of Minnesota	12	100
Univ. of North Carolina at Greensboro	13	100
North Dakota State University	7	100
Ohio State University	9	100
Oregon State University	6	100
The Pennsylvania State University	34	100
San Diego State University	18	100
Syracuse University	8	100
University of Tennessee	10	100
Texas Tech University	21	100
University of Texas at Austin	8	100
Utah State University	9	100
Virginia Polytech Institute	17	100
West Virginia University	2	100
University of Wisconsin at Madison	9	100
University of Wisconsin-Stout	4	100
Brigham Young University	29	96
University of Connecticut	19	95
University of Delaware	19	95
Purdue University	17	94
Florida State University	12	92
University of Georgia	13	92
University of Missouri-Columbia	8	87
University of Nebraska	12	83
University of Kentucky	16	81
Oklahoma State University	13	77
Colorado State University	12	75
Kent State University	13	62

Mean = 94.07%, Median = 100%, SD = 9.12

Table 14

Mean Undergraduate GPA of Master's Students 1983-84 by Department

University	GPA
Iowa State University	3.59
Brigham Young University	3.54
The University of Arizona	3.50
Colorado State University	3.50
University of Minnesota	3.50
University of Texas at Austin	3.49
Purdue University	3.42
University of Kentucky	3.40
Syracuse University	3.40
Utah State University	3.40
University of Connecticut	3.33
University of Georgia	3.30
Virginia Polytech Institute	3.30
Ohio State University	3.23
University of Guelph	3.10
University of Wisconsin-Stout	3.10
North Dakota State University	3.09
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	3.00
University of Akron	-
University of Alberta	-
Auburn University	-
Teachers College, Columbia University	-
University of Delaware	-
East Carolina University	-
Florida State University	-
University of Illinois	-
Kansas State University	-
University of Kansas	-
Kent State University	-
University of Manitoba	-
Michigan State University	-
University of Missouri-Columbia	-
University of Nebraska	-
Oklahoma State University	-
Oregon State University	-
The Pennsylvania State University	-
San Diego State University	-
University of Tennessee	-
West Virginia University	-
University of Wisconsin at Madison	-
Texas Tech University	N/A

Mean = 3.34, Median = 3.40, SD = .18

- = Data not provided N/A = Not applicable

Table 15). The mean undergraduate GPA of doctoral students in participating departments ranged from 3.00 at the University of Guelph to 3.74 at Ohio State.

The mean undergraduate GPA of doctoral students, across departments, is 3.40 (SD = .23). A number of departments indicated that they did not have access to information on the undergraduate GPAs of their master's or doctoral students.

Mean scores of graduate students on entrance exams. Information on mean scores of graduate students on entrance exams was not available to most departments. It was, therefore, not possible to gather these data.

Financial Assistance

Departments were asked to identify the forms of student financial assistance available to students in their departments in 1983-84 and, in addition, to indicate the average dollar value of each form of financial aid. Some departments may have misunderstood the question; rather than give the average dollar value of each form of financial aid for the 1983-84 academic year, they may have provided the average dollar value for a semester.

To determine whether or not this occurred, several of the departments reporting a relatively low average dollar value for any of the various forms of financial aid were contacted by telephone. All the departments contacted (except for one, which was uncertain) confirmed that the

Table 15

Mean Undergraduate GPA of Doctoral Students 1983-84 by Department

University	GPA
Ohio State University	3.74
Iowa State University	3.57
Purdue University	3.56
University of Connecticut	3.53
Brigham Young University	3.50
University of Minnesota	3.50
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	3.50
Utah State University	3.50
Virginia Polytech Institute	3.38
Syracuse University	3.30
University of Tennessee	3.08
University of Georgia	3.06
University of Guelph	3.00
University of Alberta	-
Teachers College, Columbia University	-
University of Delaware	-
Florida State University	-
Kansas State University	-
University of Kansas	-
Michigan State University	-
University of Missouri-Columbia	-
University of Nebraska	-
Oklahoma State University	-
Oregon State University	-
The Pennsylvania State University	-
Texas Tech University	-
University of Wisconsin at Madison	-
University of Akron	N/A
The University of Arizona	N/A
Auburn University	N/A
Colorado State University	N/A
East Carolina University	N/A
University of Illinois	N/A
Kent State University	N/A
University of Kentucky	N/A
University of Manitoba	N/A
North Dakota State University	N/A
San Diego State University	N/A
University of Texas at Austin	N/A
West Virginia State University	N/A
University of Wisconsin-Stout	N/A

Mean = 3.40, Median = 3.50, SD = .23

- = Data not provided N/A = Not applicable

financial aid data supplied by their departments were accurate.

To provide some compensation for this possibility, the median value, which is less affected than the mean by extreme scores such as those that would result from a misunderstanding of this item, are reported for each form of financial aid. Dollar amounts reported by Canadian universities were converted to American dollars by multiplying the reported values by .78; according to the Canadian universities, this would result in the approximate American dollar equivalence for 1983-84. In addition, the reader should be aware that there is no control for whether the assistantships/traineeships are quarter or half-time, or for a 9-month or 12-month period of time. Thirty-eight of the participating departments provided information on financial assistance available to their students (see Tables 16 and 17).

Fifteen departments indicated that they offered fellowships or traineeships. The dollar value of these fellowships/traineeships varied greatly from department to department. The average amount of this type of financial aid offered by departments ranged from $500 to $7200. The median value of this type of financial aid was $4,500.

Thirty-three departments indicated the availability of teaching assistantships in their departments. Again, the dollar value of these assistantships varied widely from

Table 16

Assistantships Available to Students by Department in the 1983-84 Academic Year

	Univ. Adm Asstships[a]		Research Asstships[b]		Teaching Asstships[c]	
	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value
U. of Akron	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	14	$4000
U. of Alberta	0	0	3	6240	3	6240
U. of Arizona	0	0	2	3000	5	2600
Auburn U.	0	0	0	0	5	-
BYU	2	2600	25	2600	8	2600
Colorado State U.	0	0	2	4185	7	4185
Tchrs.Col.,Col.U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
U. of Conn.	4	7600	4	7600	6	7600
U. of Delaware	0	0	1	-	5	-
E. Carolina U.	0	0	3	1200	3	4160
Florida State U.	1	-	1	2500	12	3750
U. of Georgia	0	0	17	2203	8	2203
U. of Guelph	0	0	5	1950	18	1950
U. of Illinois	0	0	10	3000	4	3000
Iowa State U.	1	5875	6	5485	3	5875
Kansas State U.	1	4500	3	4500	3	4500
U. of Kansas	0	0	35	5000	22	3800
Kent State U.	-	-	-	-	-	-
U. of Kentucky	0	0	0	0	8	3852
U. of Manitoba	0	0	0	0	5	1872
Michigan State U.	4	3252	10	2902	17	4157
U. of Minn.	1	8000	21	4750	8	4500
U.of Missouri-Col	0	0	1	4100	2.5	12300
U. of Nebraska	0	0	4	3600	4	3600
U. of N. Car.-Gr.	0	0	6	4000	8	4400
N. Dakota St.U.	1	3500	1	3500	8	1750
Ohio State U.	-	4815	4	4815	5	4815
Oklahoma State U.	0	0	4	4500	9	4500
Oregon State U.	2	3000	5	3000	13	3000
Penn. State U.	0	0	x	5000	x	5000
Purdue U.	1	-	16	-	26	-
San Diego State U.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Syracuse U.	1.5	4500	4	4500	7	4500
U. of Tennessee	0	0	1	4500	15	3482

(continued on next page)

Table 16 (cont.)

Assistantships Available to Students by Department in the 1983-84 Academic Year

	Univ. Adm Asstships[a]		Research Asstships[b]		Teaching Asstships[c]	
	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value
Texas Tech. U.	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.of Texas-Austin	0	0	2	-	5	6000
Utah State U.	0	0	x	5000	x	5000
Virginia Polytech	7	4860	5	4860	18	4860
West Virginia U.	0	0	0	0	2	3700
U.of Wisc.Madison	0	0	x	-	x	-
U. of Wisc.-Stout	0	0	4	4500	4	4500

- = Data not provided

x = Indicated this form of financial aid available but not how many. [a]median=$4,500 [b]median=$4,342 [c]median=$4,160

Table 17

Other Forms of Financial Assistance Available to Students by Departments in the 1983-84 Academic Year

	Scholarships[a]		Fellowship/ Traineeships[b]		Part-time Faculty[c]	
	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value
U. of Akron	0	$ 0	0	$ 0	0	$ 0
U. of Alberta	0	0	0	0	1	-
U. of Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0
Auburn U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
BYU	16	800	0	0	0	0
Colorado State U.	0	0	3	1000	3	16500
Tchrs. Col.Col.U.	x	3000	0	0	0	0
U. of Conn.	0	0	2	1500	0	0
U. of Delaware	0	0	1	-	0	0
E. Carolina U.	1	500	0	0	0	0
Florida State U.	0	0	1	6000	1	-
U. of Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0
U. of Guelph	5	1560	0	0	0	0
U. of Illinois	0	0	3	4000	0	0
Iowa State U.	3	1000	0	0	0	0
Kansas State U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
U. of Kansas	0	0	10	5400	0	0
Kent State U.	-	-	-	-	-	-
U. of Kentucky	1	750	1	3852	0	0
U. of Manitoba	0	0	2	5460	0	0
Michigan State U.	0	0	19	1000	0	0
U. of Minn.	2	8500	10	500	0	0
U.of Missouri-Col	0	0	0	0	1	13000
U. of Nebraska	0	0	0	0	0	0
U. of N. Car.-Gr.	2	500	1	6000	2	12000
N. Dakota St. U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio State U.	3	200	1	7200	0	0
Oklahoma State U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon State U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Penn. State U.	0	0	x	5000	0	0
Purdue U.	0	0	1	-	0	0
San Diego State U.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Syracuse U.	0	0	2	6000	0	0
U. of Tennessee	var.	2000	0	0	0	0

(continued on next page)

Table 17 (cont.)

Other Forms of Financial Assistance Available to Students by Departments in the 1983-84 Academic Year

	Scholarships[a]		Fellowship/ Traineeships[b]		Part-time Faculty[c]	
	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value	No.	Avg. Value
Texas Tech. U.	-	-	-	-	-	-
U.of Texas-Austin	1	1000	0	0	1	7000
Utah State U.	0	0	x	2000	0	0
Virginia Polytech	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Virginia U.	0	0	0	0	0	0
U. of Wis.-Madison	0	0	x	-	x	-
U. of Wis.-Stout	1	1500	0	0	2	7000

- = Data not provided

x = Indicated this form of financial aid available but not how many. [a]median=$1,000 [b]median=$4,500 [c]median=$12,000

department to department. The average dollar amount of teaching assistantships ranged from a low of $1,750 to $12,300. The median value of this form of assistance was $4,160.

Twenty-eight departments indicated that they had one or more research assistantships available to their students. There is much variability in the average dollar value of these research assistantships from department to department. The average dollar amount of research assistantships ranged from $1,200 to $8,000 with a median value of $4,342.

Eleven departments reported they offered one or more administrative assistantships. The average dollar value of these assistantships differed greatly from department to department. The average amount of the administrative assistantships ranged from a low of $2,600 to a high of $8,000. The median value of this form of financial aid for departments was $4,500.

A number of departments indicated that they provided students holding assistantships with tuition waivers. However, inasmuch as this information was not specifically requested, it is not known how many departments actually offer tuition waivers but did not supply this information because it was not requested.

Part-time faculty positions were available in five departments. The average dollar amount of these positions

was extremely variable, ranging from $7,000 to $16,500. The median dollar value of this form of financial aid was $12,000.

Eleven departments indicated the availability of scholarships in their departments. The average dollar value of these scholarships varied widely from department to department ranging from $200 to $8,500 with a median value across departments of $1,000.

Departments were also asked to identify "other" forms of financial assistance available to their graduate students in 1983-84. Four departments indicated that they offered another form of financial aid. Florida State reported it had three "work study" positions that paid an average amount of $3,750 for the year. Kansas State reported six "early childhood lab and child care center teaching assistantships" that paid an average of $4,500. Minnesota reported one "research fellow" that paid $6,000; Syracuse reported two "grant, teaching, research" positions that paid an average of $4,700.

Entrance Examination Requirements

Table 18 summarizes the entrance exams required by departments and the required scores on these exams. Of the 38 departments that provided information on their department's entrance exam requirements, approximately 70% reported that their department required prospective graduate students to take the Graduate Record Examination

Table 18

Entrance Exams and Minimum Scores Required by Departments

University	Exams Required	Scores Required[a]
University of Akron	None	
University of Alberta	None	
The University of Arizona	GRE	800
Auburn University	GRE	-
Brigham Young University	GRE	900
East Carolina University	GRE	850
	or Miller	37
Colorado State University	GRE	850
Teachers College, Columbia U.	None	
University of Connecticut	GRE & Miller (PhD)	
University of Delaware	GRE	1050
Florida State University	GRE	1000
	(as an alternative to 3.00 GPA)	
University of Georgia	GRE	1000
University of Guelph	None	
University of Illinois	GRE	-
Iowa State University	GRE	-
University of Kansas	None	
Kansas State University	None	
Kent State University	-	-
University of Kentucky	GRE	800
University of Manitoba	None	
Michigan State University	GRE	-
University of Minnesota	Miller	-
University of Missouri-Columbia	GRE	800
University of Nebraska	-	-
University of North Carolina/Greens.	GRE	1000
North Dakota State University	None	
Ohio State University	GRE	1500
	(or 3.00 underg. for MS; 3.50 grad work for PhD)	
Oklahoma State University	-	-
Oregon State University	GRE	-
The Pennsylvania State Univ.	GRE	1200
Purdue University	GRE	1000
San Diego State University	GRE	950
Syracuse University	GRE	-
University of Tennessee	GRE	-
The University of Texas at Austin	GRE	1000
Texas Tech University	None	
Utah State University	GRE & Miller (38)	950

(continued on next page)

Table 18 (cont.)

Entrance Exams and Minimum Scores Required by Departments

University	Exams Required	Scores Required[a]
Virginia Polytech Institute	GRE	900
West Virginia University	GRE	-
University of Wisconsin at Madison	GRE	-
University of Wisconsin-Stout	None	

[a]Scores are a composite of quantitative and verbal tests except for Ohio State's which also figures 500 points for the analytical test. - = Data not provided

(GRE) (i.e., the GRE General Test). The GRE General Test includes three components: a verbal component, a quantitative component, and an analytical component, each of which yields a separate score. Inasmuch as the analytical component is still experimental, the majority of graduate departments do not look at this score when considering a student for admission into one of their graduate programs. Instead, they typically look only at the quantitative and verbal scores.

Seventeen departments provided information on the minimum score on the GRE required of prospective graduate students. Of these departments, 16 reported a minimum required score on the GRE that was composed of the verbal score plus the quantitative score. Scores required ranged from 800 at the University of Missouri-Columbia, University of Kentucky, and University of Arizona to 1200 at Pennsylvania State. One department also included the analytical score in computing a minimum required score for prospective students--Ohio State's minimum required score of 1500 points on the GRE includes 500 points for the analytical test. The mean minimum score required on the GRE by reporting departments is 973.

Two departments, Florida State and Ohio State, indicated that the GRE was required only for students whose GPA was less than the GPA required by their departments. Only four universities use the Miller Analogies test to

screen their students. The University of Minnesota uses the Miller Analogies test exclusively, whereas the University of Connecticut requires the Miller Analogies for its prospective PhD students only. East Carolina University gives students the option of taking the GRE or the Miller Analogies; Utah State indicated that it requires both the GRE and the Miller Analogies.

Minimum GPA Requirement for Admission

Thirty-one departments provided information on their department's GPA requirement for admission. Table 19 summarizes the GPA requirements of participating departments.

The lowest GPA requirement for departments with a GPA requirement was the University of Wisconsin-Stout, with 2.25. The highest required GPA reported was 3.20 at Penn State and Utah State. Twenty-one of the 31 reporting departments reported a minimum of 3.00.

The University of Missouri-Columbia and San Diego State specified that their departments looked only at a student's GPA for the last 60 undergraduate hours. Virginia Polytech and Ohio State reported that their departments required an undergraduate GPA of 3.00 for master's students and 3.50 in graduate work for PhD students. East Carolina University stipulated that students must have a 2.50 GPA overall and a 3.00 GPA in their senior year and in their major. The University

Table 19

GPA Requirement of Departments

University	GPA	
The Pennsylvania State University	3.20	
Utah State University	3.20	
The University of Arizona	3.00	
Brigham Young University	3.00	
Colorado State University	3.00	
University of Connecticut	3.00	
Florida State University	3.00	or 1000 GRE
University of Georgia	3.00	
University of Guelph	3.00	
Iowa State University	3.00	
Kansas State University	3.00	
University of Kansas	3.00	
University of Manitoba	3.00	
Michigan State University	3.00	
University of Missouri-Columbia	3.00	last 60 undergrad hrs.
University of North Carolina/Greens.	3.00	
Ohio State University	3.00	(undergrad for MS students) or 1500 GRE
	3.50	(grad work for PhD) or 1500 GRE
Oklahoma State University	3.00	
Oregon State University	3.00	
San Diego State University	3.00	last 60 units
Syracuse University	3.00	
The University of Texas at Austin	3.00	
Virginia Polytech Institute	3.00	(undergrad for MS)
	3.50	(MS for PhD)
University of Akron	2.75	
West Virginia University	2.75	
University of Wisconsin at Madison	2.75	
East Carolina University	2.50	overall
	3.00	senior year
	3.00	major
University of Wisconsin-Stout	2.25	
University of Nebraska	None	
North Dakota State University	None	
Purdue University	None	

(continued on next page)

Table 19 (cont.)

GPA Requirement of Departments

University	GPA
University of Alberta	-
Auburn University	-
Teachers College, Columbia University	-
University of Delaware	-
University of Illinois	-
Kent State University	-
University of Kentucky	-
University of Minnesota	-
University of Tennessee	-
Texas Tech University	-

- = Data not provided

of Nebraska, North Dakota State, and Purdue indicated no minimum GPA requirement, and Florida State and Ohio State allow students whose GPA falls short of the minimum requirement to compensate with a specified score on the GRE.

Majors in Master's Degree Programs

Forty departments provided information on the majors leading to the master's degree. Table 20 lists the names of these majors as reported by the departments. Some of the majors with very similar names may in fact be virtually the same. All but one of the participating departments, Texas Tech University, offers at least one major. The most majors offered by a department is six, by Brigham Young University and the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Table 21 reports the distribution of departments on number of majors leading to the master's degree. As the table indicates, the majority of departments (64%) offer one or two majors. Twenty-two percent (9) offer three or four majors, and 12% (5) offer five or six. The mean number of majors leading to this degree is 2.34.

Majors in Doctoral Programs

Twenty-seven departments indicated, on the department survey, that they offer one or more majors leading to the doctorate degree. Table 22 lists the names of majors offered as reported by the departments. As was the case

Table 20

Majors Leading to the Master's Degree

Major	No. of Schools Offering
Administration of Human Services	1
Adolescence and Youth	1
Adult Development and Aging	1
Adult Development and Gerontology	1
Applied Human Nutrition	1
Child Development	7
Child Development and Family Relations	3
Child Development and Family Studies	3
Child and Family Studies	1
College Teaching	1
Community Program	1
Community Services	1
Consumer Economics	1
Counseling and Guidance	1
Early Childhood Education	7
Family/Child Studies	1
Family and Child Development	2
Family and Community Education	1
Family Development	2
Family Economics and Management	3
Family and Human Development	1
Family Life Education	3
Family Relations	1
Family Relationships	1
Family Relations and Human Development	1
Family Resource Management	1
Family Social Science	1
Family Studies	10
Home Economics	2
Home Economics Education	2
Hospitality/Food Service Management	1
Housing	1
Housing and Household Equipment	1
Human Development	5
Human Development and Family Studies	2
Individual Development in the Family	1
Individual/Family Studies and Gerontology	1
Interior Design	1
Interpersonal Relations	1
Lifespan (Human) Development	3
Marriage and Family Therapy (Counseling)	8
Marriage and Family Therapy/Social Work	1
Medical Child Development Specialist	1
Nutrition and Dietetics	1
Nutritional Sciences	1
Vocational Home Economics	1

Table 21

Distribution of Departments on Number of Majors Leading to the Master's Degree

No. of Majors	No. of Departments	% of Departments
1	15	37
2	11	27
3	4	10
4	5	12
5	3	7
6	2	5

Table 22

Majors in Doctoral Programs

Majors	No. of Depts. Offering
Adult Development and Gerontology	2
Applied Human Nutrition	1
Child Development	4
Child Development and Family Relations	2
Child Development and Human Relations	1
Child and Family Studies	2
Consumer Economics	1
Developmental and Child Psychology	1
Developmental Psychology	1
Early Childhood Education	1
Family and Community Education	1
Family Ecology	1
Family Economics and Management	1
Family Life Education	1
Family Relations	1
Family Relations and Human Development	1
Family Relationships	1
Family Science	1
Family Social Science	1
Family Studies	6
Home Economics	1
Housing	1
Housing and Household Equipment	1
Human Development	2
Human Development and Family Studies	1
Marriage and Family	1
Marriage and Family Therapy	4
Sociology of the Family	1
Teaching Young Children	1

with the majors leading to the master's degree, some of the majors leading to the doctorate with similar names may be virtually the same. Florida State University has the highest number of majors leading to the doctorate degree with five. Table 23 gives the distribution of departments on number of majors leading to the doctorate degree. Seventy-four percent (20) of the departments offer one or two majors, 18% (5) offer three, and 8% (2) offer four or five majors. The mean number of doctoral majors is 1.15.

Courses

Departments were asked to indicate which of the courses listed in Table 24 were either offered in their department or in another department in their university. The rationale for including information on relevant courses offered in "other" departments was that these classes would also be available to, and thus would benefit, the students of a family science department. "Early childhood education" was inadvertently left off the list of courses. Table 24 summarizes the departments' reports relative to course offerings.

Forty departments provided information on their course offerings. As Table 24 indicates, 100% of participating departments/universities offer a class in child (or human) development. Other frequently offered classes, offered by 80% or more of the participating departments/universities,

Table 23

Distribution of Departments on Number of Majors Leading to the Doctoral Degree

No. of Majors	No. of Departments	% of Departments
1	17	63
2	3	11
3	5	18
4	1	4
5	1	4

Table 24

Number and Percentage of Departments/Universities Offering Various Courses

Course	No. of Depts./ Universities That Offer Course	% of Depts./ Universities
Aging/Lifespan	39	97.5
Child (or Human) Development	40	100.0
Cross-Cultural (Comparative) Family	29	72.5
Family and Health Care	29	72.5
Family and Stress	26	65.0
Family and Violence	25	62.5
Family Consulting for Business/Industry	7	17.5
Family Development	34	85.0
Family Financial Planning and Counseling	32	80.0
Family Law	26	65.0
Family Policy	20	50.0
Family Theory and Research	37	92.5
Home Management	35	87.5
Marriage and Family Therapy	35	87.5
Methods in Family Life Education	31	77.5
Practicum in Family Life Education	22	55.0
Religion and Family	8	20.0
Practicum in Marriage and Family Therapy	29	72.5

include aging/lifespan, family development, family financial planning, family theory and research, home management, and marriage and family therapy. The most infrequently offered classes are family consulting for business/industry, offered by 17.5% of participating departments/universities, and religion and family, offered by 20%.

Departments were also asked to list additional family-oriented courses offered either in or out of their department. Table 25 lists these courses, along with the number of departments offering each of the courses.

Interdepartmental and Interuniversity Degree Programs

Departments were asked to describe any inter-departmental and interuniversity degree programs they currently participate in. Seventeen departments provided information on their interdepartmental degree programs, and five departments on their interuniversity degree programs. Departments providing information on interdepartmental or interuniversity programs varied greatly in the amount of information they provided on these programs. This accounts for the variation in the amount of detail given here on the various programs.

Interdepartmental degree programs. The Department of Family Studies at the University of Alberta has an interdepartmental MS specialization in Marriage and

Table 25

Additional Courses Offered by Departments/Universities

Course	Number of Depts. Offering Courses
Adult Development and the Family: Adult Middle Yrs.	1
Adult Development and the Family: The Aging Years	1
Alcoholism	1
Allocation of Family Resources	1
Analysis of Family Income	1
Changing Family Roles	1
Community as Educator	1
Contemporary Family	1
Courtship	1
Death, Dying, and the Family	1
Developing Family Competencies	1
Divorce	1
Energy Utilization in the Household	1
Evaluation of Family Related Programs	1
Families of Exceptional Children	1
Family/Child Interaction	2
Family Decision-Making	1
Family Economics	1
Family Ecosystems	1
Family Housing	1
Family Problems	1
Family Readings	1
Family Relations	1
Family Resources	1
Family and Work	1
Field Techniques in Family Study	1
Gerontology	1
Home as a Learning Center	1
Human Resource Development in the Family	1
Human Sexuality	3
The Individual, Marriage, and the Family	1
Interpersonal Relationships in the Family	1
Minority Families in America	1
Parent-Adolescent Relations	1
Parent-Child Relations	1
Parenting (Parent Education)	4
Sex Education	1
Social Change and Family	1
Suicide	1
Theories of Management and Decision Making in the Family	1
Values and Family Behavior	1
Work and the Family	2

Family Therapy through special arrangement with the Department of Educational Psychology.

The Department of Family Sciences at Brigham Young University described two interdepartmental degree programs. The first is a PhD program in family studies. Students in this program can major in family science or family sociology. The second program allows the student the opportunity to simultaneously earn an MS degree in Marriage and Family Therapy and an MSW degree in Social Work.

The Department of Human Development and Family Studies at Colorado State University reported it offers an interdepartmental degree in Occupational Therapy.

Students in International and Bilingual Education at Columbia University in the Department of Family and Community Education can elect to specialize in Family and Community Education.

The Department of Home and Family Life at Florida State University participates in the Interdivisional Doctoral Program in Marriage and Family. The program offers students the opportunity for specialization in (a) Marriage and Family Therapy through the Department of Home and Family Life and (b) Marriage and Family Theory and Research through the Department of Sociology.

The Department of Human Development and Family Ecology at the University of Illinois reported that it was tentatively scheduled to begin a joint degree program in

Marriage and Family Therapy with the School of Social Work in the Fall of 1985. It did not indicate whether this would be a master's or doctoral degree program.

The Department of Family Environment at Iowa State University offers an interdepartmental minor in Gerontology and Housing, as well as in Water Resources.

The Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University coordinates with the College of Education to offer an Early Childhood Handicapped program.

The Department of Family and Child Ecology at Michigan State University offers a cognate in aging. The cognate in aging is composed of courses from many different fields of study. Upon completion of the required courses, the student may secure a letter from the chairperson of the MSU Executive Committee on Aging certifying the completion of the cognate in aging.

The Family Social Science Department at the University of Minnesota reported that the six courses in the marital and family therapy sequence in the department are cross-listed with the Department of Psychology so students can become licensed psychologists.

The Department of Child and Family Development at the University of Missouri-Columbia indicated that it does not have an interdepartmental degree at the graduate level per se, but it does have a number of students who build a

master's degree in Educational and Counseling Psychology into their PhD programs.

North Dakota State University's Department of Child Development and Family Relations offers a joint program in Family Counseling/Therapy with the Counseling Department. The department did not indicate whether this is a master's or doctoral program.

The Department of Human Development and Family Studies at Oregon State University offers an MA in Interdisciplinary Studies.

The School of Family Studies and Consumer Science at San Diego State University indicated that students may initiate an individualized interdepartmental degree. No specific information was supplied.

The Department of Child and Family Studies at the University of Tennessee offers an interdisciplinary PhD in Home Economics. Students can elect to specialize in either Child Development or Family Studies.

The Department of Family and Human Development at Utah State University shares a PhD in Developmental Psychology with the Psychology Department, with a specialization in Child and Adolescent Psychology. It also shares a Family Sociology program with the Sociology Department.

The Child and Family Studies program at the University of Wisconsin at Madison offers a credential program in

Life-Span Development and Social Gerontology through the Institute on Aging and Adult Life.

Interuniversity degree programs. The Department of Child Development and Family Relations at East Carolina University reported a unique interuniversity program that it offers in which students who have been admitted to the graduate school of ECU for the MS or MSHE degree may choose to take their minor at North Carolina State University. Conversely, students admitted to North Carolina State University may choose an area in Home Economics at ECU as their minor.

The Department of Human Development and Family Studies at Colorado State University indicated only that it has an interuniversity, interdisciplinary program in Gerontology.

The Department of Family and Child Ecology at Michigan State University has two interuniversity graduate degree programs: (a) the Committee on Institutional Cooperation Traveling Scholar Program (CIC) and (b) the Michigan Intercollegiate Graduate Studies (MIGS) Program. The CIC Traveling Scholar Program enables selected doctoral students to take advantage of special facilities available on the campus of one of the participating universities but not available on the home campus. Such facilities include special course offerings, research opportunities, laboratories, and library collections. Student

participants are limited to two semesters or three terms on another campus.

The MIGS Program enables graduate students of Michigan institutions offering graduate degree programs to take advantage of unique educational opportunities at other Michigan institutions offering graduate degrees. Any graduate student in good standing in a master's educational or doctoral degree program is eligible to participate. Students on a MIGS enrollment pay tuition and other fees at the host institution for the services rendered. This type of enrollment is limited to one term for master's or educational specialist degree students, and two terms for doctoral degree students.

The University of Nebraska's Department of Human Development and the Family cosponsors an interuniversity PhD degree program with Adult and Continuing Education.

Syracuse University's Department of Child and Family Community Studies has interuniversity programs in Women's Studies, Social Policy, and Gerontology. No information was given on the university(s) that co-sponsor these programs, nor on whether they are master's or doctoral-level programs.

Adequacy of Family Science Library Holdings

The department chair or other individual assigned the responsibility of completing the survey was asked to rate the adequacy of the library holdings in the area of family

science in his or her university. Of the 38 departments that completed this item, 2.6% (1) gave their library a rating of inadequate, 10.5% (4) a rating of adequate, 57.9% (22) a rating of good, and 28.9% (11) a rating of outstanding. Table 26 lists the 11 departments that rated the family science holdings of their university library outstanding.

Faculty Perceptions of Their Departments

Information on faculty perceptions of various aspects of departments is being presented here because, according to Clark's deans (1973) and common sense, the perceptions of the "rank and file" of the departments is valuable information that should be considered by those who are responsible to make departmental decisions (Clark, 1973). The results of the Chi Square procedure that compared faculty respondents with faculty-at-large of family science departments on the dimension faculty rank (see Table 2) suggest that care should be exercised in interpreting the faculty data.

Freedom to Plan Courses and to Conduct Research, and Faculty Interest in Students

Faculty members of participating departments were asked to indicate whether they disagreed strongly, disagreed with reservations, agreed with reservations, or

Table 26

Departments that Rated the Adequacy of Their University's Family Science Library Holdings as "Outstanding"

Department of Family and Community Education Teachers College, Columbia University
Department of Human Development and Family Ecology University of Illinois
Department of Family Environment Iowa State University
Family Social Science Department University of Minnesota
Department of Child Development and Family Relations University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Department of Individual and Family Studies The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Child, Family, and Community Studies Syracuse University
Department of Child Development and Family Relationships The University of Texas at Austin
Department of Family and Child Development Virginia Polytech Institute
Department of Family Resources and Consumer Sciences University of Wisconsin at Madison
Department of Child and Family Studies University of Wisconsin-Stout

agreed strongly with three statements about their department:

1. Faculty members in this department feel very secure in their "freedom to plan courses" without undue departmental or university restrictions.

2. Faculty in this department feel very secure in their "freedom to conduct research" without undue departmental or university restrictions.

3. Faculty members in this department seem to be genuinely "interested in the welfare and personal development of graduate students."

Freedom to plan courses. Table 27 describes faculty response to the freedom to plan courses statement. The majority, 71.3% (62), of the 87 faculty members who responded to this question selected the agree strongly response with regard to the freedom to plan courses item, indicating that they felt very secure. The disagree strongly response was least often selected by faculty respondents. Only 3.4% (3) of the participating faculty members selected this response. As a general rule, then, faculty members feel good about the freedom that their departments give them to plan courses.

Freedom to conduct research. Table 27 reports faculty response to the freedom to plan research item. Of the 86 faculty members who responded to the freedom to conduct

Table 27

Summary of Faculty Response to Three Statements about their Departments

	RESPONSE OPTIONS							
	Disagree Strongly		Disagree w/ Reservations		Agree with Reservations		Agree Strongly	
Category	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Freedom to Plan Courses	3	3.4	4	4.6	18	20.7	62	71.3
Freedom to Plan Research	2	2.3	5	5.8	10	11.6	69	80.2
Faculty Interest in Welfare of Students	1	1.1	5	5.7	26	29.9	55	63.2

research item, 80.2% (69) selected the agree strongly response option. Only 2.3% (2) of the participating faculty members selected the disagree strongly response option. Thus it appears that faculty members in general feel very free to conduct research without a significant amount of departmental interference.

Faculty interest in welfare of students. The faculty response to the faculty interest in welfare of students item suggests that faculty members do not feel quite as optimistic about the interest faculty members have for students as they do with regard to their freedom to conduct courses and plan research (see Table 27).

Of the 87 faculty members responding to this item, 63.2% (55) selected the agree strongly response option. However, 29.9% (26) of the respondents selected the agree with reservations response option. When you combine those who agree strongly with the faculty interest statement with those who agree with reservations with this statement, 93.1% or 81 of the respondents are basically in agreement that faculty members in their departments appear to be interested in the welfare of their graduate students.

Faculty Ratings of 11 Aspects of Their Departments

Faculty members were also asked to rate 11 aspects of their department or university on a 4-point scale: poor, fair, good or excellent. The data are reported in Table 28.

Table 28

Summary of Faculty Ratings of Eleven Aspects of their Departments

	RESPONSE OPTIONS							
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
Category	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
University Library Holdings	0	0	15	17.6	35	41.2	35	41.2
Clarity of Program Goals	3	3.5	10	11.6	45	52.3	28	32.6
Lab and Other Equipment	8	9.2	16	18.4	35	40.2	28	32.2
Menu of Courses and Other Offerings	3	3.5	8	9.4	48	56.5	26	30.6
Faculty Interest in Teaching	1	1.1	10	11.5	40	46.0	36	41.4
Career Development of Junior Faculty	1	1.2	20	23.3	33	38.4	32	37.2
Faculty Interpersonal Relations	4	4.6	16	18.4	38	43.7	29	33.3
Student Interpersonal Relations	0	0	5	5.8	40	46.5	41	47.7
Encouragement to Become Professionally Active	0	0	9	10.7	27	32.1	48	57.1
Intradepartmental Collaboration	3	3.4	19	21.8	46	52.9	19	21.8
Interdepartmental Collaboration	4	4.6	30	34.5	44	50.6	9	10.3

University library holdings relevant to field. Eighty-five faculty members rated the adequacy of their university's library holdings in their field. The results of this rating are reported in Table 28. An even number of respondents (35) gave their university library a rating of good and excellent. Thus the vast majority of faculty members (82.4%) feel good about their library's family science holdings. No faculty member gave their university library a rating of poor.

Clarity of programs' goals. Table 28 reveals that 84.9% (73) of the 86 faculty members who rated the clarity of the goals of their department's graduate programs assigned their departments a rating of either good or excellent. The majority of these respondents assigned their department a rating of good on this item. Only 3.5% of respondents (3) felt that the goals of their department's graduate programs were poorly defined.

Laboratory and other equipment. With regard to the adequacy of laboratory and other equipment needed for teaching and conducting of research, 72.4% (63) of the 87 responding faculty members rated their department as either good or excellent. Sixteen (18.4%) gave their department a rating of fair on this item, and 9.2% (8) gave their department a rating of poor. A little over 25% of the respondents then feel that their departments are inadequately equipped in this area.

Menu of courses and other offerings. Eighty-five faculty members rated the menu of courses and other offerings of their departments. The majority of the faculty participants, 56.5% (48), gave their department a rating of good on this item. Twenty-six (30.6%) felt that their department's menu of courses and other offerings was excellent. Only 12.9% of respondents (11) rated their department as fair or poor in this area.

Faculty interest in teaching. In general, faculty members indicated that faculty members in their departments were quite interested in teaching (see Table 28). Forty (46%) of the 87 faculty members who responded to this item gave their department a rating of good, and a slightly smaller percentage, 41% (36), gave their department a rating of excellent. Only one respondent assigned his department a rating of poor on this item.

Departmental commitment to junior faculty. Eighty-six faculty members evaluated their departments in terms of departmental effort made toward the career development of their junior faculty (see Table 28). On this dimension 75.6% of the respondents rated their departments as good or excellent. Approximately equal numbers of faculty participants gave their department a rating of good and excellent (33 vs. 32). However, 23% (20) of the respondents rated their department fair, suggesting that they felt their departments are not overly involved in the development of

their junior faculty. Only one respondent rated their department as poor.

Faculty interpersonal relations. Table 28 summarizes the results of the faculty rating of faculty interpersonal relations. Thirty-eight (43.7%) of the 87 faculty members who responded to this item rated their departments as good, and 33.3% (29) rated their departments as excellent. Although the majority (77%) of respondents apparently feel pretty good about the faculty interpersonal relations of their departments, almost a quarter (23%) indicated that they felt their departments had a problem in this area.

Student interpersonal relations. Faculty members overall appear to feel that the interpersonal relations of graduate students in their departments is good (46.5%), or excellent (47.7%) (see Table 28). Only 5.8% (5) of the 81 faculty members who responded to this item gave their department a rating of fair, and no faculty members rated student interpersonal relations in their department as poor.

Encouragement to become professionally active. In terms of encouragement to become professionally active, the majority, 57.1% (48) of the 84 individuals who responded to this item rated their departments as excellent. Nine (10.7%) of the respondents gave their departments a rating of fair, and no respondent rated their department as poor in this area. In general, then, faculty members feel

encouraged by their departments to be professionally involved.

Intradepartmental collaboration. The majority of the 87 faculty members, 52.9% (46) responding to this item rated their departments as good in terms of intra-departmental collaboration. Nineteen (21.8%) felt their departments were excellent on this dimension. Approximately 25% of the respondents, however, felt that their departments were lacking in this area. Nineteen (21.8%) of the faculty members rated their departments as fair, and 3.4% (3) of the respondents rated their departments as poor.

Interdepartmental collaboration. Overall, faculty members rated interdepartmental collaboration lower than they did any other dimension of their departments. Only 10.3% (9) of the 87 respondents rated their departments as excellent in this area. About half of the respondents gave their departments a rating of good. Thirty (34.5%) rated their departments as fair, and 4.6% (4) rated their departments as poor.

Emphases of Departments

Faculty members were asked to indicate the amount of importance, either none, little, some, considerable, or extreme, they felt their departments assigned to three emphases: (a) "preparing scholars/researchers," (b)

"preparing college teachers," and (c) "preparing other practitioners." The data are presented in Table 29.

Preparing scholars/researchers. The greatest number of the 86 faculty respondents, 43% (37), indicated that their departments placed considerable emphasis on preparing scholars/researchers. Twenty-eight (32.6%) of the respondents reported that their departments placed an extreme amount of importance on preparing scholars/researchers. Twenty-one (24.4%) indicated that their departments assigned only some or little importance to the preparation of scholars/researchers. No respondent indicated that their department assigned no importance to this emphasis. It appears, then, that the preparation of scholars/researchers is, at least in the minds of participating faculty members, a fairly high priority of departments.

Preparing college teachers. Overall, the preparation of college teachers does not appear to be as important an emphasis to departments, according to faculty respondents, as the preparation of scholars/researchers. Only 8.1% of the respondents indicated that they thought their departments considered this emphasis to be of extreme importance. Although 44.2% indicated that it was a departmental goal of considerable importance, 38.4% (33) reported that it was a goal of only some importance, and

Table 29

Summary of Faculty Perceptions of Amount of Importance Assigned to Three Emphases by their Departments

	RESPONSE OPTIONS									
	None		Little		Some		Considerable		Extreme	
Category	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Preparing Scholars/ Researchers	0	0	8	9.3	13	15.1	37	43	28	32.6
Preparing College Teachers	1	1.2	7	8.1	33	38.4	38	44.2	7	8.1
Preparing Other Practitioners	2	2.3	4	4.7	22	25.6	41	47.7	17	19.8

9.3% (8) indicated that they thought their departments assigned little or no importance to this emphasis.

Preparing other practitioners. The results of the faculty estimates of the amount of emphasis departments place on preparing other practitioners suggests that the preparation of other practitioners may be a more important emphasis in many departments than the preparation of college teachers (see Table 29). Seventeen (19.8%) of the respondents reported that they thought that their department assigned an extreme amount of importance to the preparation of other practitioners, and 47.7% (41) reported that they believed that their departments placed considerable importance on this emphasis. Only 25.6% (22) of respondents indicated that their departments placed some importance on this emphasis, as opposed to the 38.4% who indicated that their departments placed only some importance on "preparing college teachers." Only 7% (6) of respondents indicated that their departments placed little or no importance on preparing other practitioners.

Faculty's Use of Professional Time

Eighty-six faculty members from 31 of the 41 participating departments provided information on the percentage of professional time they spent, in the 1983-84 academic year, in each of the six areas listed in Table 30. Table 30 orders the six professional activity areas from highest mean percentage of time spent in an activity to lowest.

Table 30

Percentage of Time Faculty Respondents Spent in Six Professional Activities

Activity	Mean % of Time	SM	Median
Teaching, preparing for classes, evaluating student tests or papers	35.7	2.1	35
Research and scholarly writing	24.8	1.7	30
Program or university administration (including committee work)	17.4	1.8	10
Advising students and directing students' research	14	.9	10
Other professional activities	7.2	1.6	2
Private practice	1	.3	0

SM = Standard error of the mean

Faculty members spent anywhere from 0% to 97% of their time teaching. The mean percentage of time spent in this activity was 35.7%. Overall, participating faculty members spent a greater percentage of their time teaching than in any other single professional activity.

The second highest usage of time for faculty members overall was in the area of research and writing. Individual faculty members reported that they spent anywhere from 0% to 90% of their professional time in this activity. The mean percentage of time spent in research and writing was 24.8%. The least amount of time was spent in private practice. Participating faculty members spent between 0% and 10% of their time in this area. The mean percentage of time spent in private practice was 1%.

Relative to the remaining professional activities, as Table 30 indicates, faculty members spent a mean of 17.4% of their time in program or university administration, 14% of their time advising students, and 7.2% of their time in other professional activities. Although the means differed between "university administration" and "advising students," when the medians for these two professional activities were computed they were both 10. The difference in means can be explained by a few extreme scores in program or university administration. Faculty respondents in general then spent a similar amount of time in program or university administration and in advising students and

directing their research. Table 31 summarizes the distribution of faculty respondents on percent of professional time spent in six activities.

Faculty Ranking of Departments

Peer rankings of departments have been conducted for many years in most academic fields. Though there is little doubt in even the strongest proponent of rankings that peer rankings have many limitations there seems to be value in going to the "experts" in a field, that is the educators, to see how they view the various departments in their field.

Of the 87 faculty surveys returned, 67 ranked anywhere from 1 to 10 of the departments. Of the 67 respondents that provided rankings, 54 ranked the 10 programs they thought were best, 1 ranked 9, 1 ranked 8, 1 ranked 7, 1 ranked 6, 4 ranked 5, 2 ranked 4, 2 ranked 2, and 1 ranked only 1 department. The rankings are based on responses of faculty members from 28 of the 41 participating departments.

Twenty faculty respondents, or approximately 23% of the respondents, did not rank departments. A number of faculty who did not rank departments indicated on the ranking sheet of the faculty survey why they had declined ranking the departments. Six indicated that they did not feel qualified to rank departments because they lacked

Table 31

Distribution of Percentage of Time Faculty Respondents Spent in Six Activities

% of Time	Teaching	Advising Students	Research/ Writing	Program or Univ. Adm.	Private Practice	Other Prof. Activities
0	3%	2%	6%	8%	84%	47%
1-10	6%	51%	21%	51%	16%	42%
11-20	15%	30%	20%	14%		6%
21-30	27%	15%	29%	7%		
31-40	20%		15%	8%		1%
41-50	15%	1%	6%	7%		
51-60	6%			5%		1%
61-70	2%		2%			1%
71-80	3%					2%
81-90	1%		1%			
91-100	1%					

experience with many of the departments. One nonranker simply stated, "This is not a possible task." Three nonranking respondents indicated they were opposed to peer rankings. One of these faculty respondents voiced many of the same concerns as Dolan, who has been the chief critic of rankings. This respondent expressed the hope that these rankings would not be tallied and published as "a list of the best programs in the country."

Although the rankings are being published in this report, they are not meant to be viewed as a definitive listing of the best 10 family science departments. They should instead be viewed as additional data about family science departments. They identify departments that have among the family science academicians surveyed a reputation for being "quality" programs. Peer rankings should be viewed as one indicator of the quality of family science graduate departments.

The low response rate with regard to faculty members who ranked departments, as well as the absence of a measure of how stable these rankings would be from one sample to another, suggests that these data should be viewed as suggestive rather than conclusive. In spite of these limitations, the data are the best ranking data currently available.

Table 32 shows the results of the faculty ranking of departments, controlling for university of highest degree

Table 32

Ranking of Departments Based on Mean of Votes Received When Vote is Dropped Out for University of Highest Degree and University Where Employed*

Rank	University	Mean	Number**
1	University of Minnesota	2.0	54
2	The Pennsylvania State University	3.2	41
3	Cornell University	4.2	40
4	Brigham Young University	4.4	44
5	Purdue University	5.2	47
6	University of Georgia	5.3	37
7	Florida State University	5.9	24
8	Univ. of No. Carolina at Greensboro	6.4	19
9	Iowa State University	6.5	16
10	Texas Tech University	6.6	10

*Includes only departments that were ranked by at least 10 faculty respondents.

**Refers to number of times faculty respondents ranked the department.

and university of current employment. These were controlled for by dropping out a vote for the university where one received his/her highest degree and where one is currently employed. This ranking was chosen over a ranking that controlled for neither variable or one that controlled for only one of these two variables because controlling for either variable resulted in some changes in mean rankings and consequently some shifts in the rank order of departments.

Tables 33-35 show the effects of controlling the two variables that were controlled. Table 33 shows the rankings without any controls. Table 34 shows the rankings when the university of highest degree is controlled. As Table 34 illustrates, controlling for the university of one's highest degree resulted in several small changes. (It should be noted that the higher the mean ranking value, the lower the actual rank order). In the rankings with no controls (see Table 33), BYU placed third, with a mean ranking of 4.1; and Cornell fourth, with a mean ranking of 4.2. Dropping out votes for one's institution of highest degree resulted in a tie for the third position between Cornell and BYU, a consequence of an increase of .1 in BYU's mean rankings. In addition, in the ranking with no controls, North Carolina, Florida State, Connecticut, and Virginia Polytech took the numbers 7, 8, 9, and 10 positions, respectively. Controlling for institution of

Table 33

Ranking of Departments Based on Mean of Votes Received With No Controls*

Rank	University	Mean	Number**
1	University of Minnesota	2.0	58
2	The Pennsylvania State Univ.	3.1	51
3	Brigham Young University	4.1	50
4	Cornell University	4.2	42
5	University of Georgia	4.9	43
6	Purdue University	5.1	49
7	Univ. of No. Carolina at Greensboro	5.4	28
8	Florida State University	5.9	28
9	University of Connecticut	6.1	15
10	Virginia Polytech University	6.2	28

*Includes only departments that were ranked by at least 10 faculty respondents.

**Refers to number of times faculty respondents ranked the department.

Table 34

Ranking of Departments Based on Mean of Votes Received When Vote is Dropped Out for University of Highest Degree*

Rank	University	Mean	Number**
1	University of Minnesota	2.0	57
2	The Pennsylvania State Univ.	3.1	45
3.5	Brigham Young University	4.2	49
3.5	Cornell University	4.2	40
5	University of Georgia	5.0	41
6	Purdue University	5.1	49
7	Florida State University	5.7	25
8	Univ. of No. Carolina at Greensboro	5.9	22
9	Virginia Polytech University	6.2	27
10	University of Connecticut	6.3	14

*Includes only departments that were ranked by at least 10 faculty respondents.

**Refers to number of times faculty respondents ranked the department.

The most meaningful listing of the top-10 departments found in this study is shown in Table 32. However, the difference in rank between many top universities is so small that rather than distinguish between 10 ranks, it may be more meaningful to identify several groups. The first group consists of the two departments that occupy the first and second positions respectively and they are separated from adjacent departments by the greatest difference in mean rankings: The University of Minnesota and the Pennsylvania State University.

The second group consists of Cornell and Brigham Young University, separated by a mean difference of only .2. Then there is a relatively large jump (.8) from BYU to the third group. This group consists of Purdue University and the University of Georgia, which are separated by a mean difference of only .1. The last group is set off from Purdue and the University of Georgia by a difference of .6 in the mean rankings. This group consists of the universities that occupy the bottom four positions in the top-10 rankings: Florida State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Iowa State University, and Texas Tech University. There is a gap of .5 between the mean rankings of number 7 ranked Florida State and number 8 ranked North Carolina University. North Carolina and Iowa State then are separated by a difference in mean rankings

of only .1. Iowa State and Texas Tech are also separated by a difference of .1 in their mean rankings.

Four universities that do not appear in the top-10 rankings reported in Table 32 missed appearing by only one or two tenths of a point. They include Michigan State, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Virginia Polytech Institute, and the University of Connecticut.

Comparison with Earlier Ranking Study

A comparision of Tables 32 and 36 reveals that the present rankings are similar to and differ from Burr's (Burr et al., 1984) in a number of ways. One consistent finding in the two studies is that Minnesota occupies the number 1 position in both studies. Another consistency is that 9 of the 10 departments that appear in the Burr et al. rankings (1984) also appear in the present rankings, although their relative positions differ, with the exception of number 1 ranked University of Minnesota.

An inconsistency between the Burr rankings and the rankings of this study is that Michigan State, which ranked number 7, with a mean ranking of 7.5 in the Burr et al. (1984) study, failed to make the top-10 in this study, although it actually had a better mean ranking in the present study (6.7). Another difference in the two rankings is that Iowa State, which did not appear in Burr's top-10, took the number 9 position in this study.

Table 36

Burr's Top-10 Ranking of Departments*

Rank	University	Mean
1	University of Minnesota	1.2
2	Brigham Young University	3.2
3	Pennsylvania State University	4.6
4	Purdue University	5.8
5	Cornell University	6.5
6	Univ. of North Carolina at Greensboro	7.0
7	Michigan State University	7.5
8	Texas Tech University	7.9
9	University of Georgia	8.6
10	Florida State University	9.1

*Burr et al., 1984

A major difference in the results of the two ranking studies is in the mean ranking values. In several cases in the present study there was only a difference in the mean rankings of two universities of .1 or .2. The mean difference in mean rankings in this study is .5, in contrast to the Burr et al. (1984) study, in which in only one case was there a difference in mean rankings of less than the modal difference of .5; the mean difference in mean rankings was 9. Thus the Burr rankings present a clearer picture of the relative positions of departments.

A few basic differences between the Burr study and the present study might account, at least in part, for the difference in rankings:

1. The rankings occurred at different points in time, approximately a year apart. One way this may have made a difference is that Beatrice Paolucci, one of the key faculty at Michigan State University, passed away during this interval. This may account for at least part of the drop for Michigan State, since there is evidence that the presence of a "star" faculty member in a department may affect the rankings (Lewis, 1968).

2. The faculty members who ranked departments in the present study were drawn from a larger number of departments. In this study, faculty from 28 universities ranked departments; in the Burr et al. (1984) study, faculty from only 18 universities ranked departments.

3. The Burr et al. (1984) rankings were obtained by combining the rankings of faculty members on five different dimensions, whereas faculty members in the present study were asked for an overall or global ranking of the top-10 departments.

4. The present rankings do not include votes for institution where one received his/her highest degree or where one is currently employed, whereas the Burr et al. (1984) rankings do.

Comparison of High- and Low-Ranked Doctoral Departments

One of the objectives of this study was to identify ways in which graduate family science departments that are perceived by faculty as outstanding departments differ from other graduate departments in the field. Inasmuch as all of the high-ranked departments were found to have doctoral programs and most departments having only master's programs received no votes from faculty rankers, the decision was made to compare only doctoral departments.

A median split, a frequently used method of dividing a group for comparative purposes, was performed on the doctoral departments, arranged according to mean rank. This split resulted in two groups of doctoral departments: the first group consisted of the top 13 ranked doctoral departments; the comparison group consisted of the 14 lowest ranked and never-ranked departments. T-tests were

then performed, with alpha set at .05, comparing the high-ranked doctoral departments with the other doctoral departments on 15 variables from the department survey and 23 variables from the faculty survey.

The results of these comparisons are summarized in Tables 37 and 38. Departments were not compared on the average amount of the various forms of financial assistance because of a possible misunderstanding of the question by some departments, discussed in an earlier section of this paper.

Only one of the t-tests that compared the two groups on the department variables was significant, $t(25)=-2.59$, $p<.02$; high-ranked departments were found to have a greater mean number of faculty than low-ranked departments (18.3 vs. 11.6). T-tests comparing the high-ranked and low-ranked departments on total in 83-84 PhD programs, $t(18)=-1.83$, $p<.08$, and number of 83-84 PhD graduates, $t(19)=-1.94$, $p<.07$, approached significance. The mean number of PhD students in 1983-84 for high-ranked departments was 40.6, and for low-ranked departments, 23.9. The mean number of PhD graduates in 1983-84 for high-ranked departments was 8.25, and for low-ranked departments, 4.11.

Seven of the t-tests that compared high- and low-ranked departments on the faculty perception variables were significant. Faculty of high-ranked departments rated

Table 37

T-Tests Comparing High- and Low-Ranked Departments on Variables From Department Survey

Variable	Ranking Group	n	Mean	t	Signif.
Total faculty	H	13	18.31	-2.59	.02**
	L	14	11.64		
% Professors	H	13	38.23	.06	.96 NS
	L	14	38.57		
% Assoc. profs.	H	13	37.31	-1.03	.31 NS
	L	14	33.21		
% Asst. profs.	H	13	24.31	.73	.47 NS
	L	14	28.07		
% Faculty w/PhD	H	13	94.85	.64	.53 NS
	L	13	96.54		
# Master's students	H	10	40.80	-.14	.89 NS
	L	10	38.30		
# Doctoral students	H	10	40.60	-1.83	.08*
	L	10	23.90		
Undergrad GPA master's	H	6	3.39	-.98	.35 NS
	L	6	3.29		
Undergrad GPA doc.	H	6	3.45	-.67	.51 NS
	L	7	3.36		
# Master's grads.	H	12	10.58	-1.14	.27 NS
	L	9	6.89		
# Doctoral grads.	H	12	8.25	-1.94	.07*
	L	9	4.11		
Rating of libr.	H	12	3.17	-.28	.78 NS
	L	13	3.08		
# Master's programs	H	13	2.85	-.85	.40 NS
	L	14	2.29		

(continued on next page)

Table 37 (cont.)

T-Tests Comparing High- and Low-Ranked Departments on Variables From Department Survey

Variable	Ranking Group	n	Mean	t	Signif.
# Doctoral programs	H	13	1.85	-.46	.65 NS
	L	14	1.64		
Ratio grad studs./fac.	H	9	6.02	.22	.83 NS
	L	9	6.43		

*.05-.10 **.01-.05 ***.01 or below NS=.10 or above
H=High ranking group L=Low ranking group

Table 38

T-Tests Comparing High- and Low-Ranked Departments On Variables From Faculty Survey

Variable	Ranking Group	n	Mean	t	Signif.
Freedom to plan courses	H	32	3.69	-.77	.44 NS
	L	38	3.55		
Freedom to conduct research	H	31	3.74	-.33	.74 NS
	L	38	3.68		
Fac. interest in studs.	H	32	3.63	-1.18	.24 NS
	L	38	3.45		
Adequacy of library	H	30	3.53	-2.30	.02**
	L	38	3.13		
Clarity of programs' goals	H	32	3.34	-2.28	.03**
	L	37	2.92		
Lab & other equip.	H	32	3.22	-2.13	.04**
	L	38	2.79		
Menu of courses	H	31	3.16	-.44	.66 NS
	L	37	3.08		
Fac. interest in teaching	H	32	3.22	-.66	.51 NS
	L	38	3.10		
Career dev. of jr. faculty	H	31	3.32	-2.11	.04**
	L	38	2.92		
Faculty relations	H	32	3.22	-2.42	.02**
	L	38	2.74		
Student relations	H	32	3.56	-1.40	.17 NS
	L	37	3.35		
Encour. to become profess. active	H	32	3.66	-2.64	.01***
	L	37	3.24		
Intradepartmental coll.	H	32	3.09	-1.81	.08*
	L	38	2.76		

(continued on next page)

Table 38 (cont.)

T-Tests Comparing High- and Low-Ranked Departments On Variables From Faculty Survey

Variable	Ranking Group	n	Mean	t	Signif.
Interdepartmental coll.	H	32	2.75	-.80	.43 NS
	L	38	2.61		
Imp.of preparing scholars/researchers	H	32	4.31	-1.73	.09*
	L	38	3.95		
Imp. of preparing college teachers	H	32	3.84	-2.67	.01***
	L	38	3.39		
Imp. of preparing other practitioners	H	31	3.74	-.14	.89 NS
	L	38	3.71		
% Time in teaching	H	31	34.98%	-.47	.64 NS
	L	38	32.71%		
% Time advising students	H	31	14.23%	.14	.89 NS
	L	38	14.53%		
% Time in research & writing	H	31	24.60%	.20	.85 NS
	L	38	25.39%		
% Time in admin.	H	31	19.52%	-.33	.74 NS
	L	38	18.16%		
% Time in priv. practice	H	31	.97%	-.07	.94 NS
	L	38	.92%		
% Time in other profess. activities	H	31	5.71%	.70	.49 NS
	L	38	8.29%		

*.05-.10 **.02-.05 ***.01 or below NS=.11 or above
H=High ranking group L=Low ranking group

Tennessee have changed the names of their home economics departments to the Department of Family and Consumer Studies and the Department of Child and Family Studies, respectively. It will be interesting to observe the rate of growth of the field over the next few years in the formation of new family science departments, change in emphasis in existing related departments (such as that which has occurred in Kent State and The University of Tennessee), as well as the addition of graduate programs in family science departments that have heretofore offered only undergraduate degrees. There is evidence that the field is continuing to grow: The University of Utah is planning to add a master's degree program in family ecology in 1987;[3] Utah State University is adding a family PhD program;[4] and The University of New Mexico has a new Family Studies department which will offer a master's degree program.[5]

The purpose of this study was to provide the family science discipline with some information on its graduate

---

[3]Information obtained from a conversation with Afesa Adams, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Utah, at the 1986 annual meetings of the Utah Council on Family Relations.

[4]Information obtained from a conversation with Wesley Burr, director of the Family Living Center at Brigham Young University.

[5]Information from personal correspondence with Richard Smith, chairman of the Department of Family Studies at the University of New Mexico.

departments. The study provides four basic types of data on these departments, including descriptive data on various aspects of departments supplied by chairs or an informant designated by the chair; a descriptive evaluation of departments by their faculty, as well as their estimates of the percentage of time they spend in different professional activities; prestige ranking of departments by faculty; and finally, a comparison of high-ranked and low-ranked doctoral departments.

The Nature of Family Science Departments

The information on departments obtained in this study will serve a variety of purposes. First, this information will satisfy, in part, the field's need for self-knowledge. Unsolicited feedback from department chairs during the study suggests that departments have frequently known little about themselves and about other departments in the field, and they were interested in having more information.

Second, this information will provide baseline data at a critical point in time, a time when many in the field believe family science is transforming from merely an interdisciplinary area to a bonafide discipline. Having baseline data at this time will help make future assessments of the progress of the field more meaningful.

This information on departments will also play an important role in helping individuals in the field make important decisions. Administrators may find these data

helpful in making decisions about such things as hiring faculty, recruiting students, and changing the curriculum. These data may prove helpful to faculty in their role as advisors to family science students who seek a department that offers the kind of training they need in order to accomplish their professional goals. They may also help faculty, and students who are near the completion of their graduate studies make decisions about employment, and identify scholars to collaborate with. And finally, prospective students may be able to use this information to find a graduate program with the features and offerings they desire.

Variability of Departments

The data in this study reveal that family science departments in the mid 1980s have high variability in some areas and low variability in others. There is substantial variation in the size of departments, in the number of faculty, and the number of graduate students. Departments also vary greatly in the ratio of graduate students to faculty; in the proportion of faculty who are full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors; in the types and dollar value of financial assistance they offer graduate students; in the names of the majors offered; and in the scores they require on the GRE, the entrance exam required by the majority of departments.

There is also considerable variation in the undergraduate GPAs of master's students. There is less variation in the undergraduate GPAs of doctoral students, since most of the departments attract graduate students with GPAs of approximately 3.5. However, there is also some variation in this area, because several departments have doctoral students with undergraduate GPAs that are relatively close to the minimum requirements.

Relative to courses, a core of approximately 15 courses is offered by the majority of departments. Beyond this core, however, there is considerable variation in the course offerings of departments: certain courses (approximately 45) are available in only a few departments--most commonly one course in one certain department.

A final area of high variability is how faculty spend their professional time. Faculty vary widely in the amount of time they spend teaching, advising students, doing research and scholarly writing, and performing administrative responsibilities. The one professional activity where there is low variability in the amount of time faculty spend in it is private practice. The vast majority of faculty are not involved in any kind of private practice.

The areas in which there is little variability among family science departments include the level of education attained by faculty, the minimum undergraduate GPA required for admission, and evaluations of the quality of family

challenges of today's families, would help the field to see what it is not doing that it should be doing. Until there is more clarity relative to what majors really are offered, the field will not be able to make these judgments effectively.

Courses

The data on course offerings reveal that the vast majority of family science departments offer a group of classes, which includes child development (or human development), aging/lifespan, family development, family financial planning, family theory and research, home management, practicum in marriage and family therapy, cross-cultural family, and family and health care.

In contrast, a large group of courses are offered only by a few departments. It is surprising to this author that so few departments offer some of these courses, because several of them deal with important phenomena and trends in the field and in society.

For example, only a few departments in the field offer a course in family consulting for business/industry, yet more and more corporations seem to suffer consequences, in the form of decreased productivity, of the marital/familial instability of their employees. There is a knowledge base in the family field relative to the family and the work world (e.g., Pleck, 1985; Draughn, 1984). Providing well-qualified family consultants, specifically trained to solve

industry's family-related problems, not only would benefit industry but would provide a new avenue of employment for future graduates of family science programs. Hopefully, as departments become more aware of this need, they will expand their curriculum and offer a course in family consulting for business/industry.

Religion and the family also deals with an important phenomenon, yet a course in this area is offered by few family science departments. Thomas and Henry (1985) have demonstrated that interest in the connection between religion and the family has increased in the 1980s. This increase in interest is evidenced in (a) more extensive discussions of the interplay between the two in basic family texts in the 1980s, (b) the recently held conferences on religion and the family at two major universities, and (c) the formation of a religion section in NCFR in 1984. This trend, along with research studies that reaffirm significant interrelationships between religion and the family (Bahr and Chadwick, 1985; Thornton, 1985), suggests that a course in religion and the family may be an important part of the training of family scientists today. Hopefully, as the information about this need and the scarcity of courses in this area becomes known, graduate departments will give serious consideration to adding such a course to their curriculum.

And finally, only one department--The University of North Carolina at Greensboro--indicated that it offers a course in divorce--certainly one of the most critical and relevant topics of today. Possibly some other family science departments offer a course in divorce but simply failed to report it, since a number of departments did not list any additional course offered by their departments/ universities. However, it is still notable that of the departments that did provide this information on course offerings, only one indicated that it offered a course in divorce. Undoubtedly, the topic of divorce is dealt with, to some extent, in other courses, such as marriage and the family. However, the magnitude of the problem of divorce today, as exemplified by the extremely high divorce rates in the United States,[6] and the explosion of information is this area (e.g., McPhee, 1985; Booth, Brinkerhoff, & White, 1984; Glenn & Shelton, 1983; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980), suggests the need for a course that deals exclusively with divorce.

---

[6]Statistical summary from the National Center for Health Statistics, published in Deseret News, March 27-28, 1986 Section A, pg. 13; a Salt Lake City, Utah, publication.

Evaluation of Selected Aspects of Their Departments by Faculty

The faculty ratings of dimensions of their departments provide the discipline with some information on areas of faculty satisfaction/dissatisfaction. The responses revealed that in general, faculty view their departments in a positive light. This suggests that morale is generally good in the field.

Among the data that lead to this conclusion is the fact that the majority of faculty reported they felt very free to conduct research and to plan courses. The latter is apparently a long-term condition in the family field, inasmuch as Christensen's faculty respondents also felt that they had a lot of freedom in this area (Christensen, 1958). Faculty also generally felt that colleagues in their departments were genuinely interested in the welfare of their students.

Other data that support this conclusion include the high level of satisfaction faculty expressed relative to their universities' family science library holdings, the clarity of their program goals, the adequacy of the menu of courses and other offerings, faculty interest in teaching, and student interpersonal relations. The two areas that faculty felt the best about were student interpersonal relations and encouragement to become professionally active.

Faculty Ranking of Departments

The ranking data in the present study provide departments with some information on how they are perceived by their peers in the field. The data also provide prospective students with additional information about departments, and this information can assist them in selecting the most effective graduate program for them. In addition, this part of the study provides the academic community with some data on family science graduate departments comparable to data that have long been available on graduate departments in other fields (Cartter, 1966; Roose-Andersen, 1970; Clark et al., 1976).

The most meaningful conclusion about the rankings is that a group of departments are consistently ranked as being among the most eminent programs. The data also suggest that it is not meaningful to make fine discriminations about the actual positioning of departments in the top-10. Rather, there are several groupings within the best departments. The University of Minnesota and The Pennsylvania State University can be considered the first group, because they are consistently ranked higher than other departments. Cornell University and Brigham Young University then cluster in a group, and two departments, Purdue University and the University of Georgia, form a third tier of eminent departments. It is less clear which departments should be included in the fourth group, but

there are eight that tend to cluster around the 7th through 10th ranks, or are very close to the top ten (Florida State University, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Iowa State University, Texas Tech University, Michigan State University, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Virginia Polytech, and the University of Connecticut).

The present study also provides some important methodological data about research on the quality of academic programs. The study provides evidence that rater association with the rated institution affects the rankings to some extent. Consistent with Cartter's study (1966) and the Clark et al. (1976) study, the larger biases in the present study were in favor of the employing university. This study also provides evidence that size of department may bias peer rankings. Size of department, defined as number of faculty, was found to distinguish between high-ranked and low-ranked departments; high-ranked departments generally had more faculty than low-ranked departments.

Heiss (1970), however, has posited an alternative explanation for a relationship between size of department and peer rankings: a "critical mass" of faculty may be requisite to a high quality graduate department. The limitations of this study suggest the need for additional research into the influence of rater association with rated institution and size of department on peer rankings.

Another finding relative to the rankings of this study was that departments with doctoral programs were uniformly ranked higher by faculty respondents than were departments having only master's programs. All the departments that appear in the top-10 rankings have doctoral programs. This finding suggests that the best departments also have doctoral programs and that the departments having only master's programs should not be included in ranking studies.

A comparison of the present rankings with the rankings in the Burr et al. (1984) study reveals a high level of consistency in the two rankings. Nine of the departments that appeared in the present rankings also appeared in the Burr et al. (1984) rankings, although their relative positions differed in several minor ways, with the exception of the University of Minnesota, which occupied the number 1 position in both studies. The fact that the ranking part of this study is basically a replication of the Burr et al. (1984) rankings and that there is a high level of consistency between the two rankings suggests reliability in the rankings; this consistency increases the confidence we can place in them.

In interpreting the ranking of family science departments by faculty, as well as all other data obtained from faculty in this study, the reader should be mindful of the limitations of the present study. The somewhat low

response rate and the overrepresentation of respondents who are full professors are two problems that should be kept in mind.

Factors Relating to Reputational Quality of Departments

Data on factors that characterize high-ranked vs. low-ranked doctoral departments provide additional information about the current condition of family science. This information is valuable because it can help to guide departmental efforts at self-evaluation and improvement.

This study was able to identify eight factors that significantly differentiate between high-ranked and low-ranked graduate family science departments. These eight factors are (a) adequacy of the family science library holdings of the university library; (b) adequacy of lab and other equipment; (c) clarity of the program goals of the department; (d) departmental efforts toward career development of junior faculty; (e) faculty interpersonal relations; (f) encouragement from departments to become professionally active; (g) emphasis by department on the preparation of college teachers; and (h) number of faculty.

The finding that faculty of high-ranked departments evaluate the family science holdings of their libraries more favorably than the faculty of low-ranked departments reinforces the widely held belief that the quality of an academic program depends in part on the quality of the library materials available. Therefore, one concrete thing

departments can do to strengthen themselves is to secure additional family science library materials. It is essential in today's fast-paced information era that both faculty and students have available to them comprehensive up-to-date library holdings relevant to the field. The finding of a relationship between quality of department and adequacy of the university library can be used by departments as leverage to obtain the funds needed to secure these materials.

The relationship found in this study between the quality of a department and the adequacy of the lab and other equipment suggests that these resources are also important. It also means that some family science departments do not have some of the physical resources they need. These departments can use this finding to help establish their need for such things as additional computer hardware and software, observation rooms, video equipment, and adequate office space for graduate students.

The relationship between clarity of the program goals of departments and the quality rankings suggest that vision, a common sense of purpose and destiny, and a willingness to establish priorities are important in creating high quality programs. Apparently the family science programs that are not among the most eminent do not know where they are going as well as do the more eminent departments. These departments can strengthen themselves

by transforming previously unarticulated or inadequately articulated goals into more clear and well-defined goals.

The findings that the faculty of "outstanding" departments report more departmental efforts toward the career development of junior faculty and more encouragement by their departments to become professionally active reinforces Cartter's (1966) conclusion that the quality of a graduate department is, in great part, determined by the quality of its faculty. Quality faculty are needed who will contribute knowledge to the field, who will be active in their national organizations--making presentations, serving on committees, and holding offices--and who will be effective teachers. These findings suggest that some family science departments may not be doing as much as they could be doing to develop their faculty in these important areas. Apparently it would benefit these departments to invest more time and effort in the development of their junior faculty and in the encouragement of their faculty in general to become professionally active.

The finding of a relationship between faculty interpersonal relations and the quality rankings suggests that the interpersonal relationships within a department is also important in creating a high quality program. This relationship is consistent with Hagstrom's (1970) finding that interpersonal communication is less likely to be marred by conflict among faculty of higher ranked

departments of mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology. Also, since this factor was one of the areas of lower faculty satisfaction, that data suggest that this is another area where family science departments that wish to upgrade themselves may want to examine and improve.

The finding that faculty of high-ranked departments perceive their departments as placing greater emphasis on the preparation of college teachers than do faculty of low-ranked departments suggests that the priorities in the better departments are more consistent with the reality that family scientists in academic positions spend more time teaching than researching; and this consistency appears to be important. Apparently, departments that want to improve should put more energy than they have previously put into the preparation of college teachers.

The final factor that distinguishes high-ranked and low-ranked departments, the size of the department as defined by the number of faculty, may mean more than one thing. It could be that the size of departments biases reputational rankings, a contention of several researchers (Abbott, 1972; Cox & Catt, 1977). Another possibility is that Heiss is correct in his contention that a "critical mass" of faculty (and students) is an essential element of a high quality graduate department. With regard to the need for a critical mass of students, if a .1 significance level had been utilized, the number of doctoral students

would have been significantly related to the quality of programs. This would have been consistent with the findings of Elton and Rogers (1971) and Clark et al. (1976), and would have added further support to that obtained through the finding in this study of a relationship between faculty size and quality of departments, that departments may benefit by setting goals for expansion and growth.

A large number of factors did not distinguish between high- and low-ranked departments. Some of these factors are worthy of mention because they were either surprising or they confirmed the findings of other researchers.

One finding that came as a surprise to this author was that the faculty of high-ranked departments did not report any greater satisfaction with their department's menu of courses and other offerings than faculty of lower ranked departments. However, this finding makes sense when considered in conjunction with the fact that 92% of the faculty respondents in the present study reported that they felt free to plan courses. If family science faculty overwhelmingly feel satisfied with their power to create new courses, this factor would not be related to quality.

Another surprising finding in this study was that undergraduate selectivity of students was not related to the quality rankings. High- and low-ranked doctoral departments did not differ significantly in terms of the

undergraduate GPAs of their graduate students. This appears to mean that departments judged to be the quality departments of the field generally do not attract better students than other departments. However, it should be remembered that less than half of the doctoral departments provided this information. If these data had been available for all 27 doctoral departments, a difference may have emerged.

It was anticipated that the ratio of graduate students to graduate faculty would be related to the quality rankings. However, the data did not support this relationship. This finding seems to contradict the folk belief in the academic world that quality schools are characterized by the smallest faculty/student ratios. Though this may or may not be true at the lower levels of education, the findings of this study suggest that it is not true in the family science field at the doctoral level.

A particularly interesting and surprising finding of this study was that the adequacy of the family science holdings of university libraries was related to the quality rankings only when faculty ratings were used. When ratings by department chairs were used, no relationship emerged. A possible explanation for this inconsistency is that the chair, whose time is of necessity filled with responsibilities in areas other than research, may not be as aware of the deficiencies of the university library as is a

faculty member who is actively engaged in research and who, therefore, makes prodigious use of the university library.

Inasmuch as scholarly productivity of faculty has frequently been identified as a major distinguishing factor between high- and low-ranked departments (Lewis, 1968; Hagstrom, 1970; Abbott, 1972; Clark et al., 1976), it seems logical that time spent in research and scholarly writing would also be related to the quality rankings. However, no relationship between these variables was found in this study. It appears then that faculty of high-ranked departments and faculty of low-ranked departments are spending a comparable amount of time in research and writing, but the former may be publishing more of their work.

A relationship between amount of emphasis placed by departments on the preparation of scholars/researchers and the quality rankings approached significance. Again, because so much research has found support for a relationship between scholarly productivity and quality rankings (Lewis, 1968; Hagstrom, 1970; Abbott, 1972; Clark et al., 1976)--a finding that could be interpreted as meaning that high-ranked departments place a higher value on research than do low-ranked departments--it was anticipated that a statistically significant relationship between amount of emphasis placed by departments on the preparation of scholars/researchers and the quality rankings would be obtained. The fact that the relationship approached

significance suggests to this author that future studies of family science departments may want to explore this area further.

The finding that percentage of faculty with the PhD is not related to the quality rankings was anticipated, because in the vast majority of family science departments, 100% of the faculty have the PhD. This finding is consistent with the Clark et al. (1976) study.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study provides baseline data on graduate departments in the family science field. For two reasons it will be useful in the future to conduct periodic studies of the field's graduate departments. First, data from the present study are being used in the development of a computer repository of information on family science departments for use by departments. This repository will need to be updated from time to time to insure that it continues to provide departments with current information that will enable them to keep abreast of what is happening in the field relative to its graduate training programs. A second reason for conducting periodic studies of the field's graduate departments is to enable the field to measure its growth in years to come.

The task of updating the information on departments can be facilitated in two ways:

1. Departments can commit to and follow through on keeping careful and complete records, including up-to-date vitae on their faculty.

2. A new version of the department survey used in this study can be developed that minimizes ambiguity of items and that makes its completion less time-consuming and less costly for departments. This in turn will have the effect of increasing the probability that departments will elect to participate in these departmental update studies and that the information they provide is accurate and complete. Specific suggestions for modifications that should be made in the department survey for use in future studies can be found in Appendix G.

Another area of study that would be useful to undertake in the future is related to the faculty rankings. If the elements of a quality family science department could be identified, as well as the relative importance of these elements, there would be an increase in the reliability and validity of the rankings (Guilford, 1954). This would allow for the calculation of a more meaningful overall ranking of departments. Faculty rankers would rank family science departments on each of the identified criteria; these rankings would then be combined, with attention to their relative importance.

REFERENCES

Abbott, W. (1972). University and departmental determinants of the prestige of sociology departments. The American Sociologist, 7, 14-15.

Angell, R. C. (1936). The family encounters the depression. New York: Scribner.

Astin, A. (1965). Who goes where to college? Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Bahr, H. M. & Chadwick, B. (1985). Religion and family in Middletown, USA. Journal Of Marriage and the Family, 47(May), 369-379.

Blackburn, R., & Lingenfelter, P. (1973). Assessing quality in doctoral programs: Criteria and correlates of excellence. New York: Carnie Foundation.

Booth, A., Brinkerhoff, D. B., & White, L. K. (1984). The impact of parental divorce on courtship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46(February), 85-94.

Burgess, E. W. & Cottrell, L. S. (1939). Predicting success and failure in marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Burr, W. R. (1983, October). Issues and methods in coping with identity problems in the family field. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Burr, W. R. (1984, March). A history of the family discipline movement. Insert in NCFR Report.

Burr, W. R. & Leigh, G. K. (1982a, March). Identity problems in the family field. Insert in NCFR Report.

Burr, W. R. & Leigh, G. K. (1982b, October). Famology: A new discipline. Presidential address delivered at the meetings of the National Council on Family Relations, Washington, D.C.

Burr, W. R. & Leigh, G. K. (1983). Famology: A new discipline. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45 (August), 463-480.

Burr, W. R., Schvaneveldt, J., Roleder, G., & Marshall, C. (1984, October). Preliminary data about eminence of family science programs. Paper presented at annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, San Francisco, CA.

Cartter, A. (1966). An assessment of quality in graduate education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Chadwick, B. A., Bahr, H. M., & Albrecht, S. L. (1984). Social science research methods. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Christensen, Glen A. (1958). An analysis of selected issues in family life education. Dissertation Abstracts, 20, 408-409. (University Microfilms No. 59-01323).

Clark, M. (1973). The assessment of quality in Ph.D. programs: A preliminary report on judgments by graduate deans. (GRE Board Research Report No. 72-7aR). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.

Clark, M., Hartnett, R., & Baird, L. (1976). Assessing dimensions of quality in doctoral education: A technical report of a national study in three fields. (Research Rep. No. ETS-PR-76-27). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Center.

Cox, W. & Catt, V. (1977). Productivity ratings of graduate programs in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. American Psychologist, 32(10), 793-813.

Davis, K. (1985, March). The study of marriage and the family as a scientific discipline. NCFR Report, p. 5.

Day, R. D., Peterson, G. W., & Roleder, G. (1984, October). Professional networks and hiring patterns at top-rated family science programs. Paper presented at annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, San Francisco, CA.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley.

Dolan, W. (1976). The ranking game: The power of the academic elite. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Draughn, P.S. (1984). Perceptions of competence in work and marriage of middle-age men, Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46(May), 403-409.

Edmonds, R. (1984, October). Internships in family programs. Paper presented at annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, San Francisco, CA.

Ellis, G. (1985, December). A recommendation about the identity of the family discipline. NCFR Report, p. 14-15.

Elton, C. F. & Rogers, S. A. (1971). Physics department ratings: Another evaluation. Science, 174, 565-568.

Glenn, N., & Villenez, W. (1970). The productivity of sociologists at 45 American universities. The American Sociologist, 5, 244-252.

Glenn, N. D., & Shelton, B. S. (1983). Pre-adult background variables and divorce: A note of caution about overreliance on explained variance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45(May): 405-410.

Groves, E. (1946). Professional training for family life educators. Marriage and Family Living, 8, 25-26.

Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hagstrom, W. (1971). Inputs, outputs, and the prestige of university science departments. Sociology of Education, 44, 375-397.

Heiss, A. M. (1970). Challenges to graduate schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hughes, R. (1934). Report of the committee on graduate instruction. Education Record, 15(2), 192-234.

Jones, L. V., Lindzey, G., & Coggesshall, P. E. (1982). An assessment of research doctorate programs in the United States: Social and behavioral sciences. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Keniston, H. (1959). Graduate study and research in the arts and sciences at the University of Pennsylvania. New York: Stratford Press.

Landis, J. (1959). The teaching of marriage and family courses in colleges. Marriage and Family Living, 21(1), 36-40.

Lawrence, J. K., & Green, K. C. (1980). A question of quality: The higher education ratings game. (AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 5). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

Lewis, L. (1968). On subjective and objective rankings of sociology departments. The American Sociologist, 3, 129-131.

Love, C. (1982). A guide to graduate family programs. Minn.: National Council on Family Relations.

McPhee, J. T. (1985). Ambiguity and change in the post-divorce family: Towards a model of divorce adjustment. Journal of Divorce, 8(2), 1-15.

Neubeck, G. (1961). Academic programs in marriage counseling. Marriage and Family Living, 23(3), 276-278.

Neubeck, G. (1985), August). Report on reactions to the two names: "Familiology" and "Family Science." NCFR Report, p. 6-7.

Pearl, L. (1950). Editorial: Are we developing a profession? Marriage and Family Living, 12(4), 128-129, 135.

Peterson, G. W., Day, R. D., & Roleder, G. (1984, October). The theoretical orientation of faculty who specialize in family studies. Paper presented at annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, San Francisco, CA.

Pleck, J. H. (1985). Working Wives/Working Husbands. Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications.

Roose, K. D., & Andersen, C. J. (1970). A rating of graduate programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Siebring, B. R. (1968). The American Council on Education rankings of quality in graduate education and membership in the National Academy of Science. Science Education, 53(1), 75-77.

Singletary, O. (1968). American universities and colleges. (10th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Thornton, A. (1985). Reciprocal influences of family and religion in a changing world. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47(May), 381-394.

Waller, W. (1938). The family: A dynamic interpretation. New York: Holt, Rinehard, and Winston.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. (1980). How children and parents cope with divorce. New York: Basic Books.

Webster, D. S. (1981). Advantages and disadvantages of methods of assessing quality. Change, 13, 20-24.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Listing of Family Science Departments

APPENDIX A

Family Science Departments: 1985

University of Akron
Department of Home Economics and Family Ecology
215 Schrank Hall South
Akron, Ohio 44325
216 (375-7721)

University of Alberta
Department of Family Studies
801 General Services Building
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2H1, Canada
(403) 432-5771

The University of Arizona
Department of Child Development and Family Relations
210 Family and Consumer Resources Building
Tucson, Arizona 85721
(612) 621-7127

Auburn University
Department of Family and Child Development
Spidle Hall
Auburn, Alabama 36849
(205) 826-4151

Brigham Young University
Department of Family Sciences
1000 SWKT
Provo, Utah 84602
(801) 378-2069

*University of British Columbia
Department of Family Science
6221 University Building
Vancouver, British Columbia
Canada V6T 1W5
(604) 228-6518

East Carolina University
Department of Child Development and Family Relations
Greenville, North Carolina 27834
(919) 757-6908

---

*Family Science Departments that did not return the Departmental Survey and as a result were not included in this study.

Colorado State University
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
141 Gifford Building
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523
(303) 491-5558

Teachers College, Columbia University
Department of Family and Community Education
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027
(212) 678-3185

University of Connecticut
Department of Human Development and Family Relations
School of Family Studies
Human Development Center
U-117, Room 18, 843 Bolton Road
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
(203) 486-4721/4722

*Cornell University
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
NYS College of Human Ecology, NG14 MVR Hall
Ithaca, New York 14850
(607) 256-7620

University of Delaware
Department of Individual and Family Studies
Newark, Delaware 19711
(302) 451-2969

Florida State University
Department of Home and Family Life
222 Sandels Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
(904) 644-3217

University of Georgia
Department of Child and Family Development
Dawson Hall
Athens, Georgia 30602
(404) 542-2551

University of Guelph
Department of Family Studies
Guelph, Ontario, N16 2W1, Canada
(519) 824-4120

University of Illinois
Department of Human Development and Family Ecology
1105 West Nevada
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(217) 333-3869

*University of Iowa
Department of Family Development
127 Macbride Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
(319) 353-3176

Iowa State University
Department of Family Environment
Ames, Iowa 50011
(515) 294-6316

Kansas State University
Department of Family and Child Development
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
(913) 532-5510

University of Kansas
Department of Human Development and Family Life
Hawarth Hall
Lawrence, Kansas 66045
(913) 864-4840

Kent State University
Department of Family and Consumer Studies
Kent, Ohio 44242
(216) 672-2197

University of Kentucky
Department of Family Studies
315 Funkhouser Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
(606) 257-7750

University of Manitoba
Department of Family Studies
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2, Canada
(204) 474-9794

*University of Maryland
Department of Family and Community Development
College Park, Maryland 20742
(301) 454-2142

Michigan State University
Department of Family and Child Ecology
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1030
(517) 355-7680

University of Minnesota
Family Social Science Department
290 McNeal Hall, 1985 Buford
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
(612) 373-1578

University of Missouri-Columbia
Department of Child and Family Development
31 Stanley Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211
(314) 382-4035

University of Nebraska
Department of Human Development and the Family
35th and Holdrege--East Campus
Lincoln, Nebraska 68583-0809
(402) 472-1650/52

University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Department of Child Development and Family Relations
1000 Spring Garden Street
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412-5001
(919) 379-5307

North Dakota State University
Department of Child Development and Family Relations
155 Home Economics Building
Fargo, North Dakota 58105
(701) 237-8268

Ohio State University
Department of Family Relations and Human Development
1787 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210
(614) 422-7705

Oklahoma State University
Department of Family Relations and Child Development
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
(405) 624-5057

Oregon State University
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
(503) 754-4765

The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Individual and Family Studies
S-106 Human Development Building
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
(814) 863-0241

Purdue University
Department of Child Development and Family Studies
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907
(317) 494-2932

*University of Rhode Island
Department of Human Development, Counseling, and Family Studies
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881
(401) 713-2150

San Diego State University
Department of Family Studies and Consumer Science
San Diego, California 92182-0282
(619) 265-5380

Syracuse University
Department of Child, Family, and Community Studies
201 Slocum Hall
Syracuse, New York 13210
(315) 423-2757

University of Tennessee
Department of Child and Family Studies
West Cumberland Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1900
(615) 974-5310

The University of Texas at Austin
Department of Child Development and Family Relationships
GEA 115
Austin, Texas 78712-1097
(512) 471-4682

Texas Tech University
Department of Human Development and Family Studies
Box 4170
Lubbock, Texas 79409-4170
(806) 742-3000

*Texas Women's University
Department of Family and Consumer Studies
P.O. Box 23975, TWU Station
Denton, Texas 76204
(817) 387-4564

Utah State University
Department of Family and Human Development
UMC 29
Logan, Utah 84322
(801) 750-1501

Virginia Polytech Institute
Department of Family and Child Development
301 Wallace Annex
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 961-4794/961-4795

West Virginia University
Department of Family Resources
P.O. Box 6122
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506-6122
(304) 293-3402

University of Wisconsin at Madison
Department of Child and Family Studies
1430 Linden Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(608) 263-2381

University of Wisconsin-Stout
Department of Marriage and Family Therapy
Menomonie, Wisconsin 54751
(715) 232-2404

APPENDIX B

Family Graduate Programs Database:

Departmental Survey--1979-1984

FAMILY GRADUATE PROGRAMS DATABASE

DEPARTMENTAL SURVEY - 1979-1984

IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR PROGRAM, FACULTY, OR STUDENTS, USE ADDITIONAL PAGES AS NECESSARY

1. Department address:

   Department _____

   School (or college) _____

   Street _____

   City _____

   State _____ Zip _____

2. Department telephone number: ( ) _____

3. Department chairperson: _____

4. Who should be contacted for information about the graduate program if other than the department chairperson?

   _____

5. What is this person's (in question #4) title? For example, are they a graduate coordinator?

   _____

6. Page two has a form for information about the tenured and tenure-track faculty in your department. Please make as many photocopies of page two as you need and provide as much of the requested information as you can. Please also send a copy of a current VITA for each tenured or tenure-track faculty member. If it will take additional time to acquire some of these VITA's, send those you have with the completed survey, and then send the others later.

2

Name ____________________ Rank ______________ Year attained rank _____

Highest degree _________ Yr. received _______ From what Univ.? _______

Major in highest degree ____

Areas of major interest ____

Does this faculty member teach or supervise graduate students?
( ) Yes ( ) No

Name ____________________ Rank ______________ Year attained rank _____

Highest degree _________ Yr. received _______ From what Univ.? _______

Major in highest degree ____

Areas of major interest ____

Does this faculty member teach or supervise graduate students?
( ) Yes ( ) No

Name ____________________ Rank ______________ Year attained rank _____

Highest degree _________ Yr. received _______ From what Univ.? _______

Major in highest degree ____

Areas of major interest ____

Does this faculty member teach or supervise graduate students?
( ) Yes ( ) No

Name ____________________ Rank ______________ Year attained rank _____

Highest degree _________ Yr. received _______ From what Univ.? _______

Major in highest degree ____

Areas of major interest ____

Does this faculty member teach or supervise graduate students?
( ) Yes ( ) No

10. Describe any inter-departmental or inter-university degree programs in which the department participates.

11. If your department has a club or organization for graduate students, describe it.

12. Identify which of the following courses are offered.

	In the dept.	Available in other depts. on campus
Aging/lifespan	( )	( )
Child (or human) development	( )	( )
Cross-cultural (comparative) family	( )	( )
Family and health care	( )	( )
Family and stress	( )	( )
Family and violence	( )	( )
Family consulting for business/industry	( )	( )
Family development	( )	( )
Family financial planning and counseling	( )	( )
Family law	( )	( )
Family policy	( )	( )
Family theory and research	( )	( )
Home management	( )	( )
Marriage and family therapy	( )	( )
Methods in family life education	( )	( )
Practicum in family life education	( )	( )
Religion and family	( )	( )
Practicum in marriage and family therapy	( )	( )
Other internship/practicum in community	( )	( )
Other family areas _____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

13. What percent of the graduate courses are offered after 5:00 PM?

_____%

14. Identify the other benefits your department offers graduate students. If these are only available to certain students, such as teaching assistants or research assistants, please explain.

( ) Desk or carrel space
( ) Office space
( ) Telephones
( ) Secretarial help
( ) Funds to attend professional meetings
( ) Other _____
( ) Other _____

15. Identify how many of each of the following forms of student financial assistance were available in 1983-84, and indicate their value.

Number		83-84 Average $ Amount
_____	Fellowship or traineeships	_____
_____	Teaching assistantships	_____
_____	Research assistantships	_____
_____	Administrative assistantships	_____
_____	Part-time faculty positions	_____
_____	Scholarships	_____
_____	Other _____	_____

16. To provide information for prospective students, please write a paragraph of about 100 words that describes the unique, innovative, or outstanding aspects of your graduate programs. (For example you could identify interinstitutional or consortia arrangements, curriculum design, etc. Also, family programs differ in their emphasis on such things as: (1) developing theory, (2) training students to do impact analyses, (3) training therapists, (4) emphasis on family strengths or wellness, (5) empirical research, (6) developing measurement instruments, (7)community involvement, (8) developing mass media publications, (9) training family life educators, (10) emphasis on lifespan analysis, (11) emphasis on human (child) development, (12) philosophical bases of ideas, (13) crosscultural study, and (14) developing materials for family life educators.)

17. Traditionally, most of the positions for graduates of family-oriented departments have been in academic, extension, or therapy settings. As these career options have become limited, some departments have begun to adapt their training programs and their contacts with non-academic institutions to expand the career options of their graduates. Is anything being done in your department to train graduates to assume different roles than they have held traditionally and/or to develop new career opportunities for graduates? If so, please describe this program and how successful it has been. If anything has not been done in the past but there are plans for the future, please describe them.

18. Annual deadline for admission (list as many as you use):

_____

19. Department GPA minimum for admission: _____

20. Standardized examinations required for admission:

Examination	Yes	No	Minimum Score Required	
GRE--Total	( )	( )	_____	
GRE--Verbal	( )	( )	_____	
GRE--Quant	( )	( )	_____	
GRE--Advanced	( )	( )	_____	Which one? _____
Miller Analogies	( )	( )	_____	
Other _____	( )	( )	_____	
_____	( )	( )	_____	

21. What are the average test scores of the graduate students currently in your graduate programs? (Include number of individual scores in each average in the parentheses following the score.)

GRE Total	_____	( )
GRE Verbal	_____	( )
GRE Quantitative	_____	( )
GRE Advanced	_____	( )
Miller Analogies	_____	( )
Other _____	_____	( )

22. Number of undergraduate students enrolled in the university: _____

23. Number of graduate students enrolled in the university: _____

24. Number of volumes in the university library: _____

25. Department's evaluation of the adequacy of the library holdings in the area of family science.

( ) Outstanding
( ) Good
( ) Adequate
( ) Inadequate

26. The university uses which system:

( ) Quarters
( ) Semesters
( ) Trimesters
( ) Other _____

27. What were tuition and fees for graduate students in 1984-85?

_____ Resident

_____ Non-resident

28. Please use pages 9 and 10 to provide information about the internships or practica courses that are offered by your department.

If you have more than one course, please photocopy pages 9 and 10, and answer questions 1-13 for each course.

9

Information About Internships and Practica

1. Course number: _____ Title: _____

2. Number of credits: _____

3. Required? ( ) Yes ( ) No If required, for whom?_____

4. Learning objectives (goals): _____

_____

_____

5. Course requirements (include number of on-site work hours, etc.):

_____

_____

6. Where are students placed for practical experience? _____

_____

7. Who sets up the placement? ( ) Faculty ( ) Students

8. What kinds of tasks are required? _____

_____

9. How many hours of on-site supervision are required per term? _____

10. What are the responsibilities of the on-site supervisor? _____

_____

_____

11. How many hours of off-site faculty instruction and supervision are required per term? _____

12. What are the responsibilities of the faculty? _____

_____

_____

13. How are student growth and performance measured? (Describe criteria and methods.)

14. What are the reasons for including internship-practica courses in your program?

15. What recommendations would you make for improving internship-practica courses?

16. What are the primary problems encountered in placing students in community programs and in business and industry? What are the main complaints from students and agencies?

12. If you were planning a curriculum to prepare family professionals for placement in non-academic positions, what courses and intern/practica would you recommend?

13. If you know family professionals who have non-academic careers, please provide the names and addresses of the two with whom you associate the most or know the best.

Name _____ Phone _____

Address _____

_____

Name _____ Phone _____

Address _____

_____

May we use your name to contact them? ( ) Yes ( ) No

14. The following list identifies university departments that offer a master's and/or doctorate degree in family living, family relations, family development, etc. Please indicate which you think are the ten "best" programs. Mark a "1" by the program you think is the best, a "2" by the one you think is next best, etc., up to "10." If you feel you cannot rank ten "best" programs, please rank as many as you feel you can.

____ Abilene Christian University (M.S. Marriage and Family Therapy)
____ University of Akron (M.S. Home Economics and Family Ecology)
____ University of Alberta (M.S. Family Studies)
____ Univ. of Arizona (M.S. Child Development and Family Relations)
____ Arizona State University (M.S. Family Science)
____ Auburn University (M.S. Family and Child Development)
____ Brigham Young University (Ph.D. Family Sciences)
____ University of British Columbia (M.S. Family Science)
____ East Carolina University (M.S. Child Dev. and Family Relations)
____ Colorado State University (M.S. Human Dev. and Family Studies)
____ Columbia University (Ph.D. Family and Community Studies)
____ University of Connecticut (Ph.D. Human Dev. and Family Studies)
____ Cornell University (Ph.D. Human Dev. and Family Studies)
____ University of Delaware (M.S. Individual and Family Studies)
____ Florida State University (Ph.D. Home and Family Life)
____ University of Georgia (Ph.D. Child and Family Development)
____ University of Guelph (M.S. Family Studies)
____ University of Illinois (M.S. Human Development and Family Ecology)
____ Northern Illinois University (M.S. Family and Child Studies)
____ University of Iowa (M.S. Family Development)
____ Iowa State University (Ph.D. Family Environment)
____ University of Kansas (Ph.D. Human and Family Life)
____ Kansas State University (Ph.D. Family and Child Development)
____ University of Kentucky (M.S. Family Studies)
____ University of Manitoba (M.S. Family Studies)
____ University of Maryland (M.S. Family and Community Development)
____ University of Massachusetts-Amherst (M.S. Center for the Family)
____ East Michigan University (M.S. Family and Child Development)
____ Michigan State University (Ph.D. Family and Child Development)
____ University of Minnesota (Ph.D. Family Social Science)
____ University of Missouri-Columbia (Ph.D. Child and Family Dev.)
____ University of Nebraska (Ph.D. Human Development and the Family)
____ University of North Carolina (Ph.D. Child Dev. and Family Rel.)
____ North Dakota State University (M.S. Child Dev. and Family Rel.)
____ Ohio State University (Ph.D. Family Relations and Human Dev.)
____ Oklahoma State University (Ph.D. Family Relations and Child Dev.)
____ Oregon State University (Ph.D. Human Dev. and Family Studies)
____ Pennsylvania State University (Ph.D. Individual and Fam. Studies)
____ Purdue University (Ph.D. Child Development and Family Studies)
____ University of Rhode Island (M.S. Human Dev., Couns., & Fam. St.)
____ San Diego State University (M.S. Fam. Studies and Consumer Sci.)
____ Syracuse University (Ph.D. Family and Community Studies)
____ University of Tennessee (Ph.D. Child and Family Studies)
____ University of Texas-Austin (M.S. Child Dev. and Fam. Relations)
____ Texas Technical University (Ph.D. Home and Family Life)
____ Texas Women's University (Ph.D. Child Dev. and Family Living)
____ Utah State University (M.S. Family and Human Development)
____ Virginia Polytech Institute (Ph.D. Family and Child Development)
____ West Virginia University (M.S. Family Resources)
____ University of Wisconsin-Madison (Ph.D. Child and Family Studies)
____ University of Wisconsin-Stout (M.S. Marriage and Family Therapy)

APPENDIX D

Department Survey Cover Letter

February 11, 1985

Dear :

Several groups, as described below, are interested in compiling information about family graduate programs. These groups are cooperating to create a system that is tentatively being called the Family Graduate Programs Database.

One important function of the Database will be to provide the information for a second edition of Carolyn Love's Guide to Graduate Family Programs. This guide has many useful functions in the field, including helping departments recruit prospective graduate students. The first edition of the Guide was published in 1982, and a new edition is needed.

The Consortium of Family Graduate Programs, organized at the 1983 NCFR annual meeting and chaired by James Walters, is the second interest group. The consortium decided during the 1984 NCFR meetings to create a retrieval system that will allow individuals or organizations to obtain current information about various aspects of family programs.

The third group cooperating to create the Database is NCFR's Task Force on the Development of a Family Discipline. This group believes that assembling and disseminating information about family programs will help the field nature, and resources have been provided to this group to establish the computerized system.

We are enclosing a questionnaire that is being sent to all family graduate programs for use as the first set of computerized data. Would you please complete the questionnaire and return it to Wesley Burr at BYU by March 30 so your department programs can be included. If you do not have some of the information sought, please complete as much of the questionnaire as you can by the 30th and return it. This will allow us to get the sytem on-line quickly, and we can then correspond further about how to improve the system.

After the system becomes operational we will send you a print-out of the information about your program. This will allow you to correct any errors that may have been made in getting the data on-line.

If the system proves as anticipated, we will be sending you a shorter questionnaire each fall to update the system just before the NCFR annual meeting.

If you have any questions about the program or suggestions about ways to improve it, please contact any of us. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

James Walters
University of Georgia

Carolyn Love
South-Western Publishing

Wesley Burr
Brigham Young University

APPENDIX E

Follow-up Letter to Departments

June 11, 1985

Department Chairperson
Department of Family Development
Home Economics
127 Macbride Hall
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Dear Department Chairperson:

The **FAMILY GRADUATE PROGRAMS DATABASE** project is progressing. We have received data from 35 departments, and it will be on-line soon. We have not yet, however, received the data for your department. We will be able to add your department to the database at any time, but if your department is to be included in a publication that will be available this fall, we need the information soon. The report will be written by Susan Middleton as her doctoral dissertation, and copies of it will be available for sale at the NCFR meetings in Dallas.

We are making two changes that will make it easier for you to be included in the Middleton Report:

1. We have learned that many departments do not have up-to-date information about the graduates of their programs. As a result, the part of the questionnaire (page 11) that asks for that information will not need to be included. Originally we had anticipated surveying a sample of the recent graduates, but that part of the project has been dropped.

2. We have extended the deadline for submitting the departmental information to July 15, 1985.

If you need another copy of the questionnaire, or if you have any questions we can help you with, please call me, Susan Middleton, or Kathy Barnes, our secretary, at (801) 378-5661.

Thank you so much for your help.

Sincerely,

Wesley R. Burr, Ph.D.
Director

cc: James Walters
Carolyn Love

APPENDIX F

Faculty Survey Cover Letter

July 15, 1985

Dear Professor :

Three groups of family scholars are interested in compiling information about family graduate programs. These groups are cooperating to create a DATABASE for use by departments having family-oriented graduate programs that can be periodically updated.

One of the groups is gathering data for a revised edition of Carolyn Love's Guide to Graduate Family Programs. This guide has several useful functions in the field, such as providing graduate students with information about departments. The first edition of the Guide was published in 1982. A new edition is needed.

The second group is the Consortium of Family Graduate Programs, organized in 1983 and chaired by James Walters. The consortium decided during the 1984 NCFR meetings to create a retrieval system that will provide current information about family graduate programs throughout the country.

The third group is a research team that is studying family graduate programs. Since 1930, there have been many publications about graduate programs in America. However, family programs have never been included. A study of famiy graduate programs will help to correct this exclusion.

Part of the data traditionally gathered about graduate programs comes from faculty involved in such programs. Your name was randomly selected from a list of faculty in family departments. Please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me by August 23, 1985. Your questionnaire will be combined with several hundred others, so your anonymity will be protected.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Wesley R. Burr, Ph.D.
Director

WRB:ksb
Enclosure
cc: Carolyn Love
James Walters

APPENDIX G

Suggested Modifications of the Present Study for Future Research of Family Science Departments

(b) the number admitted in graduate programs in 1983-84; (c) the average undergraduate GPA of graduate students; (d) the number of students who graduated in each graduate major offered in each of five designated academic years; (e) average graduate entrance examination scores of their current graduate students; (f) first jobs of master's and doctorate graduates in the last five years; (g) internships and practica; and (h) first jobs of graduates over the last five years.

It would probably not be difficult for departments to begin to keep a record of the number of students who apply for admission into their graduate programs, the number who are actually admitted, and the number who graduate each year. In addition, departments could likely begin to organize information on their practica/internships. If departments routinely kept these kind of records, they could easily provide requested data in these areas. However, even if departments kept a record of the undergraduate GPAs of their graduate students as well as their GRE scores, to complete the relevant items in the survey would require some computation time on their part, inasmuch as the survey asks for mean GPA and mean GRE values. In the interest of decreasing the time it takes departments to complete the survey, these items should probably be eliminated.

Item 9, which asks for the first jobs of master's and doctoral graduates from departments in the last five years, was included in the survey for purposes of another study. It would probably be very difficult and time-consuming for departments to keep these kinds of data on their alumni. The elimination of this item, as well as the items requesting the mean GRE scores and mean undergraduate GPAs of graduate students, would have the effect of decreasing the time it took departments to complete the survey. The "time-to-completion" of surveys would be further reduced if departments would begin now to routinely record the data on applicants and graduate students that have been previously discussed and to organize materials on their internships and practica.

Although most departments provided the paragraph on the "unique, innovative, or outstanding aspects of your graduate programs" requested in item 16, it would probably be wise to eliminate this type of question from future revisions of the survey. To answer this item well may require an unreasonable expenditure of time on the part of the respondent and may serve to discourage some busy respondents from completing the survey.

Another proposal of this study relative to changes that should be made in the department survey has to do with item 6, which requests data on faculty. The survey asks departments to provide the name of each faculty member in

the department, along with his or her rank, the year the rank was attained, highest degree, the year the highest degree was received, university of and major in highest degree, and areas of major interest. It would decrease the time departments took to complete the survey if the amount of information requested on faculty members were reduced.

And finally, it would be helpful to subsequent studies of graduate family science departments if the survey instrument specifically requested the name of the individual completing the survey, if other than the chair of the department. The absence of this information in this study made it exceedingly difficult to "check back" with departments on responses that needed verification.

Improving the Response Rate of the Faculty Survey

The low response rate to the faculty survey and the overrepresentation of professors are problems of this study, and limit the confidence that can be placed in the findings of this study relative to the faculty report items. Future studies involving the surveying of faculty of graduate family departments can increase their response rate by using the follow-up procedures that have been outlined by Chadwick, Bahr, and Albrecht (1984). These procedures include the following:

1. Send out a postcard, approximately two weeks after the mailing out of the survey instrument that briefly reiterates the purposes of the study, encourages the

respondent to complete the survey, and provides the respondent with a number to call if he or she needs a replacement survey.

2. Approximately two weeks after the post card is mailed, send out a new packet, including a new cover letter, the survey, and a return envelope.

3. Send a final mailing consisting of a different cover letter, the survey, and another return envelope when responses to the previous follow-up efforts have slowed down.

Research by Dillman (1978) suggests that the use of this type of follow-up will, on the average, increase the response rate from 20%, the expected rate of response to an initial mailing, to 74%. The high response rate to the department survey is attributable, in part, to the extensive follow-up that was conducted with departments.

The fact that the response rate to the faculty survey was more than double the expected rate of response to an initial mailing may be construed as an interest in the focus of the study on the part of faculty.

GRADUATE FAMILY SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS IN 1985

Susan G. B. Middleton

Department of Family Sciences

Ph.D. Degree, December, 1986

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine graduate family science departments in 1985. Forty-seven family science departments in universities across the United States and Canada were identified. A survey designed to gather information about each department's faculty, its students, graduate majors, etc., was sent to the departments. A faculty survey was sent to approximately 50% of the faculty identified by each department. The faculty survey asked faculty to evaluate their departments in a number of areas. In addition, faculty were asked to rank order the 10 "best" family science departments on an alphabetized listing of the departments. Departments were found to vary substantially in number of faculty, in number of masters and doctoral students, and in majors offered. The faculty survey revealed that faculty respondents generally view their departments in a positive light. The University of Minnesota enjoys the number 1 position in the ranking of family science graduate departments by faculty. In addition, several charcteristics that differentiate between high- and low-ranked departments were identified.

COMMITTEE APPROVAL:

_____

Wesley R. Burr, Committee Chairman

_____

Darwin Thomas, Committee Member

_____

Thomas Draper, Committee Member

_____

Robert F. Stahmann, Department Chairman