



1984

Perceived Training Needs of Basic and Applied Social Psychology Graduate Students

Monica M. Kuchera
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuchera, Monica M., "Perceived Training Needs of Basic and Applied Social Psychology Graduate Students" (1984). *Master's Theses*. 3396.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3396

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1984 Monica M. Kuchera

PERCEIVED TRAINING NEEDS OF BASIC
AND APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
GRADUATE STUDENTS

by

Monica M. Kuchera

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

November

1984

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank both the department chairpersons and the graduate students from the 22 social psychology graduate training programs for their participation in the study.

Further thanks goes to Dr. Emil Posavac and Dr. Fred Bryant for their informative insights and numerous suggestions with regard to the layout of the report and the statistical analyses involved.

Finally, additional thanks goes to my husband Michael, who was a constant source of encouragement throughout the process of this thesis.

VITA

The author, Monica Kuchera, is daughter of Adolph and Doris Kieffer. She was born on November 4, 1951, in Frederic, Wisconsin.

After graduating from Sibley high school in 1969, she attended Bemidji State University during her freshman year. In 1971, she transferred to the University of Minnesota to take courses on a part-time basis. In 1977, she began full-time study at Northeastern Illinois University and graduated in December, 1981, with a Bachelor of Arts degree in psychology with high honors.

In August 1982 she started in the Ph.D. program in applied social psychology at Loyola. In her second and third years, she was awarded graduate assistantships in the psychology department at Loyola University of Chicago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
VITA	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CONTENT FOR APPENDICES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Basic and Applied Social Psychology - Difference and Roles	5
The Graduate Schools' Response - Increased Applied Programs	9
Applied Graduate Training	10
Internships	15
Examples of Applied Training Programs	15
Graduate Department Evaluation	18
Purpose of the Study	21
II. METHOD	24
Subjects	24
Applied and Basic Programs	24
Survey Procedure	26
Survey Questionnaire	28
III. RESULTS	34
The Sample	34
Perceived Focus of Departments	36
Career Goals and Perceived Opportunities	37
Perceived Educational Needs	43
Practice Skills for Basic Careers	43
Knowledge Skills for Basic Careers	46
Research Skills for Basic Careers	47
Practice Skills for Applied Careers	47
Knowledge Skills for Applied Careers	48
Research Skills for Applied Careers	48

Chapter	Page
Educational Opportunities	49
Practice Skills	49
Knowledge Skills	50
Research Skills	51
The Match Between Program Emphasis and Student Career Goals	52
Match Between Basic Occupational Goal and Department Emphasis	53
Match Between Applied Occupational Goal and Department Emphasis	54
Student Satisfaction	57
General Satisfaction with Department	57
Satisfaction with Department in Relation to Career Goal	57
Graduate Training Programs of Choice	59
General Comments	60
IV. DISCUSSION	63
Summary Findings	63
Suggestions for Graduate Departments	64
Curriculum Planning	64
Communication	65
Evaluation Team	66
Attitude Role Models	66
V. REFERENCES	69
VI. APPENDIX A	74
VII. APPENDIX B	76
VIII. APPENDIX C	78
IX. APPENDIX D	85
X. APPENDIX E	91
XI. APPENDIX F	97
XII. APPENDIX G	103
XIII. APPENDIX H	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Survey Return Rates	29
2. Student Classification of Department Orientation Compared to Published Orientation of Department	38
3. Occupational Goal for Students by Published Department Orientation	40
4. Ranked Skill Items Perceived as Relevant to a BASIC Career Divided by Current Program	44
5. Ranked Skill Items Perceived as Relevant to an APPLIED Career Divided by Current Program	45
6. Choice of Same Program by Occupational Goal for Students in Basic Programs	58

CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A: Letter to Graduate Department Chairpersons	74
APPENDIX B: Letter to Social Psychology Graduate Students	76
APPENDIX C: Graduate Student Survey	78
APPENDIX D: Skill Items Relevant to Career by Published Department Orientation for a <u>BASIC</u> Occupational Goal	85
APPENDIX E: Skill Items Relevant to Career by Published Department Orientation for an <u>APPLIED</u> Occupational Goal	91
APPENDIX F: Student Perception of Department Emphasis for Specific Training Skills by Published Department Orientation	97
APPENDIX G: Student Perception of Department Emphasis for Specific Training Skills by Published Department Orientation for a <u>BASIC</u> Occupational Goal	103
APPENDIX H: Student Perception of Department Emphasis for Specific Training Skills by Published Department Orientation for an <u>APPLIED</u> Occupational Goal	110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Student attitudes toward their graduate education can play a major role in the evaluation of specific types of available training programs. The aim of this research is to provide social psychology graduate curriculum committees with the information they need to decide whether to implement, change or expand a particular training program. An examination of this issue begins with the distinctions between basic and applied social psychologists, their differing roles, occupationally required skills and graduate training programs. The methods section describes the sample and the survey questionnaire, and the results section discusses the findings of the study. Finally, recommendations are made regarding social psychology graduate training programs.

In recent years the selection of a graduate program in social psychology has involved many more available options than in former years. Previously, when entering the discipline of social psychology, it was automatically assumed by both professor and student, that one was going to become an academician. There was little question, prior to 1970, that this was "the" position that most social psychologists would occupy (Hendrick, 1978; Reich, 1981). Today however, there are other types of specialized "niches," in nonacademic settings, which are open to social psychologists with the right training (Bickman, 1981; Edwards & Holmgren, 1979; Fisher, 1982; Kiesler, 1980; Posavac,

1982; Saxe & Fine, 1980; Takooshian, 1982). For some, these new career possibilities are options to present academic career, but for other new graduates, they are a response to a necessity in the currently dismal academic job market. Wise graduate students must, therefore, have the foresight to plan their prospective careers wisely and choose a particular graduate program which maximizes their chances of employment.

A number of interesting changes have occurred over the years within the field of social psychology, which has led to differing programs of graduate study. The first of these has been a "crisis" of identity, which has changed the focus of social psychology. Historically, the predominating paradigm in social psychology since the 1940's has been the experimental approach, one that focuses on isolating theory-derived variables in a laboratory setting (Reich, 1981). This type of research has, however, come under fire in the last 10 to 15 years, from both those within the discipline and from the public in general. While the adoption of this type of research resulted in the testing of "smaller and more elegant theories" by precisely measuring a few controlled variables, it has the serious disadvantages of being nongeneralizable, nonreplicable, trivial and subsequently nonapplicable in the pressing social concerns of the "real world" at large (Gergen, 1973; Kidd & Saks, 1980; Ring, 1967). The "crisis" in social psychology, as noted by Fisher (1980), can therefore be considered as the crucial choice between either continuing to produce socially insignificant and nonuseful studies, or that of applying our social psychological insights for the "utility" and benefit of the human condition.

Reflecting the growing dissatisfaction with basic research, a number of social psychologists have suggested a transfer from the laboratory to the field. The "traditional response" espoused by Elms (1975) and Sheriff (1977) suggested including issues of various social problems into the study of general experimental social psychology. Also, McGuire (1967, 1969) proposed that field studies should be used to replicate or test theory-oriented research. Fisher (1982) states that other researchers have called for the "creative and integrative interplay of laboratory and field research." Cialdini (1980) and Saxe and Fine (1980) have both emphasized the use of social experimentation to solve social problems. Through the increased use of social experimentation "meaningful theories" would be created which could in turn be used to structure other larger scale social programs. Fisher (1982), on the other hand, has prescribed a "rejuvenation" of Lewin's vision of the "continuous interplay of theory, research, and practice in social psychology." This perspective sees:

Theory, research and practice as the three wheels of the scientific tricycle, each of which is required for proper balance and direction. Theory guides both research and practice, and is reciprocally informed by them. Research evaluates and redirects both theory and practice. Practice provides essential contact with social reality, and clearly connects the discipline to the improvement of human welfare. Without practice, theory and research can become a mutually reinforcing and insulated system divorced from substantive issues. (p. 28)

It can be said that despite these differing views of how to structure a more applied focus, a new shape or direction had occurred within social psychology, one that stressed "field analysis of applied issues" (Reich, 1981).

Concurrent with the call for a more relevant social psychology, was the national trend of declining employment opportunities for academic positions. Current statistics regarding the employment of new Ph.D.'s in traditional academic positions illustrates the gloomy situation for graduates considering this career path. The American Psychological Association notes that currently (1978) only 38% of all new Ph.D.'s were employed full-time in colleges and universities. This figure is down from 50% in 1975, and does not include those individuals who have part-time teaching assignments (Stang, 1975). By comparison, the percentage of psychologists working in nonacademic positions has increased. In a survey administered to 2312 new psychologists over a 10 year period (1968-78), Schneider (1981) found that a 23% decrease in academic job openings was accompanied by a corresponding 12% increase in "applied" nonacademic positions. Today these "applied" figures are most likely even higher.

This nonacademic employment trend within the field of psychology in general, is also reflected more specifically within the subdiscipline of social psychology as well. Hamilton (1977) found that of the 200 academically trained social psychologists who graduate every year, only approximately 25% will find employment as faculty in psychology departments. At the same time, current admissions into social psychology graduate programs has stabilized at roughly 300 per year. Increasingly, then, greater numbers of new Ph.D.'s in social psychology will, out of necessity, be seeking careers in nonacademic settings.

Basic and Applied Social Psychology - Differences and Roles

While it has been recognized that there are some similarities between academic and nonacademic settings, a distinction can be made to help clarify further discussion of these two orientations. Bickman (1981) has noted that the basic and applied approaches lie at two ends of a continuum, with differing "goals, methods, context and style." The most prominent distinction between basic and applied orientations is "purpose" (Bickman, 1981). The "purpose" of basic research is to uncover causal relationships through highly precise internally valid experiments. Theory development and testing are a basic researcher's primary activities. An applied oriented researcher's major purpose, on the other hand, is solving social problems (Bickman, 1980a) and improving the quality of life (Mayo & La France, 1980). This type of researcher is likely to be active in program development and evaluation. As Bickman (1981) has noted, the "purposes" of these two orientations also "drive" the "individual style of the researcher," the methods, and the work context.

One of the biggest differences between basic and applied researchers, according to Bickman (1981), is in the "context or environment" where the two types of researchers choose to do their research. Basic researchers conduct most of their work in universities and are not bound by any time restraints or by "cost consciousness." One typically initiates his/her own research projects, and is usually autonomous in carrying it out. The applied researcher, on the other hand, works in the field, most likely in an industrial setting. In this "cost conscious" environment, the applied researcher is usually

limited to research topics initiated by the sponsor. In this sense, he/she must be able to deal with the problem from a multidisciplinary perspective and be able to operate within the limitations of a "hierarchical structure," "real time constraints," and with "inflexible procedures."

Based upon both the "purpose" of inquiry and the "context" of research activity, the methodological distinctions between basic and applied orientations centers, according to Bickman (1981), on two different focuses of validity. The basic researcher, operating within a laboratory under highly precise experimental conditions, is more concerned with internal validity and the construct of cause. He/she typically uses a single level of analysis and a single method of research design to test his hypotheses. The applied researcher, on the other hand, uses less precise "quasi-experimental" methods in field settings, where the major concern is with external validity and of finding large effects. In these settings, a multidisciplinary approach with multiple levels of analysis is often necessary when solving a specific problem (Bickman, 1981; Fisher, 1982).

Finally, there are also distinctions between the types of personal skills, compensations and orientations of the individuals who identify with either of these two perspectives. The basic researcher is typically a solitary specialist working within a specific line of thought, whereas the applied researcher is a "generalist" who may, in many instances, find himself as a member of a team working together to solve a client-initiated problem. The applied researcher, because of his/her work with the public, therefore requires different social

skills than those of the basic researcher in a laboratory. The applied researcher also typically receives higher monetary compensation for his/her work than does the basic researcher. The basic researcher, in comparison, gains higher prestige by publishing his/her work in professional journals.

While Bickman's overview cites some of the more general distinctions between applied and basic social psychology, Fisher (1982) has summarized some of the more specific roles available to the applied social psychologists and their required competencies. One of the most commonly referred to roles is that of an "applied researcher." This position is likely to focus on research directly related to relevant social issues, such as prejudice, and is often referred to as "action research" (Chein, Cook & Harding, 1948) or "social policy research" (Fairweather & Tornatzky, 1977). According to Fisher (1982), this role requires skill and knowledge in all phases of the research process, effective writing and verbal expression, inter-group dynamics, and some theoretical understanding to the issue or problem under study. These insights are substantiated to some degree by a survey conducted by Edwards and Holmgren (1979) on both applied researchers as well as the employers of applied researchers. Their findings indicated that both groups of respondents placed high value on "interpersonal skills, making group presentations, and writing for non-social scientists." In addition, other highly rated skills were the ability to "conduct interviews, program impact evaluations, human resource planning, inter-group relations skills and statistical methods." Skills felt to be less important were: "knowledge of socio-

metric techniques, laboratory research experience, simulation methods, content analysis, and the use of standardized tests of traits and abilities."

One occupational option for the applied social psychologist is that of "research consultant." The role of a research consultant entails giving expert advice involving all levels of the research process (design, execution, and analysis) to others engaged in research. In this situation, members of such organizations as the federal government or community agencies, lack the necessary skills to carry out quality research on the problems that they are required to investigate. In addition to proficiency in research methodology, a good consultant should possess an understanding of inter-group relations and "practice skills," such as methods for building good interpersonal relationships and for conducting small group discussions (Fisher, 1982; Lippitt & Lippitt, 1978).

Another role available to the applied social psychologist is that of a program evaluator. Bickman (1979, 1980a) has been a major proponent of program evaluation for applied social psychologists. Training is necessary in program design, research methodology, in interpersonal skills, and various practice skills such as effective verbal and written communication. For program evaluators, Fisher's (1982) list of suggested skills is substantiated by the results of a survey on in-house program evaluators conducted by Posavac (1982). The program evaluators, in this study, felt that coursework in methodology was extremely valuable in their work. Such courses as descriptive statistics was recommended by 90% of the respondents, program

evaluation methods by 88%, inferential statistics by 82%, quasi-experimental and experimental methods by 77% and 75% respectively, survey research by 68%, tests and measurements by 61%, attitude measurement by 60%, multivariate statistics by 56%, systems analysis by 56%, change agent skills by 43%, organizational research by 39% and management skills by 35% of the respondents. Those aspects deemed less desirable in training programs consisted of theory related coursework (abnormal, 26%; social, 25%; industrial, 12%; sociology theories, 12%; medical sociology, 10%). It can, therefore, be seen that although some of the same skills and training are applicable to both academic and nonacademic settings, a number of training experiences are specific to applied versus basic settings.

The Graduate Schools' Response - Increased Applied Programs

Against this backdrop of a poor academic employment picture, "calls for relevancy," as well as the growing distinctions between basic and applied social psychologists (Shippee, 1979), many social psychology departments have adopted an applied approach in educating their graduate students. While basic research programs were the predominant type of graduate program up until approximately ten years ago (Bickman, 1981), there has been an ever-increasing shift toward the applied focus in graduate training. In a survey of social psychology graduate programs, Levy (1979) found that of the 92 Ph.D. programs that responded to his survey, 16% of their present graduate coursework was directed towards "nonacademic placement." Two years later this figure was anticipated to be 25% of the curriculum, and within

five years the applied focus was expected to rise to 30%.

However, not all social psychology departments have responded to the recent call for an applied orientation. There still exists, according to Helmreich (as cited by Carroll, Werner & Ashmore, 1982) in a recent survey of 43 graduate programs, 14 "traditional" or "semi-traditional" programs with an emphasis on laboratory/experimental methods. It has also been noted by Levy (1979) that 34% of the 92 social psychology graduate programs he surveyed, currently do not offer applied courses. Some departments, however, are in the process of adding application oriented coursework, but there still remains a small "bastion" (12%) according to Levy (1979), who are not planning to offer any such coursework in the near future (2 years). For those graduate programs that are anticipating the development of an applied program, a number of useful "guidelines" have been developed. These guidelines are reflected in the different focuses relating to such areas as theory and research.

Applied Graduate Training

Theory. Traditional training in social psychological theory has primarily exposed graduate students solely to the "contemporary theories" in social psychology (Fisher, 1982). Today, however, there is mixed opinion whether these theories alone are sufficient to solve the complex problems presented to the applied researchers in field settings. Such theories as cognitive dissonance or self-perception deal primarily with processes internal to the individual, and in and of themselves, do not contribute insight into the multiple levels of

causation that may be occurring in dealing with actual issues such as prejudice. Caplan and Nelson (1973) have noted that indeed the predominant social psychological perspective may tend to blame the individual rather than looking at the possible roots of a problem in the social system. Consequently, it has been noted that for applied social psychology to be useful, it needs to have a comprehensive approach to problem solving. This means that all variables should be considered when focusing on a social problem at hand. Mayo and La France (1980) have stated that:

inclusion of variables broader than those traditionally studied by social psychologists.... "Social stimulus situations," as usually studied, are narrow in scope, constricted in size, and immediate in impact. For an applicable social psychology, we need to know how individuals are affected by social stimuli that are broader, larger, and more enduring. (p. 88)

To incorporate these suggestions, one solution is to add interdisciplinary coursework within the areas of sociology (Kelman, 1968), economics and political science to traditional social psychological theory. In addition, Fisher (1982) proposes that additional "core competencies" be addressed in the areas of "theoretical understanding." These are: "interpersonal relations, group dynamics, program design, intergroup relations, societal functioning and organizational theory." This additional coursework will help to produce more well-rounded and better informed applied social psychologists.

Research. Research skills required for laboratory settings are different from those required for field settings. As noted by Fisher (1980) the preponderant use of laboratory methods has had a

constricting influence on applied social problems. Sechrest (1978) states that:

Many psychologists trained for research in laboratories where high levels of control are possible, are virtually useless in the more demanding, broader field investigations that are involved in program evaluation.

Triandis (1978) and Bickman (1979, 1980a) have both stressed the importance of including program evaluation in graduate training programs. The evaluation of social programs is an essential arena where social psychologists can contribute both their theoretical and research expertise, to improving social programs. In addition to program evaluation techniques, Fisher (1982) has suggested a number of "core competency" research skills, which include: "research design, statistical analysis, computer usage, measurement skills, and field research methods."

Practice. The area of "practice skills," as outlined by Fisher (1982), has received the most attention as being highly related to the usefulness of applied social psychologists in field settings. In the more traditional academic approach to graduate training, the greatest amount of effort expended by both the students and faculty, was on purely "intellectual pursuits." This "one-sided education" is not usually seen as a problem for those individuals intending to pursue a purely academic career course. For those individuals interested in accomplishing effective applied work, however, a variety of skills are necessary. Fisher (1982) has noted that practice skills including such interpersonal skills as "interviewing and conflict resolution," in addition to "small group skills, consultation skills, and

program development skills," are necessary for those entering the consulting or applied research areas. Other social skills such as "tact, social poise, persuasiveness" (Deutsch, 1975, 1980) as well as self-assurance, are also necessary both when initially contacting and later when working with "people whose status, intellectual background, social and cultural values, and interests may be quite different from those of the social scientist." Also, verbal communication skills are necessary to be able to hold and maintain the attention of "significant audiences," as well as aiding one in advocating social change through the findings of one's research (Deutsch, 1975, 1980; Mayo & La France, 1982). These skills are, therefore, considered to be a necessary part of training for applied social psychologists.

Applied social psychologists must also have effective writing skills when communicating to policy makers and other diverse audiences who must read reports and study findings. According to Mayo and La France (1982), the only aspect of graduate training in social psychology which addresses any form of communication, is that of writing scholarly journal articles. From the first year on, students are taught how to present research findings in the technical jargon of professional journals. Learning to write in "social psychologese," however, may not be generally understandable and as a result, may be totally useless to non-psychologists in an applied setting. It is, therefore, necessary that applied social psychologists be able to "...simplify all needless complexity in our written work and express it in plain English rather than technical jargon." In addition, Ryckman (1976) has noted that applied social psychologists be familiar with and use

other modes of communication with the general public, such as "non-technical journals, the mass media, and popular lectures or workshops."

In addition to more effective oral and written communication skills, Deutsch (1975; 1980), Fisher (1982) and Lundstedt (1968) have discussed the importance of "self-insight" or "self-understanding" for applied social psychologists. Since applied practitioners must often rely on "subjective impressions" of what is actually going on, they are more likely to use "impressions" more effectively if they are aware of their own "psyches." In this sense, learning to cope with such feelings as "anger, anxiety, trust, or feelings toward authority" can aid a social practitioner in dealing with both the recipients of policies, as well as the funders, and key decision-makers.

"Self-awareness" is not a "necessary consequence of formal coursework in social psychology." Experience in some form of "psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy or participation in sensitivity training or encounter groups predisposes one to an inner awareness." Deutsch (1975, 1980) has suggested that in addition to experiential learning, practice in a relevant context may be necessary to make self-awareness a tool to be used. This would be similar to the roles a supervisor might take, such as focusing on the feelings, and the thoughts one is having when engaging in interactions with many types of individuals. Lundstedt (1968) feels that this type of training may be a "major asset" in the graduate training of practitioners, advisors and consultants, but not an experience required of all students.

Internships

A key ingredient to an applied social psychology graduate training program is usually considered to be an internship (Bickman, 1980; Fisher, 1982; Lundstedt, 1968; Takooshian, 1982; Severy, 1979). The basis for this suggestion rests upon the insight that the internship provides the student with the opportunity to gain "real-world" experience in the skills necessary to conduct oneself as a professional in field settings. In addition to providing the much needed experience, it gives the student an opportunity to decide which type of setting he/she is most suited for. "Social psychologists may receive field experiences in hospitals, business organizations, government agencies, research institutes, and community organizations such as schools and welfare institutions" (Lundstedt, 1968). The obvious advantages of such field training programs is that students have opportunities for a wider experience than the academic program is able to provide. Lundstedt (1968) has also noted that to make field training effective it must be supervised conjointly by the graduate department and the participating organization.

Examples of Applied Training Programs

The first type of graduate training program adds a strong applied focus to an already existing traditional social psychology program, incorporates a number of applied courses, and adds a practicum. This type of program is represented by the program at the State University of New York at Buffalo (SUNYAB) (Bunker, 1979; Fisher, 1982). All students are required to "master" basic research and the-

oretical knowledge in social psychology, and then specialize and extend their training to applied social problems. The students are also expected to choose one of three career models, to which their further coursework is oriented. These three areas are: "applied research, academic, or organizational/group consultation" (Fisher, 1982). Three applied minors have been integrated into the program to help facilitate meeting the students' final career goals. In addition, the students must complete two research projects or "practical projects" which involve an "informal internship."

Another type of graduate training program in applied social psychology is represented by the program at Loyola University of Chicago (Bickman, 1980; Fisher, 1982). This type of program represents a major change in focus from traditional/experimental training, to that of an applied focus (Posavac, 1979, 1980). The major objectives of this program centers upon training students to identify major social problems, design programs to remedy social problems, structure research designs to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, and finally to analyze and report back the findings to sponsors and participants.

An essential element of this doctoral program is a 1000 hour internship usually completed in the third year of training. The students are responsible for obtaining their own internship in an applied area of their choice. These internships are typically full-time jobs which provide financial support for the student, as well as feedback from the employer to the faculty supervisor, regarding the student's competence.

The applied social psychology program at the University of

Saskatchewan represents a combination of theoretical and applied coursework, practicum experiences, and practice skill training. The student is involved in applied settings from the beginning of their training. There is a "one-day-a-week practicum" for the first eight months, which continues into a four month summer internship. This training is continued throughout the student's training program. During these practicums and internships, the student, in conjunction with other professionals (sociologists, social workers, human service), focuses on the integration of theory, research, and practice for the resolution of a social problem. In addition, students participate in "interpersonal skills workshops" in small-group processes during their first year. Students strongly interested in furthering their "practice skills" training may choose to participate in the NTL Institute Graduate Student Professional Development Program.

Another graduate program which has a "practica" as an integral part of its graduate training, is the University of Utah. For the most part, practica are taken upon completion of the departmental core curriculum of methodology and theory, and completion of the master's degree. Practica differ according to the student's career goals, point in training, and "input to outcome ratio" (amount of time and energy required for the benefit of employer and student). The practica are closely supervised by the faculty, and typically require a "written product of results in the form of a technical report, journal article or grant proposal."

Graduate Department Evaluation

Frequently, the degree of student satisfaction within a particular program is underplayed, or regarded as a minor issue in evaluation. Most efforts to improve or change courses or curricula have centered on determining what accrediting agencies and faculties believe students need to know, rather than what students perceive as necessary. The majority of studies addressing student perception of the educational process, have focused on faculty evaluation (Costin, Greenough & Menges, 1971; McKeachie, Lin & Mann, 1971; Rodin & Rodin, 1972; Sockloff, 1973; Wallace & Schwab, 1973) rather than on courses or curricula (Aleamoni & Spencer, 1973; Freedman, Stumpf & Krieger, 1978; McFillen, 1976). Students' perceptions and satisfaction with their departments, however, are relevant outcomes of the educational process (Grush & Costin, 1975).

When considering an evaluation of the curriculum within a graduate department, one of the richest sources of information about the important characteristics of the department, are descriptions provided by those individuals who are experiencing the program, the graduate students. Students currently enrolled in the graduate program can give insightful information about the department, since they are currently involved in the educational process as it exists in the present, rather than one that has occurred in the past (e.g., gathering information from past graduates). The core of most graduate student experience is in the graduate department, and they can describe with some accuracy most of the rules and requirements, satisfactions or anxieties that are experienced within the department (Hartnett, 1976). Kelman

(1968) has noted that:

Students are in a particularly good position to tell us, on the basis of their own experiences, what are effective and ineffective ways of preparing for a given examination or acquiring a given skill. They can tell us about experiences they need, in preparing for their own career goals, that are not available in the curriculum at all or that can only be acquired at great sacrifice. They can alert us to new developments--to which they are often better attuned than those of us rooted in older traditions--that should be reflected in the curriculum offerings. They can tell us, from their perspective, what can realistically be expected from students in the course of a four-year training program. In short, they have so much to offer in the way of new information and challenging perspectives that their advice must be actively sought and seriously considered in the planning and evaluation of curriculum and in the setting of standards and requirements. (p. 102)

Another reason for evaluation of graduate programs, is to attempt to gain a better understanding of the program. Program improvement will not occur without an understanding of the department's current strengths and weaknesses. Department chairmen and faculty often have an inflated notion of their program's strengths, and are often unaware of the realities of their weaknesses. What chairmen and other faculty members think about their program, may often differ dramatically from what graduate students perceive to be the situation. Departments should regularly measure what their students think about their graduate training, simply as a means of insuring that the students' self-perception of the program is reasonably accurate. If there are areas of student "disenchantment" and "disillusionment," then the proper steps should be taken to improve the situation at the departmental level. The uses of such regular evaluations includes the documentation of the "need" for specific types of courses or skills which may be included in the development of new, or for the change of existing programs, and the

evaluation of existing curricula in terms of its usefulness for both academic or nonacademic occupational careers. Student input, therefore, can serve as a first step to documenting need which can result in improvement of the "student-department fit."

In reviewing the literature, most of the graduate student curriculum evaluation studies in psychology have been done with clinical, rather than social psychology programs. These studies do, however, lend insight into the process of student evaluation of graduate training programs.

In the 1970's, clinical psychology also underwent significant changes, with the resultant proliferation of explicit professional training programs (Psy.D.) as an alternative to the longstanding scientist-practitioner model. A number of surveys sought to address the students' response to this new type of a more applied program.

The first of these dealt with recent graduates of the new Psy.D. programs as compared to traditional clinical psychology graduates. Most of the Psy.D. respondents were more satisfied with their graduate training programs than those who had received their clinical training from traditional Ph.D. programs. Dissatisfactions with the traditional Ph.D. programs were stronger among practitioners than among academicians, and were related to the "perceived needs" for greater clinical experience, with a concurrent decrease in emphasis in research (Garfield & Kurtz, 1976; Peterson, Eaton, Levine & Snapp, 1982). These were exactly the changes which embodied most Psy.D. programs. The training that the students received in such programs, was suited to the functions that they would perform as professionals.

Another clinical student satisfaction survey was conducted by Marwit (1982) on currently enrolled graduate students, representing both the Psy.D. professional programs and A.P.A. approved clinical psychology programs. He found that those students most dissatisfied with their curriculum (25%) were those students in the scientist-professional program, who have aspirations for "applied practice careers" as opposed to research careers. Over two-thirds of these students expressed a desire for a "professional school curriculum." These findings suggest that the Psy.D. programs are catering to a need that the scientist-practitioner schools are not meeting.

It can be seen, therefore, that a curriculum review of perceived training needs and resultant student satisfaction, can play a useful role in structuring graduate training programs. The long-term usefulness of this type of evaluative information, when used in conjunction with employer perceived job requirements, can provide invaluable information to department chairpersons and faculty curriculum committees for altering or expanding current programs. Such information can aid in making graduate training programs more responsive to the needs of both students and employers.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of the present project is to gather data relating to social psychology graduate students' perceived training needs and satisfaction with their basic and applied graduate training programs. The selection of a particular orientation (basic or applied), and following through with the prescribed course of instruction, is

making a decision which ultimately structures one's career possibilities. The previously described differences in focus of these two types of training programs in social psychology, and the resultant impact of this training on the careers of these students, necessitates a comparison of the responses of both groups of students on a number of issues. The present research, therefore, examines the perceived training needs of currently enrolled social psychology graduate students, as well as types of career goals, perception of career opportunities, rating of department training emphasis, the match or mismatch of perceived training needs and department emphases, and satisfaction with the social psychology graduate department.

Based upon the published differences in orientation, training, and resultant career paths, a number of hypotheses have been suggested. It is expected that graduate students will choose the type of graduate training program that most closely fits their proposed occupational goal. In this sense, graduate students from basic and applied graduate programs should have divergent career paths (application/nonacademic or academic/basic research) and each group will perceive the necessity of different specialized training skills. The skills perceived to be more applicable for a academic/basic research career should be: "journal writing skills," "oral presentations to large groups," "techniques of effective classroom teaching," "social psychology theory," "theory development," "lab methods," and "computer/statistical analyses." The skills perceived to be more applicable for an applied non-academic career should be: "nonscientist writing skills," "small group leadership," "personal interviewing," "interpersonal social

skills," "techniques of conflict resolution," "internship," "program design," "applied and interdepartmental courses," "administration of standardized tests," "program evaluation," "field research methods," "survey methods/questionnaire design."

In addition, the basic and applied graduate training programs should reflect the strength of their published orientation in the type of coursework offered to train their graduate students. The "match" or "mismatch" between student goals and department goals should be evident in the differences between the students' perceived training needs, and the amount of emphasis the department places in a number of specific training areas. Likewise, for students of either program, there should be greater student satisfaction in those departments where there is agreement between students' occupational goals and perceived training needs, and the published goals of the department.

It is hoped that the students' evaluations obtained from this project, will enable social psychology graduate departments to more effectively meet the needs of the students whom they train, as well as the organizations for which they will ultimately be employed.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The sample for the present study, consisted of 317 graduate students currently enrolled in either a basic or applied social psychology Ph.D. training programs in the U.S. and Canada. Of this total, 175 students were enrolled in 9 "applied" programs and 142 were enrolled in 13 "basic" programs.

Applied and Basic Programs

The criteria for inclusion of graduate programs in this sample, was the published orientation of the department as basic or applied, in one or more of the following three sources: A.P.A.'s Graduate Study in Psychology, 1982-83; Graduate Programs in Social/Personality Psychology (Werner, 1983); and, from a number of published articles reviewing various graduate programs in applied social psychology (Bickman, 1980b; Brehm, 1980; Bunker, 1979; Carroll, Werner & Ashmore, 1982; Fisher, 1980, 1982; Kidd & Saks, 1980; Oskamp, 1984; Posavac, 1979, 1980; Severy, 1979). The sample was restricted to only those departments which had a published orientation in either of these two approaches.

An "applied" program, as defined in this study, includes a particular focus to provide explicit training for the preparation for nonacademic employment positions in areas such as industry, government

agencies and mental health organizations. These programs typically include special applied coursework (educational, organizational), a thesis and/or dissertation of an applied nature, quasi-experimental research methods, and an internship of some type in a nonacademic setting (Carroll, et.al., 1982; Fisher, 1982; Shippee, 1979).

The more traditional/basic orientation holds a high degree of commitment to describing and discovering relationships between variables. In addition, theory testing through the highly precise experimental/laboratory methods is usually emphasized. Those graduate programs focusing on this basic approach typically orient their graduates toward academic and/or basic research positions. A "basic" course of instruction would include experimental design, theory coursework, a theory-testing thesis and dissertation, and a greater opportunity for teaching assistantships.

Another criteria for inclusion in this study was that the universities sampled include only those programs offering a Ph.D. degree. The reason for this requirement lies with one of the assumptions of this study, that most of those students applying to and currently enrolled in basic programs, are aspiring and are being trained for academic (teaching) positions. In order to attain this type of position, a necessary prerequisite is a Ph.D. degree (or an ABD working on a dissertation). While many students with an applied focus can obtain jobs with a master's degree, I chose only those students aspiring for a Ph.D. degree to maintain comparability between the two programs. It also meant that similar curriculum requirements (e.g., methods/statistics courses, master's thesis, oral exams, dissertation,

etc.) would underlie both programs.

Survey Procedure

Based on the preceding criteria, the A.P.A.'s Graduate Study in Psychology: 1982-83 was examined for all Ph.D. social psychology programs who had a published orientation of either basic or applied. Those programs with minimal or no descriptions or combination programs (i.e., social-personality) were excluded. The specific orientations were cross-checked with more extensive data describing the program, department areas of specialization and recent program graduates' career placements (Bickman, 1980b; Brehm, 1980; Bunker, 1979; Carroll, Werner & Ashmore, 1982; Fisher, 1980, 1982; Kidd & Saks, 1980; Oskamp, 1984; Posavac, 1979, 1980; Severy, 1979; Werner, 1983). This initial phase resulted in 72 social psychology graduate programs. For each of these schools further deletion from the list occurred where there was missing information and/or the reporting of composite GRE scores only (i.e., all programs, minimum scores or all non-clinical scores). Missing or nonuseful data resulted in a sample of 15 applied and 21 basic programs.

Each of the department chairpersons were contacted by mail concerning the survey. The letter (see Appendix A) outlined the purposes of the study and requested their cooperation in the study. Of those 15 applied institutions contacted, nine agreed to participate, two sent no responses and four schools stated that the departments either had merged with other departments, or no longer offered a degree in social psychology. For the 21 basic programs contacted, 13 agreed

to participate while eight did not reply. The initial departmental response rate was, therefore, 87% for the applied programs and 67% for the basic.

The department chairpersons then sent the names and addresses of their currently enrolled social psychology graduate students to the psychology department at Loyola University of Chicago. However, two department chairpersons refused to give the names and/or addresses of their students. They, however, agreed instead to distribute the questionnaires to the students through their departmental mailboxes. In addition, one department chairperson in a basic program asked the students themselves to release their names and addresses, which resulted in a significant reduction in the total students available to survey in this particular department.

A four page questionnaire and a letter assuring students of anonymity were sent to graduate students (see appendix). As well, follow-up reminder cards were also sent two weeks after the original mailing to 392 social psychology graduate students. One hundred twenty one were departmentally delivered. Of this total, 245 were sent and 25 were departmentally delivered to applied students; 141 were sent and 96 were departmentally delivered to students enrolled in basic programs. Of the 513 questionnaires, 11 were returned by the post office as a "moved--not residing at address" or returned by the persons themselves stating that they had either left the program or had graduated. Of the remaining 502 questionnaires, 317 were completed and returned. Responses were received from 175 of the applied respondents, and 142 from the basic students. Table 1 reveals the return response rates

by individual school and the resultant overall response rates of 66% for applied and 60% for basic programs. The combined response rate for the total sample was 63%. It should be noted, however, that the two schools with the lowest response rates (applied program #07 [36%] and basic program #10 [37.5%]) were the two graduate schools that distributed the questionnaires in the department mailboxes.

Survey Questionnaire

The respondents answered a four page, anonymous, mailed survey questionnaire which consisted of 28 questions. The first seven and the last three questions of the survey sought to establish basic demographic and other descriptive data relating to the student and his/her status in the program.

Questions 8 through 11 dealt with assistantships and internships. In this section, students were asked to check if they had (or did not have), an assistantship and an internship experience. In addition, those who responded yes to an internship were asked to state the area of focus whether or not they were responsible for obtaining their own internship, and if they had received monetary compensation.

The next section of the questionnaire (questions 12 through 19) dealt primarily with the career objectives or occupational goals of the student. Question 12 first asks if the student has decided on a career, question 13 then asks when this decision was made (i.e., prior to entering graduate school, first year to four years into the program). For those individuals who have chosen an occupation, question 14 requests which of 15 categories best describes their current

Table 1

Survey Return Rates

<u>Applied Programs</u>	<u>Number of Questionnaires Sent</u>	<u>Number of Questionnaires Returned</u>	<u>% Response Rate</u>
#01	19	13	68.4
#02	22	13	59.1
#03	17	9	52.9
#04	22	15	68.2
#05	16	14	87.5
#06	28	25	89.3
#07	25	9	36.0*
#08	108	71	65.7
#09	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>75.0</u>
Subtotal	265	175	66.0%
<u>Basic Programs</u>			
#10	96	36	37.5*
#11	17	14	82.4
#12	17	11	64.7
#13	19	17	89.5
#14	9	8	88.9
#15	6	6	100.0
#16	10	7	70.0
#17	18	9	50.0
#18	11	7	63.6
#19	7	6	85.7
#20	5	4	80.0
#21	6	6	100.0
#22	<u>16</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>68.8</u>
Subtotal	237	142	60.0%
Total Response Rate	502	317	63.0%

*Distributed by department in student mailboxes.

occupational goals (i.e., full-time teaching, part-time applied research, etc.). Within this occupational frame, the student is then asked to describe their areas of specialization in question 15. Questions 16 and 17 are intended to assess any change of plans that have occurred since beginning the program, and why the student decided to change their focus if they have. Questions 18 and 19 were formulated to assess whether the student's perceptions of the career they have selected and the academic training of which they are a part, will culminate in a high probability of obtaining a job, and whether this fact is important to them.

The next section of the questionnaire consisted of 20 items, focusing on various aspects of training programs in social psychology. This section served the dual purpose of asking if a specific training component was perceived to be relevant to the student's proposed career (yes/no/DK), and whether the graduate department emphasized this training component to the perceived satisfaction of the student. The four ratings included a "too much emphasis" (not as necessary as the department feels), "sufficient emphasis" (just the right amount of emphasis), "too little emphasis" (student feels the department is weak in this area and should focus more on this area), and a "no emphasis" category, which has to be interpreted in the light of whether a particular component is perceived as relevant or not to one's proposed career. The issues explored in this 20 item questionnaire had their origin in previous work by other researchers. Fisher (1982), for example, outlines three areas of core competencies for the applied social psychologist. These areas are: "theoretical understanding,"

"research skills," and "practice skills." These areas, however, are also useful for the basic social psychologist who enters the academic world, but to a differing degree when compared with the practicing applied social psychologist. In addition to the basic skills which are relevant for all social psychologists, there are also special skills, such as "writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists" or "techniques of conflict resolution," which are more directly applicable to an applied social psychologist. Both Edwards and Holmgren (1979) in their survey of organizations, and Posavac (1982) in his survey of program evaluators, highlighted a number of relevant skills necessary for the nonacademic social psychologist. The first nine skill categories reflect "practice skills," the second grouping of five skills represent "knowledge skills," and the last six skills relate to "practice skills."

The first nine statements in question 20 relate primarily to Fisher's (1982), and Edwards and Holmgren's (1979) "practice skills." A listing of the skills include the following: "writing skills for both journals and research reports, and for reports to be read by non-scientists;" "oral presentations to large groups," "growth of interpersonal social skills," "small group leadership skills," "personal interviewing skills," "techniques of conflict resolution," "internship in a chosen occupational area," and "techniques for effective classroom teaching."

The next five skill statements of question 20 are structured around a "theoretical understanding" of the different areas which may be useful for both basic and applied social psychologists. These items

include: "general social psychology theory," "program design," "theory development," "applied coursework," and "interdepartmental coursework."

The last six skill statements of question 20 relate to "research skills" necessary for a basic and applied student's career objectives. The research skills include: "administration of standardized tests," "program evaluation," "laboratory methods," "field research methods," "survey methods and questionnaire design," and "computer and statistical analysis." The research focus is a very central aspect of both basic and applied Ph.D. programs, and therefore is considered an essential element of department satisfaction ratings.

Question 21 asks the students how they know what skills are necessary for their chosen careers. The purpose of this question is to assess what sources of information the students felt best described the necessary requirements for a teaching or an applied career.

The next three questions (numbers 22, 23 and 24) were designed to assess a general satisfaction with the students' graduate training. By asking the students if they would choose the same program again or if they would stay in the same program if they had another opportunity to do so, a general underlying of real satisfaction can be attained, to some degree. If a student's answer is no, question 23 explores what program would have been preferable, and question 24 attempts to determine why the student chose to stay with their present program. Finally, question 25 asks the students to expand upon any other issues (not mentioned in the study) that they felt were important for their present graduate training, and which may be central for attaining their desired occupations. This question will allow the

student to give additional information regarding other experiences overlooked or underemphasized by the questionnaire.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The Sample

The sample used in this study consisted of 22 graduate schools, 16 of which were public universities, and 6 which were private universities. Of those, the basic programs were found to be in predominantly public institutions (10) while the applied programs were mainly in private universities (6). However, the total number of respondents reflect the fact that the three private applied programs were larger than the six public programs. Approximately 73.1% of applied respondents were from private schools, with 26.9% from public institutions. The majority of the basic respondents were in public institutions (83.1%) as compared to 16.9% in private institutions. In addition, the applied sample of students (86.9%) and basic sample of students (60.6%) were both from predominantly urban areas with a total population of over 50,000 (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area [SMSA]) (Bureau of Census, 1980).

Department sizes varied widely from 5 to 110 students in the sample of universities examined. The results of a t-test on the difference between the department size means for the two orientations were found to be significant ($t_{(315)} = 5.01, p < .0001$). The mean number of students for basic and applied programs was 34.8 and 57.4, respectively.

With regard to GRE scores, a t-test showed a significant mean

difference between basic and applied programs ($t_{(315)} = 7.72, p < .0001$). The mean GRE scores for programs with an applied orientation were higher ($\bar{X} = 1217$) than for those programs with a basic orientation ($\bar{X} = 1150$).

The percentages of the applied oriented student sample represented by first, second, third, fourth and fifth-plus year levels were 13.7%, 26.8%, 24.6%, 21.1%, and 13.7%, respectively. For the basic student respondents, the distribution was 16.3%, 29.1%, 22.7%, 19.1%, and 12.8%, respectively. In addition, 63% of the applied respondents and 47.4% of the basic respondents had completed a master's thesis, or 56.5% of the total sample.

The majority of these students are aspiring for a Ph.D. degree (90.3% of applied students; 94.4% of basic students), with only 5.6% of basic students and 8.0% of applied students intending to complete a terminal master's degree. Most of the students are full-time (93.7% of basic students; 73.7% of applied students), with more applied students (25.7%) in a part-time status than basic students (6.3%) ($\chi^2_{(2)} = 21.86, p < .0001$). In addition, the percentages of applied students holding a teaching, research, combined teaching and research or no assistantship were 20.6%, 24.6%, 29.1% and 25.7%, respectively. For basic students, the distribution was 28.2%, 10.6%, 35.9% and 25.3%, respectively.

The majority of the applied graduate students (63%) had not held, or were not currently holding an internship in their proposed career. Of those who had completed an internship, however, 40% had done so in business related areas, 26% in mental health and health care fields, 17% in program evaluation and 12% in environmental areas .

(transportation, etc.). In addition, 15% were currently holding an internship. The majority (56%) were in business related areas of personnel, management, consulting and career planning, and 28% were in mental health and health care fields. The majority of those on internships were responsible for obtaining the internship (85%), and 80% received monetary compensation for their work.

Finally, the applied program respondents were slightly more equitably distributed by sex than the basic respondents (47.1% male; 52.9% female versus 39.4% male; 60.6% female). A t -test showed no significant difference ($t_{(315)} < 1$, n.s.) between the mean ages of basic ($\bar{X} = 29.8$) and applied ($\bar{X} = 30.1$) respondents. In addition, chi-square analyses revealed a significant difference between basic and applied students with regard to marital status ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 4.54$, $p < .05$). The basic students were predominantly single (64.5% single; 35.5% married) while the applied students showed more of an equal split (52.6% single; 47.4% married).

Perceived Focus of Departments

Chi-square analysis indicates that there is a significant relationship between the students' definitions of their program as basic or applied, and the published classification of the program. Table 2 shows that the majority of the students in basic training programs perceive their programs to be predominantly a traditional training program in social psychology. The remaining 9.1% perceived their program to be a combination of basic and applied, and 2.9% felt their program was applied. While the majority (55.7%) of the students from

(published) applied programs perceived their program as having a totally applied focus, 25.3% felt these programs were a combination of basic and applied, and 19% felt their programs still had a basic orientation. These findings suggest that a greater discrepancy exists between the students' perception of the published applied programs and its actual focus, than is the case for students in published basic programs. This perceived discrepancy may be due to differing student perceptions of how an applied focus is defined, a lack of communication within the department and/or a lack of commitment or emphasis to a totally applied department focus.

Career Goals and Perceived Opportunities

The majority of both basic (82.1%) and applied (86.1%) graduate students answering this questionnaire have decided on what career they intend to pursue upon completion of their graduate degrees. The students were given a choice of approximately 12 (plus three write-in) general categories to describe their current occupational goals. These categories were later collapsed into two major groupings. Those individuals desiring to pursue teaching only, teaching with basic research or basic research only were classified as aspiring for "traditionally-oriented" occupations. Those individuals intending to pursue teaching with applied research or applied research only were classified as aspiring for "application-oriented" occupations. A chi-square analysis revealed a significant difference between the distributions of basic and applied graduate students on this item. Table 3 shows the distinction between the two groups of students for these two types of desired occupational goals.

Table 2

Student Classification of Department Orientation
Compared to Published Orientation of Department

<u>Published Orientation</u>	<u>Student Classification of Program</u>				
	<u>Applied Schools</u>	<u>Applied</u>	<u>Applied/Basic</u>		<u>Basic</u>
#01		5 (38.5%)	6 (46.2%)	2 (15.4%)	
#02		12 (92.3%)	1 (7.7%)		
#03			2 (22.2%)	7 (77.8%)	
#04		2 (13.3%)	6 (40.0%)	7 (46.7%)	
#05		12 (85.7%)	2 (14.3%)		
#06		18 (72.0%)	5 (20.8%)	2 (8.3%)	
#07		45 (64.3%)	19 (27.1%)	6 (8.6%)	
#08				6 (100.0%)	
#09		<u>3 (33.3%)</u>	<u>3 (33.3%)</u>	<u>3 (33.3%)</u>	
		97 (55.7%)	44 (25.3%)	33 (19.0%)	= 174
 <u>Basic Schools</u>					
#10			6 (16.7%)	30 (83.3%)	
#11		1 (7.1%)		13 (92.9%)	
#12			2 (18.2%)	9 (81.8%)	
#13			1 (6.8%)	16 (94.1%)	
#14		2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	
#15		1 (16.7%)		5 (83.3%)	
#16			1 (14.3%)	6 (85.7%)	
#17				6 (100.0%)	
#18				11 (100.0%)	
#19				6 (100.0%)	
#20			1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	
#21				7 (100.0%)	
#22		<u> </u>	<u>1 (11.0%)</u>	<u>8 (88.9%)</u>	
		4 (2.9%)	13 (9.1%)	125 (88.0%)	= 142

Note. $\chi^2(42) = 234.33, p < .0001, \text{ETA} = .81$

The majority of basic students (62.6%) intend to have an application oriented occupation goal, with 37.4% desiring a traditional/academic position. In addition, the majority of applied students (89%) intend to enter application-oriented positions, however a smaller percentage (11%) still intend to pursue the more traditional teaching with basic research route.

Students from published basic and applied programs pursuing an academic career with basic research most often mentioned such areas of specialization, the various areas in general social psychology theory (i.e., attribution, social cognition, etc.), social issues (i.e., women's studies, family violence, etc.) or research (i.e., statistics and data information management). Students from published basic and applied programs, who intend on pursuing an "application oriented" occupation, tended to mention most often such areas as law and justice, business (i.e., marketing research, human relations training), health, and research (i.e., program evaluation, policy analysis).

For those students who first entered graduate school with a specific career goal in mind, 43.6% of the students in basic programs and 45.9% of the students in applied programs stated that their occupational goals had changed. The majority of the changes occurring in the students in basic programs was reflected in the fact that 68.1% of those students who had changed their career goals were now intent on pursuing an application oriented career. The responses mentioned most often for this change of focus were: exposure to new information (15.6%), difficulty in finding an academic position (12.5%), a change in special area of interest (12.5%), disillusionment with the academic

Table 3

Occupational Goal for Students by Published Department Orientation

<u>Published Orientation</u>	<u>Occupational Goal</u>	
	<u>Basic Career</u>	<u>Applied Career</u>
Applied Department	11.0% (16)	89.0% (130)
Basic Department	37.4% (40)	62.6% (67)

$$\underline{\chi^2}(2) = 30.07, \underline{p} < .0001, \underline{n} = 253$$

system (9.4%), allowed to do applied work (9.4%), and became more interested in research (9.4%). Of the students in applied programs who had changed occupational goals after initially entering the program, 91.8% mentioned hopes for an academic position. These students cited the following reasons for changing their career goals: exposure to new information (21.4%), perceived difficulty in finding an academic position (16.1%), social psychology courses did not adequately prepare a student for the current market (12.5%), and experiences in work settings or internships (16.1%).

Both groups of graduate students agreed that it was either very important (53.5% for basic students, 59.3% for applied students) or important (30.7% for basic students, 20.7% for applied students), that they obtain employment in their chosen careers immediately after graduation. With regard to perceived employment opportunities however, t-test analyses revealed significant differences between basic and applied students in relation to their chosen occupational goals. The students from applied programs perceived more opportunity to obtain employment in a basic career than students from basic programs ($t_{(100)} = 2.99$, $p < .01$). On a seven-point scale, which ranged from an excellent opportunity (7) to no opportunity (1), the \bar{X} scores for students from applied and basic programs were 5.20 and 4.38, respectively. For those students intent on pursuing an applied career, t-test results showed a wider gap between the two groups in perceived employment opportunity ($t_{(131)} = 4.62$, $p < .0001$). Applied students ($\bar{X} = 5.54$) perceived a greater opportunity for employment than did students from basic programs ($\bar{X} = 3.87$). These results suggest that students of applied pro-

grams feel they are receiving a more useful program of study regardless of the area of career goal, and perceive a good to very good chance of obtaining employment in their career goals. Students from basic programs, on the other hand, perceive an average chance for employment in an academic career and a poor to average opportunity for an applied career. These findings seem to suggest that students from basic programs perceived a deficit in a number of necessary skills which are required in a nonacademic setting. They may feel, therefore, that they are less equipped to compete for nonacademic careers in today's market.

The students were also asked how they learned about what types of skills were necessary for their chosen careers. While all students could check any category that applied to their own situation, the majority of students from both basic and applied programs stated that advice from undergraduate or graduate faculty was a very significant information source (61.8% for basic students versus 53.8% for applied students). The majority of students from applied programs (63.6%), as compared to 39.7% of basic students, felt that past or present employment for an organization which required the specialized skills, to be a significant source of information. The following sources were found to be less helpful by both basic and applied groups: "advice from friends or relatives in the same occupation" (34.5% versus 29.5%) or "from friends and relatives with advanced degrees" (29% versus 23.7%), "published articles, pamphlets or books which stated necessary requirements" (35.3 versus 34.1%), "self-investigation" (11% versus 6.9%) and "information from professional organizations" (7% versus 5.8%).

Perceived Educational Needs

Taking into account the previously stated career objectives, the next question asked was whether or not each of the 20 "practice, knowledge or research" skill items were relevant to each student's proposed career. The students' answers were, therefore, based on their individually stated basic or applied career objective. Appendices D and E show the more detailed breakdown of the χ^2 analyses for both basic and applied career goals, department orientation and perceived relevance for each of the 20 items. Due to the excessive length of these Appendices, Tables 4 and 5 have been constructed to show the ranked percentages for each of the 20 items for both students of basic and applied programs. Table 4 represents those students pursuing a basic career and Table 5 represents those students pursuing an applied career. Since most of the responses to the 20 items were in the "yes--relevant to career" category, the present analysis will further delineate the distinctions between the two group's responses. Unless otherwise noted, χ^2 values are discussed only if they achieved at least .05 statistical significance.

Practice Skills for Basic Careers. It was expected that the greatest differences between applied and basic careers would be in the "practice skill" area. Chi-square analyses revealed that there were very few significant differences in the perception of relevant "practice skills" between basic and applied graduate students intending to pursue basic careers. Both groups of students agreed that most "practice skills" are relevant for a basic career. Three of the nine skill areas showed statistically significant differences between the

Table 4

Ranked Skill Items Perceived as Relevant to a BASIC Career
Divided by Current Program

<u>BASIC OCCUPATIONAL GOAL</u>			
APPLIED PROGRAM	% re- ported as rele- vant	BASIC PROGRAM	% re- ported as rele- vant
<u>90-100% ENDORSEMENT</u>		<u>90-100% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
Journal writing skills (P)	100.0%	Journal writing skills (P)	97.4%
Computer/stat. analysis (R)	100.0	Social psych. theory (K)	97.4
Survey/ques. design (R)	93.8	Lg. group presentation (P)	94.9
Field research methods (R)	93.8	Computer/stat. analysis (R)	92.3
Theory development (K)	93.8	Classroom tchg. tech. (P)	92.3
Lg. group presentation (P)	93.8	Theory development (K)	92.3
<u>80-89% ENDORSEMENT</u>		<u>80-89% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
Social psych. theory (K)	87.5	Laboratory methods (R)	84.6
Classroom tchg. tech. (P)	87.5	Field research methods (R)	82.1
Sm. group leader. skills (P)	87.5		
Laboratory methods (R)	81.3	<u>60-79% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
Interpersonal social sk. (P)	81.3	Survey/ques. design (R)	79.3
Nonscientist writing sk. (P)	81.3	Interpersonal social sk. (P)	71.8
*Internship (P)	81.3	Sm. group leader. skills (P)	63.2
<u>60-79% ENDORSEMENT</u>		<u>30-59% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
*Program evaluation (R)	75.0	Interdepartment courses (K)	59.0
Applied coursework (K)	75.0	Nonscientist writing sk. (P)	51.3
Program design (K)	68.8	Applied coursework (K)	48.7
*Conflict resolution tech. (P)	62.5	Program design (K)	41.0
*Personal interviewing (P)	62.5	Conflict resolution tech. (P)	36.8
Interdepartment courses (K)	62.5	Program evaluation (R)	30.8
		Internship (P)	30.8
		Personal interviewing (P)	30.8
<u>10-20% ENDORSEMENT</u>		<u>10-20% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
Standard. test admin. (R)	12.5	Standard. test admin. (R)	15.4

*Significant χ^2 differences between the two groups
on this skill item (see Appendix D)

Note: (P) = Practice Skills
(K) = Knowledge Skills
(R) = Research Skills

Table 5

Ranked Skill Items Perceived as Relevant to an APPLIED Career
Divided by Current Program

APPLIED OCCUPATIONAL GOAL

APPLIED PROGRAM	% re- ported as rele- vant	BASIC PROGRAM	% re- ported as rele- vant
<u>90-100% ENDORSEMENT</u>		<u>90-100% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
Applied coursework (K)	99.2%	Computer/stat. analysis (R)	98.5%
Survey/ques. design (R)	96.8	Field research methods (R)	98.4
*Nonscientist writing sk. (P)	96.0	Journal writing skills (P)	96.9
Computer/stat. analysis (R)	95.2	Survey/ques. design (R)	96.9
Field research methods (R)	94.4	Lg. group presentation (P)	95.4
Journal writing skills (P)	91.2		
Lg. group presentation (P)	91.2	<u>80-89% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
		Applied coursework (K)	89.2
<u>80-89% ENDORSEMENT</u>		Social psych. theory (K)	89.1
Interpersonal social sk. (P)	89.6	Interdepartment courses (K)	84.6
*Program evaluation (R)	88.8	Sm. group leader. skills (P)	83.1
*Internship (P)	88.6	Interpersonal social sk. (P)	81.5
Interdepartment courses (K)	88.1		
Sm. group leader. skills (P)	86.3	<u>50-79% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
*Personal interviewing (P)	81.5	Nonscientist writing sk. (P)	79.7
*Social psych. theory (K)	80.8	Program evaluation (R)	78.5
Program design (K)	80.6	Classroom tchg. tech. (P)	76.9
		Program design (K)	72.3
<u>50-79% ENDORSEMENT</u>		Theory development (K)	70.8
*Conflict resolution tech. (P)	78.4	Internship (P)	69.2
Theory development (K)	66.7	Laboratory methods (R)	66.2
*Classroom tchg. tech. (P)	50.8	Conflict resolution tech. (P)	63.1
		Personal interviewing (P)	60.0
<u>20-49% ENDORSEMENT</u>		<u>20-49% ENDORSEMENT</u>	
*Laboratory methods (R)	32.0	Standard. test admin. (R)	35.4
Standard. test admin. (R)	28.0		

*Significant x^2 differences between the two groups
on this skill item (see Appendix E)

Note: (P) = Practice Skills
(K) = Knowledge Skills
(R) = Research Skills

two groups. These areas were: "personal interviewing techniques," "techniques of conflict resolution," and an "internship in a chosen area." Students from applied programs felt these areas were more important than the students from basic programs and placed a higher level of endorsement on them than did basics (see Table 4). These findings suggest that either both groups of students view having a variety of practice skills as necessary prerequisites for teaching in universities where additional experience may be necessary to obtain a position, or the students may be arming themselves for the possibility of not obtaining a job in academia. The students in applied programs show this foresight (possibly due to the training that they are currently receiving) for such skills as "techniques of conflict resolution" (62.5% vs. 36.8% for basics), "nonscientist writing skills" (81.3% vs. 51.3% for basics), "small group leadership skills" (87.5% vs. 63.2% for basics) and "personal interviewing skills" (62.5% vs. 30.8% for basics). These students may, therefore, have an advantage in both job markets.

Knowledge Skills for Basic Careers. There were no significant differences between the responses of two groups, regarding the "knowledge skill" area, however, there are "interocular differences" on a number of applied items. Students from applied programs perceive "program design," "applied coursework," and "interdepartmental coursework" as more relevant to their careers than do students from basic programs (see Table 4). Both groups, however, felt that applied and interdepartmental coursework was less important than social psychology theory and theory development. Apparently since an academic teaching career

deals primarily with imparting knowledge to students, this skill area showed the least differences between the groups.

Research Skills for Basic Careers. Chi-square analyses showed that there was a significant difference in the responses of students from basic and applied programs, regarding program evaluation skills. While students from applied programs perceived this skill to be relevant to their basic careers (75%), most students from basic programs either "didn't know" (35.9%) or did not feel it was relevant (33.3%). Both groups believed administration of standardized tests was not relevant, while all other areas of research skills were perceived to be significant to their careers in basic social psychology. These research skill areas received between 80 to 100% endorsement from both groups of students (see Table 4 and Appendix D). Again, since doing basic research is a major part of an academic position, most types of methodology are seen as a relevant and useful skill.

Practice Skills for Applied Careers. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences in the frequencies of responses between students from basic and applied graduate programs regarding what "practice skills" they felt were relevant for an applied career (see Appendix E). There were differences in perceptions of relevance for five out of the nine practice skill areas. Table 5 shows that while basic students felt that "techniques of effective classroom teaching" was a relevant skill, the applied student more realistically felt that the following practice skills were more important to an applied career: "non-scientist writing skills," "personal interviewing techniques," "techniques of conflict resolution," and an "internship in an occupa-

tional area." Thus, these results suggest that while students from basic programs seem to lack a clear awareness of required practice skills, the students from applied programs have a realistic understanding of the extra necessary practice skills, and their relevance to applied work.

Knowledge Skills for Applied Careers. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences in responses between students from basic and applied programs in general social psychology theory. Students from basic programs found social psychology theory, as well as theory development, more relevant to their applied careers, than did students from applied programs. The students from applied programs, on the other hand, stated that such applied skills as "program design," "applied coursework" and "interdepartmental coursework" were more relevant to their careers. Applied students more highly endorsed application oriented knowledge coursework than did students from basic programs. These findings suggest that graduate students in basic programs planning on applied careers, do not seem to have as full a knowledge of those "knowledge" skills that are required for an applied career. Their responses of relevance to career may reflect those skills that they have been trained in, and not necessarily the ones needed for applied areas (see Appendix E and Table 5).

Research Skills for Applied Careers. Chi-square analyses revealed that the majority of the students from both basic and applied programs are in agreement that "field methods," "survey methods," "questionnaire design" and "computer/statistical analysis" are useful for applied research. There is, however, a significant difference

between the students from both basic and applied programs on "program evaluation" and "laboratory methods." These differences between the two groups seem to reflect their respective training programs. Only 32% of the students from applied programs (vs. 66.2% for basic students) felt "laboratory methods" was relevant. In addition, students from basic programs were less likely to report "program evaluation" as relevant to their careers. These findings again suggest that students from applied programs have a greater understanding and awareness of the research skills required for applied occupations (see Table 5 and Appendix E).

Educational Opportunities

Students from basic and applied graduate training programs were asked to rate their respective graduate departments on the degree of emphasis placed upon each of the 20 practice, research and knowledge skill areas. The response categories available to the respondents were: no emphasis, too little emphasis, sufficient emphasis, and too much emphasis. These were later coded from 0 to 3 respectively. Chi-square analyses showed a significant difference between the two training programs in a number of these areas.

Practice Skills. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences in responses between the perceptions of basic and applied graduate students, of their respective programs in seven out of the nine practice skill areas (see Appendix F). The majority of these skill areas were reported by both basic and applied graduate students to be either not a part of their training programs, or perceived as

insufficiently emphasized by their graduate departments. More than 50% of the students from basic departments reported "no emphasis" in the five areas of "writing skills for non-scientists" (50%), "personal interviewing techniques" (50%), "growth of interpersonal social skills" (55%), "conflict resolution" (41%), and "internships" (61%). Students from applied programs reported a smaller percentage of "no emphasis" skills. Approximately 40% of these students reported "no emphasis" in the following areas: "growth of interpersonal social skills," "techniques of conflict resolution."

It appears that both basic and applied programs, according to the graduate students in this study, seem to be putting some degree of emphasis on these practice skill areas. In addition, roughly 25% to 35% of the students from basic and applied programs rate their departments as having too little emphasis in these practice skills areas. It appears that both types of departments place a greater degree of emphasis on the traditional basic/experimental practice skills of "journal writing" (70% for basic; 66% for applied), and "oral presentations to large groups" (61% for basic; 46% for applied). In addition, applied programs have usually added an internship of some type for experiential training. Basic programs, on the other hand, have not added an internship or increased their emphasis on teaching techniques typically required for an academic position.

Knowledge Skills. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences in the responses between the perceptions of the basic and applied graduate students of their respective programs, in four out of the five knowledge skills (see Appendix F). The applied students

reported "sufficient emphasis" in all of the four areas of "social psychology theory" (75%), "program design" (53%), and "applied (69%) and interdepartmental coursework" (48%). Of these areas students from basic programs reported an increasing emphasis in interdepartmental coursework (43%). In addition, students from basic programs generally reported a higher number of "no emphasis" responses in all "knowledge skill" categories, except "social psychology theory" and "theory development," which have traditionally been seen as major areas of focus for basic social psychology programs. However, students in applied training programs also report that there is "sufficient emphasis" in the traditional "social psychological theory" (75%) and "theory development" (60%) areas. It appears that applied programs, in contrast to basic programs, tend to include more "knowledge skills" within the traditional basic graduate training framework.

Research Skills. Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences in responses between the perceptions of both groups of graduate students, of their respective programs, in four out of six research skill areas (see Appendix F). While both groups of students perceive "sufficient emphasis" in their respective departments in "computer and statistical analyses" (83% for basic; 77% for applied), a number of differences in research skills are apparent between the two department orientations.

Seventy-eight percent of students in basic programs report "sufficient emphasis" and 15% "too much emphasis," in "laboratory methods," whereas 54% of students from applied programs report the same degree of emphasis for "laboratory methods." Twenty-six percent

of applied students report "no emphasis" whatsoever in "laboratory methods." At the same time, students in applied programs report that "program evaluation" (76%), "field methods" (76%), "survey methods, and questionnaire design" (78%), are given "sufficient emphasis" in their program. Students in basic programs, on the other hand, give greater percentages of "no" or "too little" emphases in these research areas. While basic programs still seem to emphasize "laboratory methods," and "statistical analysis," it appears that applied graduate departments have shifted their focus from laboratory research to a wide array of more useful methods in nonacademic settings.

The Match Between Program Emphasis and Student Career Goals

Chi-square analyses were conducted to see if there was a match or mismatch between the skills the students felt to be relevant to their careers, as compared to the actual departmental emphases. Manova analyses were also performed on this data, but since the major focus of this section was on the distinctions between the differing levels of department emphasis (none, too little, sufficient, or too much) in relation to the students' career goals, χ^2 analyses were the most descriptive and therefore the preferred method to use. Most of the student's responses were found to be in the "yes--relevant to career" mode. The following percentage comparisons were constructed on the basis of these responses. In addition, since either of the two major career classifications were being pursued by students of both basic and applied programs, a distinction was also made on these two classificatory variables and program types.

Match Between Basic Occupational Goal and Departmental Program

Emphasis. The comparison of percentages of responses between students in basic and applied programs, pursuing a basic/academic career show only two categories of agreement in the practice skill area (see Appendix G). The areas within the traditional social psychology training realm are "journal writing skills" and "oral presentations to large groups." "Techniques for effective classroom teaching," also considered as a necessary prerequisite for an academic position, was however, given "no emphasis" (38.9%) or "too little emphasis" (36.1%) in the traditional basic programs. Applied students perceive the relevance of other practice skills, and feel that their departments have put sufficient emphasis on these areas. Students from basic programs also perceive the relevancy of "practice skills" for their occupations, however, their basic graduate training programs do not offer these students the opportunity to obtain such training. Students from basic programs report "no emphasis" in the following areas: "non-scientist writing skills" (30%), "small group leadership skills" (29.2%), "personal interviewing techniques" (41.7%), "interpersonal social skills" (50%), "techniques of conflict resolution" (35.7%), "internship in chosen field" (63.7%) and "teaching techniques" (38.9%). Within the category of "knowledge skills," the students from applied programs intent on a basic/academic career, showed a greater opportunity to pursue all types of relevant knowledge skills, except "program design," than students from basic programs. These basic students, although perceiving the need for various other types of knowledge skills, receive the major emphasis of their training in "social psychology theory" and "theory

development." In other areas, such as "applied coursework" and "program design," departments seem to be increasing their emphasis, however, the emphasis is considered to be insufficient by this sample of students.

A comparison of responses in the "research skill" area for both groups of students, shows that again, students from applied programs feel they are receiving sufficient emphasis by their departments in all of the research areas. Students from basic programs, however, feel that "field research methods" and "program evaluation" should receive more emphasis. These findings suggest that students from applied programs see more of a "match" between their perceived training needs and their department's emphasis for an academic (basic) career than do students in basic programs. Applied students report only three areas (less than 50% reporting sufficient emphasis) out of the 20 items, which they felt needed more emphasis. Students from basic programs, on the other hand, report 13 out of the 20 skill items to be lacking a sufficient emphasis by the graduate training departments. It appears applied students feel their training is sufficiently preparing them and perhaps given them an "edge" in the competition for the more hard to obtain academic (basic) careers, or perhaps better equipping them for an alternative applied career.

Match Between Applied Occupational Goal and Department Program Emphasis. A comparison of percentages of responses between students in applied and basic graduate programs intending to pursue an applied career, Appendix H shows that a majority of both groups perceive too little or no emphasis in "practice skill" areas. While "journal

writing" skills and "oral presentation to large groups" are emphasized by both types of programs, applied programs have also added an "internship" to their program to make it an applied program. Other areas of practice skills such as "non-scientist writing skills," "small group leadership skills," "personal interviewing skills," "interpersonal social skills," "techniques of conflict resolution," seem to be offered to some degree, but between 24% to 40% of students from both basic and applied programs report "no emphasis" in these areas. Within the practice skill areas therefore, little difference other than an internship, was perceived to exist between basic and applied programs for applied careers.

The majority of applied program students perceive sufficient emphasis in four of the five knowledge skill areas as they relate to applied careers. All percentages exceed 55%, except for "interdepartmental coursework," in which 17.1% and 37.8% of the students report "no or too little emphasis." Students in basic programs, on the other hand, report sufficient emphasis in "theory development" (65.2%) and "interdepartmental coursework" (52.9%). It appears basic departments are including outside courses to augment their basic programs. In addition, "applied coursework" and "program design" are less likely to be offered by basic programs.

Within the "research skill" area, students from both basic and applied programs perceive little or no emphasis on "standardized test administration." Only 37% of the students from basic programs and 30% of the students from applied programs perceive this skill to be necessary for their careers and therefore emphasis by the depart-

ment on this skill may not be warranted. Of all the other research areas, students from applied programs report sufficient emphasis on the other relevant skills more than 66.9% of the time. Students from basic programs, however, report the most significant emphasis in "laboratory methods" (88.4%), and "computer and statistical analyses" (71.9%). The other areas which the students in basic programs perceived as relevant but underemphasized by the department were "program evaluation," "field methods" and "survey and questionnaire design." These results suggest that students in basic programs perceive a great degree of "mismatch" between what they perceive to be relevant for their applied careers, and what their graduate departments are emphasizing in their training. Fourteen out of the 20 skill items were perceived by basic students to be in need of more emphasis in training. There is a greater match, however, between students in applied programs, perceptions of relevant skills for applied careers, and their graduate department's emphasis of these skills. Only eight out of the 20 skill items were reported to be less than a 50% department emphasis. The majority (seven) of which were in the "practice skill" section. This suggests these students feel that more than an internship is needed to work adequately in applied settings. It goes without saying that students with applied occupational goals who are in a basic program, and students with basic career goals in an applied program, are not properly matched with the program. This alone may explain the results seen above.

Student Satisfaction

General Satisfaction with Department. Approximately 40% of the students in either program would not choose the same program again. General satisfaction was assessed by the question: "If you had the opportunity to begin graduate school again, would you choose the same program?" Students from basic and applied programs were compared by means of a chi-square test. No significant differences were found between these two groups on general satisfaction with programs ($\chi^2(2) = .060, p < n.s., n = 308$). The percentage of "yes, would choose the same program" was 62.5% for the students in basic programs and 60.5% for the students in applied programs.

Satisfaction with Department in Relation to Career Goal. It was hypothesized that those students in graduate training programs whose occupational goals were different from the department's published orientation, would be less likely to choose the same program again and would therefore be more dissatisfied. Basic and applied occupational goals were compared by using a chi-square test for each orientation. Chi-square analyses showed no significant differences between the two occupational groups for the applied graduate training programs ($\chi^2(2) = 1.69, p < n.s.$). Forty percent of the students in applied programs intent on pursuing a basic career, and 37.2% pursuing applied careers, stated that they would not choose the same program again. There was, however, a significant difference between the two occupational goals for students in basic programs. Table 6 indicates that for basic students pursuing a basic career, 29% would not choose the same program. For those basic students pursuing an applied career,

Table 6

Choice of Same Program by Occupational
Goal for Students in Basic Programs

<u>Occupational Goal</u>	<u>Choose the Same Program?</u>	
	<u>no</u>	<u>yes</u>
Basic	29.0% (11)	71.0% (27)
Applied	36.0% (23)	64.0% (41)

$$\chi^2(2) = 6.64, p < .05, n = 102$$

36% would not choose the same program.

Graduate Training Programs of Choice. Those 88 students who answered "no" to the previous question were then asked what type of graduate training program they would now choose if given the opportunity to do so. A variety of open-ended responses were coded into two general categories: types of specific graduate training programs, and general comments about how to change their current graduate training program. Overall percentages of responses will be reported for the two groups of students.

For the first category of specific training programs, the results indicated that approximately 16% and 22% of both groups of students would choose business management and industrial/organizational behavior, respectively, for graduate study. In addition, approximately 39% of students in basic programs and 27% of students in applied programs, would choose clinical/counseling psychology, cognitive psychology or sociology.

General comments about changing current graduate training programs were reported by 40% of the students in basic programs, and 44.7% of the students in applied programs. The major suggestions were to change to a "more applied program" (65% of the basic students; 40% of the applied students) and to structure a better organized graduate training program (13% of the basic students; 12.5% of the applied students). While 7.2% of both groups of students were already in the process of transferring, and 8.1% had almost completed their programs, many of these students stated that they had invested too much time (29.7%), and/or money (6.4%) to change programs. In addition, approx-

imately 9.9% of both groups of students felt that they had learned useful skills in their programs, even though they would not choose the same program again.

General Comments. The last open-ended question asked the students to comment on any other aspect of their graduate training, which they felt was overlooked on the questionnaire. Each student could comment on any number of issues they felt were pertinent to their training. The issues reported here were the most frequently mentioned ones. The responses were later grouped into three categories: faculty issues, career skills, and social psychology training program changes.

In the area of "faculty issues," the students from both programs voiced similar concerns. Students from both basic and applied programs stated that the attitude of the faculty towards the program was very important. In a number of cases, for example, students wrote that the faculty respected only basic research. This was true even in the case of applied programs. In this same vein, students felt that faculty should support the students' research goals and interests, even if different from their own. In addition, both students from basic and applied programs felt that some faculty were "naive about the qualities needed for employment," and they were, therefore, unable to design applied careers effectively. One student in an applied program wrote:

...It's difficult for faculty to help students prepare for and/or find jobs in applied settings if the faculty have never had to find applied jobs themselves.

In the area of "career skills," the students' responses echoed many of the same types of training needs perceived to be necessary for applied careers. Both groups of students felt the departments needed more connections with outside organizations. One student from an applied program wrote:

Organizational environments are at the core of any applied research. I think the program could be stronger if arrangements could be made to involve one executive from some outside firm in the academic forum as a guest lecturer or whatever. It would afford students with a specific link as well as inexpensive labor for some applied problems.

In addition, a number of students in applied programs saw the need for learning different social skills as well as coursework in business related areas. One applied student wrote:

If you're gonna work in an applied setting (i.e., some kind of organization) you probably need some coaching in organizational manners and what social behaviors are expected of you by others - it's a different world from studenthood in academe ... also realistic issues like administration, budgeting and business knowledge can be invaluable in working with organizations. A special emphasis on non-profit organizations and government contracting would also be helpful. I doubt, however, that these issues are addressed by many of the social programs.

Finally, within the social psychology departments in general, both students in basic and applied training programs, felt they needed more flexibility in their programs to pursue the needed requisites for their careers. While students of applied programs wanted more opportunity to gain a broader depth of experience in applied areas, the students in basic programs intent on basic careers wanted more time to publish early enough in their careers to establish themselves

in the field. One student in a basic program wrote:

At the very least, a successful graduate student must perform both research and coursework (not to focus on "politics" which evades most departments). Considering publications, with all the M.S. and Ph.D. work, making a name for yourself is difficult. I'm concerned that many programs do not give enough structure to early research endeavors, so that every year one will produce projects, hopefully some publications. That is, the balance between classes and research works against a student's completing graduate studies on time, with a full vita.

It can be seen, therefore, that a number of important and unresolved issues exist in many graduate departments, which the students feel are important to their graduate study and future careers. Graduate departments should consider addressing such issues in the context of their training programs in an effort to design more effective programs.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The major purpose of the present study was to examine the differences in perception between basic and applied social psychology graduate students, with regard to their occupational goals, perceived training needs, current department emphases and general satisfaction with their respective graduate training programs. It was hypothesized that each of these areas would be perceived differently by the students in each type of graduate training program. It was also expected that student satisfaction would be higher in those programs where students felt there was a "match" between their occupational goal and focus of the program.

Summary Findings

The greatest number of both basic and applied social psychology graduate students, are intending to pursue application-oriented careers upon graduation. Students from (published) basic departments, perceive less of an opportunity for employment in applied careers than students from (published) applied programs. Basic students are aware, to some degree, of the different types of skills that are required in applied work. They, however, report little or no opportunity for obtaining such skills with their departments and are more dissatisfied in their programs of study. Applied students, on the other hand, perceive a higher chance of obtaining applied work, and report greater opportunity

for the needed research and knowledge skills that they feel are required. The applied students, however, perceived greater necessity for more "practice skills" to augment their current training programs.

Suggestions for Graduate Departments

Curriculum Planning. A number of suggestions regarding program design can be derived from the results of this study, for both basic and applied graduate departments. The first and most obvious benefit of the results of this survey is in terms of curriculum planning. Departments with a published basic orientation, should probably consider changing their current training programs by adding an applied option. While 37% of their graduate students intend on basic careers, a larger proportion (62.6%) of these students are intending on pursuing a non-academic career. As stated by Bickman (1981), Fisher (1982) and others, a more specialized and a broader mix of skills are required to prepare social psychologists for nonacademic employment. These departments should try to increase their focus on providing their students with these necessary training skills. Even the students intent on a basic career, are keenly aware of these specialized skills and, to some degree, have expressed a desire to obtain these skills. The value of such skills may be useful in either becoming a more well-rounded academician or in preparing oneself for the possibility of a nonacademic career.

Social psychology programs of limited size, in many instances, do not however, have the resources to broaden their training programs. These departments could supplement their training programs with inter-

departmental course offerings in sociology, education or political science. Business and management schools can also offer courses in personnel and organizational behavior. In addition, internships in applied settings could also augment the students' current training, and provide an invaluable opportunity for students to experience "real-world" settings.

Graduate departments having a (published) applied orientation, should focus on a different set of issues. While greater emphasis is placed on areas such as research and theory skills, more focus could also be placed on a number of the "practice skills" or interpersonal skills addressed by Bickman (1981), Deutsch (1975), Fisher (1982), Lundstedt (1968), Mayo and La France (1982) and others as important in applied settings. Internships should be emphasized, as well as greater contact with outside organizations. These organizations can serve as valuable links to "real-world" settings, and provide the students with different types of information sources, and the possibility of job placement opportunities.

Communication. In the area of initial student choice of a graduate training program in social psychology, it would be beneficial for prospective students to have some awareness of the educational orientation of the faculty in a particular department prior to making an enrollment decision. Many department descriptions sound very similar, and are to some degree indistinguishable from one another. Thus in many instances, students have little information regarding the educational orientation of the department. Communicating the focus of the program to prospective students may assist these students in find-

ing social psychology departments which provide a reasonable fit with their own interests and occupational goals. Social psychology departments, on the other hand, may want to consider only those students whose educational views and occupational goals are similar to the training they are able to provide.

For those students already involved in social psychology graduate programs, discussions of the findings of this survey may also be useful in opening up new channels of communication between the faculty and students. By working together, both faculty and students can structure a program which most effectively fits the needs of both interested parties. Perhaps at this level, a reclassification of department goals or focus is called for. This is especially the case in published applied programs where there is some discrepancy between student and department perceptions of focus. These discussions may therefore help to close existing gaps that may currently exist between the students' occupational goals and expectations, and the department's orientation and course of study.

Evaluation Team. As an outgrowth of these findings, the responses of these students suggest a need for a permanent student evaluation component for all social psychology graduate training programs. Student input may be an important and necessary component of what should be an effective graduate program planning team of teachers, employers, and students. This type of active student input could bring a fresh new perspective into the development of a workable, mutually agreed upon, and occupationally relevant Ph.D. program.

Attitude Role Models. Faculty members in these training pro-

grams should also promote an attitude of acceptance for application-oriented research. It has been noted, by a number of the graduate students in this study, that many faculty "respect only basic research." In this respect, students intent on applied careers are receiving "double messages" from their graduate departments. On the one hand, they are being told of the poor academic market and the need for an alternative type of training, but on the other hand, students find many departments unwilling or unable to teach them the applied training skills that they need for these nonacademic positions.

Role models are also needed for students intent on pursuing application-oriented careers. While ideally these role models should be the department's own faculty, other individuals currently involved in applied settings could be brought in to participate in department colloquia. Contact with such people can provide valuable knowledge as well as help to socialize students into applied roles.

In conclusion, these issues underscore the need to gain a better understanding of the perceptions of social psychology graduate students, of both types of programs. Social psychology programs are facing a critical challenge in the 1980's, one of either developing and maintaining departmental "vitality," in the currently bleak economic job market. For many departments with static or declining enrollments, the question of "survival" is crucial. Many social psychology departments may find it increasingly necessary, to be more responsive to the needs and interests of their graduate students. Given the findings of this preliminary survey, it would appear that student perceptions can be a valuable source of information concerning

the design and implementation of social psychology graduate training programs.

REFERENCES

- Aleamoni, L. M. & Spencer, R. E. (1973). The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A description of its development and a report of some of its results. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33, 669-684.
- American Psychological Association. (1982). Graduate study in psychology. (15th Ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Bickman, L. (1979). Program evaluation and social psychology: Toward the achievement of relevancy. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 483-490.
- Bickman, L. (Ed.). (1980). Applied social psychology annual. (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bickman, L. (1980). Applied social psychology: Present and future. In R. F. Kidd & M. J. Saks (Eds.), Advances in applied social psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bickman, L. (1981). Some distinctions between basic and applied social psychology. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual (Vol. 2), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Brehm, S. S. (1980). Social psychology and clinical practice. In R. F. Kidd & M. J. Saks (Eds.), Advances in Applied Social Psychology, (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bunker, B. B. (1979, September). Applied social psychology at SUNY at Buffalo. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Caplan, N. & Nelson, S. D. (1973). On being useful: The nature and consequences of psychological research on social problems. American Psychologist, 28, 199-212.
- Carroll, J. S., Werner, C. M. & Ashmore, R. D. (1982). Internships and practica in social psychology graduate training programs. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8(2), 348-356.
- Chein, I., Cook, S. & Harding, J. (1948). The field of action research. American Psychologist, 3, 43-50.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1980). Full-cycle social psychology. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Costin, F., Greenough, W. T. & Menges, R. J. (1971). Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity and usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 41, 511-535.
- Deutsch, M. (1975). Graduate training of the problem-oriented social psychologist. In M. Deutsch & H. Hornstein (Eds.), Applying social psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Deutsch, M. (1980). Socially relevant research: Comments on "applied" versus "basic" research. In R. F. Kidd & M. J. Saks (Eds.), Advances in applied social psychology, (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Deutsch, M. & Hornstein, H. (Eds.). (1975). Applying social psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Edwards, J. D. & Holmgren, R. L. (1979). Some prerequisites for becoming a "really" applied, nonacademic social psychologist. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 516-523.
- Elms, A. C. (1975). The crisis of confidence in social psychology. American Psychologist, 30, 967-976.
- Fairweather, G. W. & Tornatzy, L. G. (1977). Experimental methods for social policy research. New York: Pergamon.
- Fisher, R. J. (1980). Touchstones for applied social psychology. In R. F. Kidd & M. J. Saks (Eds.), Advances in applied social psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fisher, R. J. (1982). The professional practice of applied social psychology: Identity, training, and certification. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual (Vol. 3). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Freedman, R. D., Stumpf, S. A. & Krieger, K. M. (1978, August). Business students' perceptions of subject matter, their learning, evaluation of courses, and school comparisons. Paper presented at the 38th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco.
- Garfield, S. L. & Kurtz, R. (1976). Clinical psychologists in the 1970's. American Psychologist, 31, 1-9.
- Gergen, K. J. (1973). "Social psychology as history." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 309-320.
- Grush, J. E. & Costin, F. (1975). The student as consumer of the teaching process. American Educational Research Journal, 12, 55-66.

- Hamilton, V. L. (1977, September). Applied social psychology: Responses to crises. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Hartnett, R. T. (1976). Environments for advanced learning. In J. Katz & R. T. Harnett (Eds.), Scholars in the Making. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Helmreich, R. (1980). Survey of graduate social psychology training programs. Paper presented at Chairpersons of Social and/or Personality Programs meeting, American Psychological Association, Montreal.
- Hendrick, C. (1976). Social psychology as history and as traditional science: An appraisal. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2, 392-403.
- Kelman, H. C. (1968). Socialization for independence: Notes on the training of social psychologists. In S. Lundstedt (Ed.), Higher education in social psychology. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University.
- Kidd, R. F. & Saks, M. J. (Eds.). (1980). Advances in applied social psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kiesler, C. A. (1980). Psychology and public policy. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Levy, S. G. (1979). Graduate training and prospects in social psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 504-506.
- Lippitt, G. & Lippitt, R. (1978). The consulting process in action. La Jolla, CA: University Associates.
- Lundstedt, S. (1968). Themes and issues in graduate study. In S. Lundstedt (Ed.), Higher education in social psychology. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University.
- Marwit, S. S. (1983). Doctoral candidates' attitudes toward models of professional training. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14, 105-11.
- Mayo, C. & La France, M. (1980). Toward an applicable social psychology. In R. F. Kidd & M. J. Saks (Eds.), Advances in applied social psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- McFillen, J. M. (1976). A factor analytic approach to instructor and course evaluation and composite scale reliability. Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, 36, 38-42.
- McGuire, W. J. (1967). Some impending reorientations in social psychology: Some thoughts provoked by Kenneth Ring. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3, 124-139.
- McGuire, W. J. (1969). Theory-oriented research in natural settings: The best of both worlds for social psychology. In M. Sherif & C. W. Sherif (Eds.), Interdisciplinary relationships in the social sciences. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- McKeachie, W. J., Lin, Y. & Mann, W. (1971). Student ratings of teaching effectiveness: Validity studies. American Educational Research Journal, 8, 435-445.
- Oskamp, S. (1984). Applied social psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Posavac, E. J. (1979, September). Applied social psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Posavac, E. J. (1980). Training in applied social psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology Newsletter, 6(3), 9.
- Posavac, E. J. (1982). Inhouse health-care program evaluators: Their role and training. Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 159-167.
- Peterson, D. R., Caton, M. M., Levine, A. R. & Snapp, F. P. (1982). Career experiences of doctors of psychology. Professional Psychology, 13, 268-275.
- Reich, J. W. (1981). An historical analysis of the field. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology annual (Vol. 2), Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ring, K. (1967). Experimental social psychology: Some sober questions about frivolous values. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 3, 113-123.
- Rodin, M. & Rodin, B. (1972). Student evaluation of teachers. Science, 177, 1164-1166.
- Ryckman, R. M. (1976). Applied social psychology--a haven for the comfortable radical pussycat: A response to Helmreich. Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 127-130.

- Saxe, L. & Fine, M. (1980). Reorienting social psychology toward application: A methodological analysis. In L. Bickman (Ed.), Applied social psychology (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sechrest, L. (1978). Newsletter of the Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology, 4.
- Severy, L. J. (1979). Applied research internship at the University of Florida. In B. B. Bunker (Chair), Alternative models of applied training in social psychology. Symposium presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.
- Sheriff, M. (1977). Crisis in social psychology: Some remarks toward breaking through the crisis. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 368-382.
- Shippee, G. (1979). Experimental social innovation as an alternative to a pseudo-relevant social psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 491-498.
- Sockloff, A. L. (1973). Instruments for student evaluation of faculty: Ideal and actual. In A. L. Sockloff (Ed.), Proceedings: The first invitational conference on faculty effectiveness as evaluated by students. Philadelphia: Measurement and Research Center, Temple University, 132-151.
- Stang, D. J. (1975). The current and projected state of the job market in psychology. Newsletter of the Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology, 1, 3-4.
- Stang, D. J. (1980). Matching academic training and applied job requirements. Society for Advancement of Social Psychology Newsletter, 6(2), 3-4.
- Triandis, H. C. (1978). Basic research in the context of applied research in personality and social psychology. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4, 383-387.
- Takooshian, H. (1982). Entering nonacademic social psychology. The Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology Newsletter, 8(5), 5-8.
- Wallace, M. & Schwab, D. P. (1973). The validation of a teaching effectiveness measure in two business schools. Proceeding of the 33rd annual meeting of the Academy of Management, 33, 229-235.
- Werner, C. (1983, Revised). Graduate programs in social/personality psychology: Programs and admissions criteria. Unpublished raw data.

APPENDIX A

January 25, 1984

Dear Program Director:

I am asking for your assistance in the implementation of a research project being planned as my Master's thesis, titled "Perceived Training Needs of Basic and Applied Social Psychology Graduate Students." While this will be my thesis, the Loyola Program will use it as part of its ongoing reexamination of curriculum. As implied by the title, the study will require that graduate students from each type of program fill out a four-page questionnaire regarding their perceived educational needs in relation to their occupational goals. Programs have been matched on a number of variables and your social program has been selected for this sample.

Since this study will be using a mailed questionnaire, I will require a list of the names and addresses of the currently enrolled graduate students from those social psychology programs that will participate in the study. These names and addresses as well as individual answers will be kept confidential. I would appreciate your returning the enclosed postcard. Please indicate if you can or cannot participate in this study by checking the appropriate box.

Thank you for your cooperation and I will be happy to send you a summary of the results upon completion of the study.

Sincerely,

Monica M. Kuchera

APPENDIX B

Dear Fellow Graduate Student:

I am currently working on my Master's thesis enroute to a Ph.D. in social psychology at Loyola University of Chicago. As part of the data collection process I am surveying graduate students in other social psychology departments. The questions deal with your educational needs, as they relate to your proposed occupation, and whether your program is fulfilling these needs. Your responses can be used to aid faculty in planning new programs, or for making changes in existing graduate training programs.

The first stage of this study involved contacting social psychology graduate departments in the U.S. and Canada and requesting the names and addresses of their currently enrolled graduate students. I have assured the department heads that all names would be kept confidential and that your participation would be completely voluntary. The front of each questionnaire does, however, contain an identification code that will allow me to identify universities by the type of program (basic or applied) and will enable me to tally returned surveys. This identification number will be removed as soon as your response is tallied.

Any information you provide will be treated confidentially, and no individual will be identified in either my thesis or in summaries returned to department heads. Any subsequent publications of the results will be based only on group findings. A summary of the results of this survey will be available to you upon request.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Monica M. Kuchera

APPENDIX C

GRADUATE STUDENT SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to obtain your views as a current graduate student of your program in social psychology. We are interested in how well you think your department is doing in preparing you for your chosen occupation. Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible. All responses will remain totally anonymous and confidential.

1. Are you currently enrolled as a

- Full-time student
 Part-time student
 Unclassified

2. What degree do you eventually hope to obtain in your present program of study?

- Ph.D.
 M.A./M.S.
 Other (please specify) _____

3. Would you describe your present social psychology program as

- Basic
 Mostly basic/some applied coursework
 $\frac{1}{2}$ basic/ $\frac{1}{2}$ applied
 Mostly applied/some basic coursework
 Applied
 Other (please specify) _____

4. Please indicate the month and year in which you entered your graduate program?

- Month
 Year

5. How many years' worth of courses have you completed?

- 0 to 1 year
 More than 1 year to 2 years
 More than 2 years to 3 years
 More than 3 years to 4 years
 More than 4 years to 5 years
 Other (please specify) _____

6. Have you completed a Master's thesis?

- Yes
 No

7. What degree did you hold before entering your current program?

- B.A. In what area? _____
- Some graduate study. Area? _____
- M.A. In what area? _____
- Ph.D. In what area? _____
- Other (please specify) _____

8. Do you have (or have you had) an assistantship?

- Yes, in teaching
- Yes, in research
- Yes, in both research and teaching
- No

9. Other than graduate teaching or research assistantships, have you had or are you currently engaged in an internship related to your future career?

- Yes, currently. In what area? _____
- Yes, completed internship. Area? _____
- No (skip to question #12)

10. If yes to question #9, was this internship

- Paid
- Volunteer

11. Were you responsible for obtaining your own internship?

- Yes
- No

12. Have you decided what occupation you'd like to pursue when you have completed your degree?

- Yes
- No (skip to question #20)

13. When did you make this decision?

- Before I entered this program
- 1 semester/quarter into this program
- 1 year into the program
- 2 years into the program
- 3 years into the program
- 4 years into the program
- Other (please specify) _____

	Is This Relevant To Your Proposed Career?	Rate Your Program's Emphasis			
		No Emphasis	Too Little Emphasis	Sufficient Emphasis	Too Much Emphasis
A. Writing skills for journal and research reports	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Oral presentations to large group	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Small group leadership skills	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Personal interviewing techniques	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. Growth of interpersonal social skills	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
G. Techniques of conflict resolution	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
H. Internship in your chosen occupational area	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
I. Techniques for effective classroom teaching	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
J. General social psychology theory	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
K. Program design	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
L. Theory development	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
M. Applied coursework (mental health, organizational, educational, etc.)	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Is This Relevant To Your Proposed Career?	Rate Your Program's Emphasis			
		No Emphasis	Too Little Emphasis	Sufficient Emphasis	Too Much Emphasis
N. Interdepartmental coursework (social, business, etc.)	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
O. Administration of standardized tests	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
P. Program evaluation	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
Q. Laboratory methods	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
R. Field research methods	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
S. Survey methods and questionnaire design	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____
T. Computer and statistical analysis	yes/no/DK	_____	_____	_____	_____

21. From which of the following information sources did you find out what types of skills are necessary for your chosen career? (Check all that apply.)

- Friends or relatives in the same occupation
 Advice from undergraduate or graduate faculty
 Friends or relatives with advanced degrees
 Published articles, pamphlets or books which state necessary requirement
 Past or present employment for an organization which requires these skills
 Other (please specify) _____

22. If you had the opportunity to begin graduate school again would you choose the same program?

- No
 Yes (skip to question #25)

23. If your answer to question #22 was no, what type of program would you choose? _____

24. If you would prefer to be in a different program, please explain why you have decided to continue in your present program.

25. Are there any other issues not addressed in this survey concerning your present graduate training, that you think are important in obtaining your desired occupation?

We also need the following demographic information:

26. What is your age? _____

27. Are you a
 _____ Male
 _____ Female

28. Are you
 _____ Single
 _____ Married
 _____ Divorced/separated
 _____ Widowed

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Please fold this survey and return it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to:

Social Psychology Program Survey
 Loyola University of Chicago
 Department of Psychology
 6525 N. Sheridan Rd.
 Chicago, IL 60626

APPENDIX D

Appendix D

Skill Items Relevant to Career by Published Department
Orientation for a BASIC Occupational Goal

Practice Skills	Basic Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Writing skills for journal and research reports						
Published basic program (n = 39)	97.4%	(38)	2.6%	(1)		
Published applied program (n = 16)	100.0%	(16)				
$x^2(1) = .00, p < n.s.$						
Writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists						
Published basic program (n = 39)	51.3%	(20)	33.3%	(13)	15.4%	(6)
Published applied program (n = 16)	81.3%	(13)	12.5%	(2)	6.3%	(1)
$x^2(2) = 4.25, p < .10$						
Oral presentations to large groups						
Published basic program (n = 39)	94.9%	(37)	2.6%	(1)	2.6%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 16)	93.8%	(15)			6.3%	(1)
$x^2(2) = .84, p < n.s.$						
Small group leadership skills						
Published basic program (n = 38)	63.2%	(24)	21.1%	(8)	15.8%	(6)
Published applied program (n = 16)	87.5%	(14)	12.5%	(2)		
$x^2(2) = 3.92, p < .10$						

Appendix D (continued)

Practice Skills	Basic Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Personal interviewing techniques						
Published basic program (n = 39)	30.8%	(12)	51.3%	(20)	17.9%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 16)	62.5%	(10)	37.5%	(6)		
$\chi^2(2) = 6.18, p < .05$						
Growth of interpersonal social skills						
Published basic program (n = 39)	71.8%	(28)	10.3%	(4)	17.9%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 16)	81.3%	(13)	12.5%	(2)	6.3%	(1)
$\chi^2(2) = 1.26, p < n.s.$						
Techniques of conflict resolution						
Published basic program (n = 38)	36.8%	(14)	21.1%	(8)	42.1%	(16)
Published applied program (n = 16)	62.5%	(10)	25.0%	(4)	12.5%	(2)
$\chi^2(2) = 4.71, p < .05$						
Internship in chosen occupational area						
Published basic program (n = 39)	30.8%	(12)	51.3%	(20)	17.9%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 16)	81.3%	(13)	18.8%	(3)		
$\chi^2(2) = 12.10, p < .001$						

Appendix D (continued)

Practice Skills	Basic Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Techniques for effective classroom teaching						
Published basic program (n = 39)	92.3%	(36)	2.6%	(1)	5.1%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 16)	87.5%	(14)	12.5%	(2)		
$\chi^2(2) = 2.90, p < n.s.$						
Knowledge Skills						
General social psychology theory						
Published basic program (n = 39)	97.4%	(38)			2.6%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 16)	87.5%	(14)	6.3%	(1)	6.3%	(1)
$\chi^2(2) = 2.98, p < n.s.$						
Program design						
Published basic program (n = 39)	41.0%	(16)	25.6%	(10)	33.3%	(13)
Published applied program (n = 16)	68.8%	(11)	18.8%	(3)	12.5%	(2)
$\chi^2(2) = 3.81, p < .10$						
Theory development						
Published basic program (n = 39)	92.3%	(36)			7.7%	(3)
Published applied program (n = 16)	93.8%	(15)	6.3%	(1)		
$\chi^2(2) = 3.67, p < .10$						

Appendix D (continued)

Knowledge Skills	Basic Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Applied coursework (mental health, organization, educational, etc.)						
Published basic program (n = 39)	48.7%	(19)	33.3%	(13)	17.9%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 16)	75.0%	(12)	18.8%	(3)	6.3%	(1)
	$\chi^2(2) = 3.29, p < .10$					
Interdepartmental coursework (sociology, business, etc.)						
Published basic program (n = 39)	59.0%	(23)	28.2%	(11)	12.8%	(5)
Published applied program (n = 16)	62.5%	(10)	31.3%	(5)	6.3%	(1)
	$\chi^2(2) = .51, p < n.s.$					
<u>Research Skills</u>						
Administrator of standardized tests						
Published basic program (n = 39)	15.4%	(6)	61.5%	(24)	23.1%	(9)
Published applied program (n = 16)	12.5%	(2)	81.3%	(13)	6.3%	(1)
	$\chi^2(2) = 2.49, p < n.s.$					
Program evaluation						
Published basic program (n = 39)	30.8%	(12)	33.3%	(13)	35.9%	(14)
Published applied program (n = 16)	75.0%	(12)	25.0%	(4)		
	$\chi^2(2) = 11.09, p < .001$					

Appendix D (continued)

Research Skills	Basic Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Laboratory methods						
Published basic program (n = 39)	84.6%	(33)	10.3%	(4)	5.1%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 16)	81.3%	(13)	18.8%	(3)		
$x^2(2) = 1.48, p < n.s.$						
Field research methods						
Published basic program (n = 39)	82.1%	(32)	7.7%	(3)	10.3%	(4)
Published applied program (n = 16)	93.8%	(15)	6.3%	(1)		
$x^2(2) = 1.86, p < n.s.$						
Survey methods and questionnaire design						
Published basic program (n = 39)	79.5%	(31)	7.7%	(3)	12.8%	(5)
Published applied program (n = 16)	93.8%	(15)	6.3%	(1)		
$x^2(2) = 2.36, p < n.s.$						
Computer and statistical analysis						
Published basic program (n = 39)	92.3%	(36)	2.6%	(1)	5.1%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 16)	100.0%	(16)				
$x^2(2) = 1.30, p < n.s.$						

Note. 1 - tail x^2 tests

APPENDIX E

Appendix E

Skill Items Relevant to Career by Published Department
Orientation for an APPLIED Occupational Goal

Practice Skills	Applied Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Writing skills for journal and research reports						
Published basic program (n = 65)	96.9%	(63)	16.7%	(2)		
Published applied program (n = 125)	91.2%	(114)	8.0%	(10)	.8%	(1)
$x^2(2) = 2.31, p < n.s.$						
Writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists						
Published basic program (n = 64)	79.7%	(51)	14.1%	(9)	6.3%	(4)
Published applied program (n = 126)	96.0%	(121)	3.2%	(4)	.8%	(1)
$x^2(2) = 13.41, p < .001$						
Oral presentations to large groups						
Published basic program (n = 65)	95.4%	(62)	3.1%	(2)	1.5%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 125)	91.2%	(114)	4.8%	(6)	4.0%	(5)
$x^2(2) = 1.20, p < n.s.$						
Small group leadership skills						
Published basic program (n = 65)	83.1%	(54)	13.8%	(9)	3.1%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 124)	86.3%	(107)	6.5%	(8)	7.3%	(9)
$x^2(2) = 3.93, p < .10$						

Appendix E (continued)

Practice Skills	Applied Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Personal interviewing techniques						
Published basic program (n = 65)	60.0%	(39)	29.2%	(19)	10.8%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 124)	81.5%	(101)	9.7%	(12)	8.9%	(11)
$x^2(2) = 12.75, p < .001$						
Growth of interpersonal social skills						
Published basic program (n = 65)	81.5%	(53)	13.8%	(9)	4.6%	(3)
Published applied program (n = 125)	89.6%	(112)	5.6%	(7)	4.8%	(6)
$x^2(2) = 3.78, p < .10$						
Techniques of conflict resolution						
Published basic program (n = 65)	63.1%	(41)	23.1%	(15)	13.8%	(9)
Published applied program (n = 125)	78.4%	(98)	14.4%	(18)	7.2%	(9)
$x^2(2) = 5.22, p < .05$						
Internship in chosen occupational area						
Published basic program (n = 65)	69.2%	(45)	23.1%	(15)	7.7%	(5)
Published applied program (n = 123)	88.6%	(109)	5.7%	(7)	5.7%	(7)
$x^2(2) = 13.20, p < .001$						

Appendix E (continued)

Practice Skills	Applied Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Techniques for effective classroom teaching						
Published basic program (n = 65)	76.9%	(50)	21.5%	(14)	1.5%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 126)	50.8%	(64)	42.1%	(53)	7.1%	(9)
$\chi^2(2) = 12.63, p < .001$						
Knowledge Skills						
General social psychology theory						
Published basic program (n = 64)	89.1%	(57)			10.9%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 125)	80.8%	(101)	12.0%	(15)	7.2%	(9)
$\chi^2(2) = 4.99, p < .05$						
Program design						
Published basic program (n = 65)	72.3%	(47)	9.2%	(6)	18.5%	(12)
Published applied program (n = 124)	80.6%	(100)	9.7%	(12)	9.7%	(12)
$\chi^2(2) = 2.98, p < n.s.$						
Theory development						
Published basic program (n = 65)	70.8%	(46)	21.5%	(14)	7.7%	(5)
Published applied program (n = 124)	66.7%	(84)	27.0%	(34)	6.3%	(8)
$\chi^2(2) = .73, p < n.s.$						

Appendix E (continued)

Knowledge Skills	Applied Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Applied coursework (mental health, organization, educational, etc.)						
Published basic program (n = 65)	89.2%	(58)	10.8%	(7)		
Published applied program (n = 124)	99.2%	(123)			.8%	(1)
$\chi^2(2) = 14.32, p < .001$						
Interdepartmental coursework (sociology, business, etc.)						
Published basic program (n = 65)	84.6%	(55)	9.2%	(6)	6.2%	(4)
Published applied program (n = 126)	88.1%	(111)	8.7%	(11)	3.2%	(4)
$\chi^2(2) = .98, p < n.s.$						
<u>Research Skills</u>						
Administration of standardized tests						
Published basic program (n = 65)	35.4%	(23)	53.8%	(35)	10.8%	(7)
Published applied program (n = 125)	28.0%	(35)	56.8%	(71)	15.2%	(19)
$\chi^2(2) = 1.44, p < n.s.$						
Program evaluation						
Published basic program (n = 65)	78.5%	(51)	13.8%	(9)	7.7%	(5)
Published applied program (n = 125)	88.8%	(111)	4.0%	(5)	7.2%	(9)
$\chi^2(2) = 6.18, p < .05$						

Appendix E (continued)

Research Skills	Applied Occupational Goal					
	Relevant to Career?					
	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	%	n	%	n	%	n
Laboratory methods						
Published basic program (n = 65)	66.2%	(43)	32.3%	(21)	1.5%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 125)	32.0%	(40)	62.4%	(78)	5.6%	(7)
$x^2(2) = 20.53, p < .0001$						
Field research methods						
Published basic program (n = 65)	98.4%	(64)			1.5%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 124)	94.4%	(117)	4.0%	(5)	1.6%	(2)
$x^2(2) = 1.96, p < n.s.$						
Survey methods and questionnaire design						
Published basic program (n = 65)	96.9%	(63)	1.5%	(1)	1.5%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 124)	96.8%	(120)	2.4%	(3)	.8%	(1)
$x^2(2) = .37, p < n.s.$						
Computer and statistical analysis						
Published basic program (n = 65)	98.5%	(64)			1.5%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 124)	95.2%	(118)	2.4%	(3)	2.4%	(3)
$x^2(2) = 1.78, p < n.s.$						

Note. 1 tail x^2 tests

APPENDIX F

Appendix F

Student Perception of Department Emphasis for
Specific Training Skills by Published Department Orientation

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Suffi- cient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Writing skills for journal and research reports								
Published basic program (n = 141)	3%	(4)	25%	(36)	70%	(99)	2%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 170)	5%	(8)	25%	(43)	66%	(112)	4%	(4)
$x^2(3) = 2.85, p < n.s.$								
Writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists								
Published basic program (n = 135)	50%	(67)	35%	(48)	15%	(20)		
Published applied program (n = 172)	25%	(43)	39%	(67)	36%	(62)		
$x^2(2) = 25.80 p < .0001$								
Oral presentations to large groups								
Published basic program (n = 140)	11%	(15)	28%	(39)	61%	(86)		
Published applied program (n = 170)	15%	(25)	39%	(67)	46%	(78)		
$x^2(2) = 7.45, p < .01$								
Small group leadership skills								
Published basic program (n = 133)	38%	(50)	37%	(49)	25%	(34)		
Published applied program (n = 170)	31%	(52)	31%	(52)	38%	(66)		
$x^2(2) = 5.94, p < .05$								

Appendix F (continued)

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too		Suffi-		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Little		cient		Emphasis	
	%	n	Emphasis	%	n	Emphasis	%	n
Personal interviewing techniques								
Published basic program (n = 132)	55%	(73)	23%	(30)	22%	(29)		
Published applied program (n = 164)	34%	(56)	38%	(62)	28%	(46)		
	$x^2(2) = 13.93, p < .001$							
Growth of interpersonal social skills								
Published basic program (n = 132)	55%	(73)	23%	(30)	20%	(27)	2%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 169)	40%	(67)	31%	(52)	29%	(49)	6%	(1)
	$x^2(2) = 8.44, p < .05$							
Techniques of conflict resolution								
Published basic program (n = 130)	47%	(61)	23%	(30)	29%	(38)	1%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 165)	41%	(68)	30%	(50)	28%	(46)	1%	(1)
	$x^2(3) = 2.02, p < n.s.$							
Internship in chosen occupational area								
Published basic program (n = 124)	61%	(76)	21%	(26)	18%	(22)		
Published applied program (n = 165)	14%	(23)	25%	(41)	60%	(99)	1%	(2)
	$x^2(3) = 78.49, p < .0001$							

Appendix F (continued)

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too		Suffi-		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Little		cient		Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Techniques for effective classroom teaching								
Published basic program (n = 138)	32%	(44)	35%	(49)	31%	(43)	1%	(2)
Published applied program (n = 169)	25%	(43)	25%	(43)	48%	(81)	2%	(2)
$x^2(3) = 9.01, p < .015$								
<u>Knowledge Skills</u>								
General social psychology theory								
Published basic program (n = 140)			11%	(15)	84%	(117)	5%	(8)
Published applied program (n = 173)	3%	(6)	21%	(36)	68%	(118)	7%	(13)
$x^2(3) = 12.50, p < .001$								
Program design								
Published basic program (n = 120)	32%	(38)	32%	(39)	33%	(40)	2%	(3)
Published applied program (n = 158)	16%	(25)	32%	(50)	51%	(80)	2%	(3)
$x^2(3) = 12.41, p < .001$								
Theory development								
Published basic program (n = 136)	5%	(7)	31%	(42)	60%	(81)	4%	(6)
Published applied program (n = 167)	10%	(16)	30%	(50)	55%	(92)	5%	(9)
$x^2(3) = 2.37, p < n.s.$								

Appendix F (continued)

Research Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too		Suffi-		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Little		cient		Emphasis	
	%	n	Emphasis	%	n	Emphasis	%	n
Laboratory methods								
Published basic program (n = 135)	1%	(1)	6%	(8)	78%	(106)	15%	(20)
Published applied program (n = 165)	26%	(43)	12%	(20)	54%	(90)	7%	(12)
$\chi^2(3) = 45.99, p < .0001$								
Field research methods								
Published basic program (n = 139)	7%	(10)	43%	(60)	50%	(69)		
Published applied program (n = 172)	2%	(3)	22%	(38)	75%	(129)	1%	(2)
$\chi^2(3) = 25.68, p < .0001$								
Survey methods and ques- tionnaire design								
Published basic program (n = 138)	10%	(14)	36%	(50)	51%	(71)	2%	(3)
Published applied program (n = 173)	1%	(2)	21%	(37)	76%	(131)	2%	(3)
$\chi^2(3) = 25.14, p < .0001$								
Computer and statistical analysis								
Published basic program (n = 141)			17%	(24)	73%	(103)	10%	(14)
Published applied program (n = 174)			23%	(40)	71%	(124)	6%	(10)
$\chi^2(2) = 3.19, p < n.s.$								

Note: 1 - tail χ^2 tests

APPENDIX G

Appendix G

Student Perception of Department Emphasis for
Specific Training Skills by Published Department Orientation
for a BASIC Occupational Goal

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Writing skills for journal and research reports								
Published basic program (n = 38 of 39 responses)	5.3%	(2)	39.5%	(15)	55.3%	(21)		
Published applied program (n = 15 of 15 responses)	13.3%	(2)	20.0%	(3)	66.7%	(10)		
Writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists								
Published basic program (n = 20 of 36 responses)	30.0%	(6)	55.0%	(11)	15.0%	(3)		
Published applied program (n = 13 of 14 responses)			46.2%	(3)	53.8%	(7)		
Oral presentations to large groups								
Published basic program (n = 37 of 39 responses)	8.1%	(3)	32.4%	(12)	59.5%	(22)		
Published applied program (n = 15 of 15 responses)	13.3%	(2)	26.7%	(4)	60.0%	(9)		

Appendix G (continued)

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Small group leadership skills								
Published basic program (n = 24 of 35 responses)	29.2%	(7)	45.8%	(11)	25.0%	(6)		
Published applied program (n = 14 of 16 responses)	7.1%	(1)	28.6%	(4)	64.3%	(9)		
Personal interviewing techniques								
Published basic program (n = 12 of 35 responses)	41.7%	(5)	50.0%	(6)	8.3%	(1)		
Published applied program (n = 10 of 14 responses)	10.0%	(1)	50.0%	(5)	40.0%	(4)		
Growth of interpersonal social skills								
Published basic program (n = 26 of 34 responses)	50.0%	(13)	30.8%	(8)	15.4%	(4)	3.8%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 13 of 15 responses)	15.4%	(2)	23.1%	(3)	61.5%	(8)		
Techniques of conflict resolution								
Published basic program (n = 14 of 33 responses)	35.7%	(5)	14.3%	(2)	42.9%	(6)	7.1%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 10 of 14 responses)	20.0%	(2)	30.0%	(3)	50.0%	(5)		

Appendix G (continued)

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Internship in chosen occupational area								
Published basic program (n = 11 of 34 responses)	63.6%	(7)	18.2%	(2)	18.2%	(2)		
Published applied program (n = 13 of 14 responses)	15.4%	(2)	23.1%	(3)	61.5%	(8)		
Techniques for effective classroom teaching								
Published basic program (n = 36 of 39 responses)	38.9%	(14)	36.1%	(13)	25.0%	(9)		
Published applied program (n = 14 of 15 responses)	21.4%	(3)	57.1%	(8)	21.4%	(3)		
<u>Knowledge Skills</u>								
General social psychology theory								
Published basic program (n = 38 of 39 responses)			21.1%	(8)	78.9%	(30)		
Published applied program (n = 14 of 15 responses)	7.1%	(1)	28.6%	(4)	64.3%	(9)		
Program design								
Published basic program (n = 16 of 32 responses)	6.3%	(1)	56.3%	(9)	37.5%	(6)		
Published applied program (n = 11 of 14 responses)	9.1%	(1)	54.5%	(6)	36.4%	(4)		

Appendix G (continued)

Knowledge Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too Little		Sufficient		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Theory development								
Published basic program (n = 36 of 39 responses)	5.6%	(2)	36.1%	(13)	58.3%	(21)		
Published applied pro- gram (n = 15 of 16 responses)	6.7%	(1)	33.3%	(5)	60.0%	(9)		
Applied coursework (mental health, organizational, educational, etc.)								
Published basic program (n = 19 of 34 responses)	26.3%	(5)	47.4%	(9)	26.3%	(5)		
Published applied pro- gram (n = 12 of 15 responses)			16.7%	(2)	75.0%	(9)	8.3%	(1)
Interdepartmental coursework (sociology, business, etc.)								
Published basic program (n = 23 of 35 responses)	17.4%	(4)	52.2%	(12)	26.1%	(6)	4.3%	(1)
Published applied pro- gram (n = 10 of 15 responses)	10.0%	(1)	40.0%	(4)	50.0%	(5)		

Appendix G (continued)

Research Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Administration of standardized tests								
Published basic program (n = 6 of 34 responses)			83.3%	(5)	16.7%	(1)		
Published applied program (n = 2 of 13 responses)					100.0%	(2)		
Program evaluation								
Published basic program (n = 12 of 33 responses)	25.0%	(3)	41.7%	(5)	33.3%	(4)		
Published applied program (n = 12 of 14 responses)			33.3%	(4)	50.0%	(6)	16.7%	(2)
Laboratory methods								
Published basic program (n = 33 of 37 responses)	3.0%	(1)	6.1%	(2)	78.8%	(26)	12.1%	(4)
Published applied program (n = 13 of 15 responses)	15.4%	(2)	23.1%	(3)	61.5%	(8)		
Field research methods								
Published basic program (n = 32 of 38 responses)	3.1%	(1)	53.1%	(17)	43.8%	(14)		
Published applied program (n = 15 of 15 responses)			20.0%	(3)	80.0%	(12)		

Appendix G (continued)

Research Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Survey methods and questionnaire design								
Published basic program (n = 31 of 37 responses)	16.1%	(5)	22.6%	(7)	61.3%	(19)		
Published applied program (n = 15 of 15 responses)			33.3%	(5)	66.7%	(10)		
Computer and statistical analysis								
Published basic program (n = 36 of 39 responses)			16.7%	(6)	75.0%	(27)	8.3%	(3)
Published applied program (n = 16 of 16 responses)			12.5%	(2)	87.5%	(14)		

APPENDIX H

Appendix H

Student Perception of Department Emphasis for
Specific Training Skills by Published Department Orientation
for an APPLIED Occupational Goal

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Writing skills for journal and research reports								
Published basic program (n = 63 of 65 responses)	1.6%	(1)	19.0%	(12)	79.4%	(50)		
Published applied program (n = 114 of 124 responses)	3.5%	(4)	29.8%	(34)	63.2%	(72)	3.5%	(4)
Writing skills for reports to be read by non-scientists								
Published basic program (n = 51 of 63 responses)	41.2%	(21)	45.1%	(23)	13.7%	(7)		
Published applied program (n = 121 of 126 responses)	25.6%	(31)	43.0%	(52)	31.4%	(38)		
Oral presentations to large groups								
Published basic program (n = 62 of 65 responses)	8.1%	(5)	22.6%	(14)	69.4%	(43)		
Published applied program (n = 114 of 122 responses)	9.6%	(11)	43.9%	(50)	46.5%	(53)		

Appendix H (continued)

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too Little		Sufficient		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Small group leadership skills								
Published basic program (n = 54 of 63 responses)	35.2%	(19)	37.0%	(20)	25.9%	(14)	1.9%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 107 of 122 responses)	29.0%	(31)	34.6%	(37)	36.4%	(39)		
Personal interviewing techniques								
Published basic program (n = 39 of 60 responses)	41.0%	(16)	33.3%	(13)	25.6%	(10)		
Published applied program (n = 100 of 118 responses)	28.0%	(28)	43.0%	(43)	29.0%	(29)		
Growth of interpersonal social skills								
Published basic program (n = 52 of 62 responses)	51.9%	(27)	19.2%	(10)	26.9%	(14)	1.9%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 112 of 122 responses)	40.2%	(45)	28.6%	(32)	30.4%	(34)	.9%	(1)
Techniques of conflict resolution								
Published basic program (n = 41 of 62 responses)	41.5%	(17)	36.6%	(15)	22.0%	(9)		
Published applied program (n = 97 of 119 responses)	39.2%	(38)	34.0%	(33)	25.8%	(25)	1.0%	(1)

Appendix H (continued)

Practice Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too Little		Sufficient		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Internship in chosen occupational area								
Published basic program (n = 43 of 59 responses)	46.5%	(20)	23.3%	(10)	30.2%	(13)		
Published applied program (n = 108 of 119 responses)	11.1%	(12)	25.0%	(27)	63.9%	(69)		
Techniques for effective classroom teaching								
Published basic program (n = 14 of 15 responses)	21.4%	(3)	57.1%	(8)	21.4%	(3)		
Published applied program (n = 50 of 64 responses)	24.0%	(12)	36.0%	(18)	38.0%	(19)	2.0%	(1)
<u>Knowledge Skills</u>								
General social psychology theory								
Published basic program (n = 57 of 63 responses)	7.0%	(4)	87.7%	(50)	5.3%	(3)		
Published applied program (n = 101 of 125 responses)	4.0%	(4)	19.8%	(20)	71.3%	(72)	5.0%	(5)
Program design								
Published basic program (n = 47 of 60 responses)	25.5%	(12)	34.0%	(16)	40.4%	(19)		
Published applied program (n = 100 of 116 responses)	13.0%	(13)	31.0%	(31)	55.0%	(55)	1.0%	(1)

Appendix H (continued)

Knowledge Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No		Too Little		Sufficient		Too Much	
	Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis		Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Theory development								
Published basic program (n = 46 of 61 responses)	4.3%	(2)	26.1%	(12)	65.2%	(30)	4.3%	(2)
Published applied pro- gram (n = 83 of 120 responses)	6.0%	(5)	32.5%	(27)	59.0%	(49)	2.4%	(2)
Applied coursework (mental health, organizational, educational, etc.)								
Published basic program (n = 57 of 62 responses)	26.3%	(15)	43.9%	(25)	29.8%	(17)		
Published applied pro- gram (n = 123 of 124 responses)	4.9%	(6)	26.8%	(33)	66.7%	(82)	1.6%	(2)
Interdepartmental coursework (sociology, business, etc.)								
Published basic program (n = 55 of 63 responses)	21.8%	(12)	23.6%	(13)	52.7%	(29)	1.8%	(1)
Published applied pro- gram (n = 111 of 126 responses)	17.1%	(19)	37.8%	(42)	45.0%	(50)		

Appendix H (continued)

Research Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Administration of standardized tests								
Published basic program (n = 23 of 62 responses)	34.8%	(8)	30.4%	(7)	34.8%	(8)		
Published applied program (n = 35 of 116 responses)	34.3%	(2)	34.3%	(12)	31.4%	(11)		
Program evaluation								
Published basic program (n = 51 of 62 responses)	15.7%	(8)	47.1%	(24)	37.3%	(19)		
Published applied program (n = 110 of 122 responses)	7.3%	(8)	11.8%	(13)	77.3%	(85)	3.6%	(4)
Laboratory methods								
Published basic program (n = 43 of 63 responses)			4.7%	(2)	88.4%	(38)	7.0%	(3)
Published applied program (n = 40 of 118 responses)	10.0%	(4)	12.5%	(5)	67.5%	(27)	10.0%	(4)
Field research methods								
Published basic program (n = 64 of 64 responses)	9.4%	(6)	45.3%	(29)	45.3%	(29)		
Published applied program (n = 117 of 124 responses)	2.6%	(3)	19.7%	(23)	76.9%	(90)	.9%	(1)

Appendix H (continued)

Research Skills	Emphasis of Department							
	No Emphasis		Too Little Emphasis		Sufficient Emphasis		Too Much Emphasis	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Survey methods and questionnaire design								
Published basic program (n = 63 of 64 responses)	6.3%	(4)	42.9%	(27)	49.2%	(31)	1.6%	(1)
Published applied program (n = 120 of 124 responses)	1.7%	(2)	19.2%	(23)	78.3%	(94)	.8%	(1)
Computer and statistical analysis								
Published basic program (n = 64 of 65 responses)			20.3%	(13)	71.9%	(46)	7.8%	(5)
Published applied program (n = 118 of 124 responses)			27.1%	(32)	66.9%	(79)	5.9%	(7)

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by MONICA KUCHERA has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Emil Posavac, Director
Professor, Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Fred Bryant
Assistant Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS.

November 30, 1984
Date



Director's Signature