



1-1-1987

### Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in UCEA Member Institutions

M. Scott Norton

Frederick D. Levan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#).

#### Recommended Citation

Norton, M. Scott and Levan, Frederick D. (1987) "Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in UCEA Member Institutions," *Educational Considerations*: Vol. 14: No. 1. <https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.1653>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Considerations by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact [cads@k-state.edu](mailto:cads@k-state.edu).

This research shows that the Ph.D and Ed.D degree programs in educational administration are virtually identical pursuits in UCEA member institutions.

# Doctoral Studies of Students in Educational Administration Programs in UCEA Member Institutions

by M. Scott Norton  
and Frederick D. Levan

One of the initial activities of the UCEA Program Center for Preparation Programs was to determine the perceived value of certain kinds of preparation program information. Faculty members in UCEA member institutions listed curriculum information as having the highest interest and benefit for them and their departments' preparation programs. As a result of this interest, the study of curriculum became a high priority activity of the Program Center.

The feasibility of completing a study of the curricula of preparation programs in educational administration was discussed at length by the advisory committee of the Program Center in a one-day meeting in Tempe, Arizona. Questions of importance were: (1) Could such a study accurately determine the course work, practicum and research activity experienced by students in their preparation? (2) What degree programs should be included in the study? (3) Should only UCEA member institutions be included in the study? and (4) To what extent would it be possible and/or necessary to determine actual course content?

The student's official program of study was selected as the primary data document since it appeared to provide the most reliable indication of the actual courses, practica and research activities of students in preparation programs. Since the student's program of study for the doctorate in most all instances reflects course work completed for the Master's degree and administrative certification, the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degree programs were selected for study. In addi-

tion, study of these doctoral degree programs provided some opportunity to compare degree differences. It was decided further to limit the study to a random sample of UCEA member institutions.

A primary concern, and a limitation of this study, was the inability to ascertain actual course content as well as the specific nature of program practica. Any attempt to determine actual subject matter of courses presented major problems. However, it was the consensus of the Program Center's advisory committee that such a determination was not essential. For example, it was the committee's view that it would be valuable to learn the extent of exposure of students to various areas of study (i.e., theory, policy, research) even though the specific course content might vary among institutions.

## Pilot Study Activities

Study feasibility was examined through two pilot studies. The first pilot effort encompassed the examination of 36 Ed.D. programs of study at Arizona State University. Eight categories were utilized to record data as follows: (1) courses completed in educational administration; (2) courses completed outside the field of educational administration; (3) total number of courses completed and total credit hours; (4) practica completed; (5) research and statistics courses completed; (6) dissertation credits; (7) language requirements; and (8) residency requirements.

A second pilot study utilized 29 UCEA member institutions. One program of study for each doctoral degree offered was examined. An analysis of student programs was completed in the same manner described in the first pilot study. Several problems were encountered in the second effort, however. It was not always clear, for example, whether courses indeed were offered within or outside the department of educational administration. Dissertation credit was difficult to identify and in some cases was nonexistent even though the institution did require a dissertation. Such information as requirements for residency and foreign language were not determinable by an examination of students' programs.

With the above experiences in mind, the major study of the doctoral programs of students in educational administration was initiated and is reported in the sections that follow.

## The Study Sample

A random sample of 27 UCEA member institutions resulted in the following selections:

Arizona State University	University of Kentucky
Fordham University	University of Minnesota
Illinois State University	University of Missouri
Kansas State University	University of Nebraska
New Mexico State University	University of Oklahoma
New York University	University of Oregon
Oklahoma State University	University of Toledo
Penn State University	University of Tennessee
State University of New York at Buffalo	University of Texas
Temple University	University of Utah
Texas A & M University	University of Virginia
University of Connecticut	University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Florida	Washington State University
University of Kansas	

Each institution was asked to send two student programs of study for each of the doctoral degrees offered. The

M. Scott Norton and Frederick D. Levan are professors of education at Arizona State University.

programs were to be selected on a random basis and were to have been developed within the last three years. Responses were received from all of the institutions except Fordham University and Penn State University. In all, 78 programs of study were utilized, 39 for the Ed.D. degree and an equal number for the Ph.D. degree.

**The Study Results**

Each of the 78 programs of study was analyzed and each course or experience recorded under one of seven categories as follows: (1) Courses in educational administration; (2) Research and statistics courses; (3) Foundations courses; (4) Seminars/Workshops; (5) Cognate courses; (6) Field Experience; and (7) Dissertation. Each of these categories is discussed in the following sections.

**Courses in Educational Administration**

All courses in the area of educational administration were recorded under one of 14 course areas. For example, the course area, Organization and Administration, included all courses that were concerned with how schools and school systems are organized and how they are administered. Thus, such courses as Educational Administration, Introduction to Administration, Organization and Administration, and Problems in Educational Administration were recorded under Organization and Administration. Similarly, such courses as Organizational Theory, Theory, Theory and Application, The Theory of Educational Administration and Advanced Theory were recorded under the course area of Theory.

Table 1 reveals the 14 course areas for educational administration for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degree programs. Data do not include educational administration seminars, field experiences, research courses that were offered in educational administration or credits for dissertation.

**Table 1  
Courses in Educational Administration**

Course	Ph.D.	% of		Ed. Adm. Course Work
		Ed. Adm. Course Work	Ed. Adm. Course Work	
Organization & Administration	104	32	88	28
Personnel	43	13	27	8
Law	27	8	35	10
Finance	23	7	26	8
Human and Community Relations & Societal Factors	21	6	28	8
Management	17	5	12	4
Theory	15	5	18	5
Principalship	15	5	20	6
Policy	15	5	8	2
Supervision	14	4	19	6
Facilities	14	4	25	8
Politics	9	3	9	3
Leadership	9	3	13	4
Superintendency	2	1	3	1

The 324 educational administration courses for the Ph.D. degree represented 39 percent of the total course work. The 331 courses in the Ed.D. degree program represented 39 percent of the total doctoral course work as well.

As indicated by the data, Ph.D. degree students completed 32 percent of the course work in educational admin-

istration, with the exceptions previously noted, in courses in the area of Organization and Administration. Courses in personnel, law and finance constituted 29 percent of the course work in administration. Thus, 60 percent of the educational administration courses was in the area of organization and administration, personnel, law and finance. All other course areas included only 40 percent of the course work in the field of administration. As indicated in Table 1, courses in theory, policy and leadership constituted only 11 percent of the Ph.D. students' course work.

Similar results are noted for Ed.D. degree students. The four course areas, Organization and Administration, Law, Personnel and Finance constituted 53 percent of the educational administration course work. However, Ed.D. degree programs of study contained considerably less course work in organization and administration and personnel than Ph.D. programs. Ed.D. degree programs revealed a somewhat higher degree of course work in areas such as facilities and law.

**Research and Statistics**

Courses in research methods and statistics represented 16 and 13 percent of the total course work for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs of study respectively. The various courses in research and statistics were recorded within nine areas as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2  
Research and Statistics Courses**

Courses	Number of Courses	
	Ph.D.	Ed.D.
<b>Statistics</b>		
Tests and Measurements	12	8
Elementary Statistics	23	29
Intermediate Statistics (Inferential)	16	20
Advanced Statistics (Multivariate)	2	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Research Methods</b>		
Introduction to Research	35	32
Quantitative Research	14	1
Advanced Research Methods	21	7
Qualitative Research	6	8
Computer (Research)	7	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>48</b>

Elementary Statistics and Intermediate Statistics dominated the course work for Ed.D. students and Introduction to Research clearly was the primary research methods course on Ed.D. degree programs of study. Ed.D. degree programs contained more courses in statistics than did Ph.D. programs of study. For the Ed.D. degree programs, work in statistics constituted 7 percent of the total course work while it represented 6 percent of total course work for Ph.D. students. However, Ph.D. course work in research methods clearly surpassed that in Ed.D. degree programs. Research courses in Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs represented 10 percent and 6 percent of the total course work respectively.

**Foundations**

Foundations encompassed a wide variety of course work in the areas of psychology, guidance and counseling, human resources development, special education, curriculum and instruction, history and philosophy of education,

and other courses related to education. In view of the generally accepted definition of Foundations (i.e., history, philosophy, psychology and sociology), the area of General Education might have been a more appropriate title for this classification.

Course work in the Foundations area constituted 26 percent and 24 percent of the total course work for Ph.D. and Ed.D. students respectively. These percentages were second only to the course work taken specifically in educational administration. It should be emphasized once again that the Foundations area included virtually all course work in education taken outside departments of educational administration except cognate work (Business, Liberal Arts, Music, etc.) and research, statistics, and seminar courses.

In total, 219 of the 841 Ph.D. courses and 207 of the 844 Ed.D. courses were classified as Foundations. It is significant to note that of the 219 Ph.D. Foundations courses, only five courses were reported on at least five students' programs of study. The variability of such courses on doctoral programs appeared obvious. For example, only the courses of Philosophy of Education, Directed Reading, Sociology of Education, Advanced Educational Psychology and Secondary School Curriculum appeared on at least five Ph.D. programs of study. The mode for the number of times a course appeared as a Foundations course was one.

Similarly, only five Foundations courses were common to as many as five students' programs in the Ed.D. degree. Philosophy of Education, History of Education, Advanced Educational Psychology, Psychology of Exceptional Children and Practicum in Counseling appeared on five student programs of study. One hundred six of the 207 Ed.D. Foundations courses were listed on only one program of study.

#### Cognate Course Work

Cognate work included courses in liberal arts, fine arts, business administration, religion and computer applications. Cognate work comprised 7 percent of the Ph.D. and 9 percent of the Ed.D. course work. Such work had no program commonality. Virtually every cognate entry was singular. Of the 841 total Ph.D. and 844 total Ed.D. courses, 60 and 72 were cognate courses respectively.

#### Seminars and Workshops

Seminars and Workshops included courses both inside and outside departments of educational administration. Twenty-eight of the 43 Ph.D. Seminars/Workshops and 31 of the 62 Ed.D. Seminars/Workshops were related to educational administration. Seminar/Workshop titles included School Administration, Educational Management, Fundamentals of School Administration, Policy, Secondary School Curriculum, Audiovisual Materials and various others.

Seminars/Workshops consisted of 5 percent and 7 percent of the total course work in Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs respectively. No patterns or commonalities were found among the Seminar/Workshop courses on the programs of study examined.

#### Field Experiences

Field Experiences included internships, independent study, field work and practica. Of the 33 Field Experience entries for Ph.D. degree programs, 26 were exclusively educational administration. Of the 41 Ed.D. entries, 31 were in the area of educational administration. The Ph.D. and Ed.D. experiences in educational administration are categorized in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**Field Experiences in Educational Administration**

Field Experience	Number of Courses	
	Ph.D.	Ed.D.
Internship	13	15
Independent Study	7	11
Field Experience/Application	6	5

As noted previously, other field experiences outside the field of educational administration were included in degree programs. Such experiences were quite limited, however.

#### Total Program Summary

Table 4 indicates the total percent data for each of the major areas of study for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degree programs.

**Table 4**  
**Total Percent Data for Areas of Doctoral Study**

Area of Study	Ph.D.	% of	Ed.D.	% of
	No. of Courses	Total Work	No. of Courses	Total Work
Educational Administration Course Work	324	39	331	39
Research and Statistics	136	16	108	13
Foundations	219	26	207	24
Cognates	60	7	72	9
Seminars/Workshops	43	5	62	7
Field Experiences	33	4	41	5
Dissertation*	26	3	23	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>814</b>		<b>844</b>	

\*Represents number of listings and not credit hours.

As the data indicate, no area of study for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees varies more than 3 percent. While Ph.D. programs of study did contain 3 percent more courses in research and statistics, Ed.D. degree programs contained more work in statistics than did Ph.D. programs. The difference is accounted for by the greater research methods emphasis in the Ph.D. degree programs. The results relative to the dissertation are questionable. Since dissertation credit was not clear in all cases, dissertation was recorded only as a single entry for each student's program. Credit hours completed were not considered. In any case, these data led to an obvious conclusion that differences between Ed.D. and Ph.D. degree programs in UCEA member institutions are indistinguishable.

#### Summary

The data gathered from student programs of study in UCEA member institutions supported the following conclusions:

1. Ph.D. and Ed.D. degree programs in educational administration are virtually identical pursuits in UCEA member institutions. The amount and kind of course work completed in the field of educational administration are the same for the two doctoral programs.

2. Students pursuing either the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree program in UCEA member institutions could expect to complete at least 60 percent of their total doctoral work in the course areas of organization and administration, personnel, finance, law and human/community relations and social factors.

3. Research and statistical course requirements for the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees differed only slightly except for a somewhat higher expectation of research methods course work in Ph.D. programs.

4. Foundations course work for both the Ph.D and Ed.D. programs constituted approximately 25 percent of the student's program of study. Foundations encompassed a broad area of course work and included virtually all general education course work taken outside the field of educational administration.

5. Field experiences and workshops for doctoral students constituted a relatively small percent of the student's program of study. A student could expect no more than

5 percent of the total doctoral program to be devoted to field experiences.

6. Cognate work, courses in disciplines outside the field of education, also represented a relatively small percent of doctoral programs. Such course work almost always was brought to the doctoral program as previous credit earned during the Master's program.

7. Course work in theory, policy, the principalship, supervision, facilities, politics, leadership and the superintendency, when considered individually, would be expected to constitute 5 percent or less of the doctoral student's program of study.