Graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships

in the college of education at Iowa State University

by

Pamela Olivia Hayes

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department:	Industrial Education and Technology
Major:	Industrial Education and Technology
	~~ ~~ ~ ~ ~nd Development)

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1994

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family, especially to my maternal grandparents, Henry and Flora Hayes, who are deceased. It was their Southern rearing that made me the person that I am. To my paternal grandparents, Jim and Ella McKenzie, and my step grandparents.

To my parents, Robert and Nonie Hayes Nelson, and Willie and Dora McKenzie. To my siblings Wilbert, Willie, Jr., and Sandra. To my nieces and nephews. To my aunts, uncles and cousins.

Thank you all for your continued support; emotionally, financially and spiritually.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Need for the Study

Despite their maturity level, graduate students are found to have unrealistic expectations of the college environment (Winston, 1976; Rimmer, Lammert & McClain, 1982). Their level of performance is dependent on their degree of satisfaction with the experiences they have had within the departments. This satisfaction may be the primary factor as to whether they remain in school to attain their degrees or drop out before completion (Gregg, 1972).

Hill (1981) recognized that the link between graduate students' perceptions and their evaluations of advanced learning experiences exists within the department themselves, not the whole institution. If graduate departments are responsible for training men and women to become competent professionals, they should make an effort to examine those factors that enhance a student's educational experience (Gregg, 1972; Bowen, 1984). Better ways to communicate graduate students' needs to faculty are imperative for students to build rapport with their educational institution (Hartnett & Katz, 1977). Who better to ask than those who are affected the most by the learning environment? It is the perceptions of the students that are critical in understanding desirable qualities in graduate programs (Hill, 1981).

The intent of this research is to add to the existing body of knowledge about faculty-student relations. The perceptions and comments obtained from the graduate students will offer insight about the quality of faculty-students interaction in the College of Education at Iowa State University. Assessing the attitudes of these students based on their experiences will accurately represent perceptions of faculty-student relation in the College of Education. The results will provide insight and direction to the colleges' departments helping in the continuous improvement of the relationships between faculty and students.

Background Information

Graduate education in the United States began in 1876 when Johns Hopkins graduate school was established. Since this inception, graduate enrollment has rapidly increased in educational institutions in the United States. People are seeking advanced degrees in higher education for many reasons. Some researchers contend that the master or doctorate degree is viewed as a necessity to attain positions of leadership and power (Hite, 1985). Others view graduate education as a way to gain graduate level knowledge for self-development (Trivett, 1977).

Who goes to graduate school, why and how they get there consumes much of the literature on graduate students (Baird, 1976). Unfortunately, more attention has been given to the questions about who, why and how, and not enough on what. A review of the literature repeatedly mentions that little attention has been given to what happens to graduate students during their graduate study (Trivett, 1977). Winston (1976) pointed out that the majority of research on college campuses has been conducted by graduate faculty and graduate students. Yet, studies assessing the graduate environment and specifically relating to the graduate students' experience have been lacking as a topic of research.

In spite of their growing numbers and increasingly important presence in the academic community, graduate students are "stock tragic figures" in the higher education literature (Harvey, 1972). Their role and plight has been neglected because students are silent partners in academia, not advocates for their rights. They have accepted the norms because of their dependence on their institutions not only for their degrees, but also for financial support (Altbach, 1970).

According to Harvey (1972, p.6), "many writers assume that graduate students are exploited, anxious, preoccupied with trivialities, and live in poverty." To shed some light on

the powerlessness of graduate students on American campuses, Altbach (1970, p. 565) summarized the following conditions:

1. Graduate students are adults in every sense of the term but are often treated as children by their universities.

2. Graduate students are often woefully exploited by individual professors, departments or universities, by way of inadequate remuneration for work performed, work loads which almost preclude prompt completion of academic work, or occasional plagiarism by senior professors of students' original work.

3. Graduate students are subject to arbitrary treatment by professors, departments or institutions and have few means of resisting such treatment.

4. Graduate students are often almost totally dependent on their professors or departments for a livelihood, for certification as a scholar, and possibly for a future academic position.

5. The role of a graduate student as a teaching or research colleague with a senior professor is often ambivalent.

In response to this heightened awareness, greater attention is being given to the graduate students' needs and satisfaction with their graduate program. Lange (1980) reported finding published statements in professional journals discussing the inherent frustration and anxiety associated with the graduate experience. Rimmer, Lammert and McClain (1982) conducted a needs assessment at Miami University of Ohio examining the perceived needs of graduate students. They found that, as a group, graduate students expressed needs concerning future careers, increasing and improving social interactions with their peers. Research by Buchanan (1989) dealt with the perceptions of students on environmental factors that contributed to their ability to complete a degree program at Oklahoma State University (OSU). Regardless of their ethnicity or college affiliation students had a positive perceptions

of OSU's internal environmental factors. In another study, Gettys (1989) was interested in students' opinions, perceptions and needs at the University of Tennessee - Knoxville (UTK). This research was one of a series of studies conducted during that time in the College of Education. Consistent with her counterparts, Fowler (1988) and Roney (1989) research, Gettys found that students were highly satisfied with their instructional programs and least satisfied with the university's administration.

These studies focused on broad issues covering many areas of the graduate experience that led to general findings not representative of other educational institutions. Yet, much of the evidence shows that graduate students, indeed, have unique needs and problems that should be addressed by graduate administrators as well as faculty who have direct contact with graduate students.

As mentioned previously, research specifically related to graduate students during the degree process has been lacking in the literature on higher education. However, one area of the graduate experience, faculty-student relations, has warranted invigorating discussion by researchers who have conducted studies addressing the graduate experience. Graduate student relationships with their faculty have received severe criticism (Harvey, 1972). Graduate students' relationships with departmental faculty are often described as ambiguous role relations. In some cases, these relationships are perceived as one-sided, because "students may be subject to arbitrary treatment with few means of resisting and surviving to obtain their degrees" (Winston, 1976, p. 43).

The conceptual framework for this study comes from Gregg (1970, 1971, 1972) and Hartnett (1976). Gregg (1972) believed that graduate students have a significant amount of contact with the department in which they are enrolled. Most of the interaction occurs in the form of two types of role relations; faculty-student and student-student relationships. This study focused on the manner in which students perceived a collegial relationship with faculty,

also known as collegiality. The following variables; gender, department size, school within the university, and degree objective, were used to measure the extent to which collegiality affected a student's academic and nonacademic satisfaction. Hartnett (1976) also reported that faculty-student relations are important to the graduate student's experience. This study found that the relationship consists of two elements; accessibility and faculty treatment of students. Both of these studies will be discussed thoroughly in Chapter II, the literature review.

Nevertheless, a review of the literature shows that there is a lack of research addressing the relations between faculty members and graduate students. Researchers encourage continuing work in this area to increase awareness in an effort to improve the graduate experience within the graduate environment (Altbach, 1970; Cohen, Kamieniecki, & Glen, 1980; Gregg, 1970; Hartnett, 1976; Harvey, 1972).

Statement of the Problem

The problem which provides the focus for this research is one of an exploratory nature. Graduate students' perceptions of faculty in the College of Education at Iowa State University are currently unknown. The problem of this research is to seek an answer to the following question: Do graduate students perceive that collegiality exists in the College of Education at Iowa State University?

Purpose and Objectives

The central purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which graduate students perceived collegiality in the relationships with faculty in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction, Health and Human Performance, Industrial Education and Technology, and Professional Studies of the College of Education at Iowa State University. The level of

collegiality was measured by focusing on perceptions of faculty accessibility, faculty

treatment, and faculty mentoring. More importantly, the study attempted to determine if there

were differences in graduates students' perceptions when gender, degree objective, and ethnic

groups were considered.

The research objectives related to the purpose of the study were as follows:

1. Collect selected demographic data to describe graduate students in the College of Education.

2. Gather graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships (collegiality) in the College of Education.

    A. Identify the extent to which students perceive faculty to be accessible in the College of Education.

    B. Assess the students' perceptions of their treatment by faculty in the College of Education.

    C. Identify students perceptions of mentoring by faculty in the College of Education.

3. Determine differences between selected variables as specified in the research questions.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research questions

The following questions served as a basis for this research:

1. Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to gender?

2. Do graduate student's perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to degree objective?

3. Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to ethnic groups?

Hypotheses to be tested

The following hypotheses were formed to support the research questions for this study:

1. There is no significant difference between male and female graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

2. There is no significant difference between master and doctorate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

3. There is no significant difference between the various ethnic groups' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

Definition of Terms

The following terms assisted the researcher in developing this study:

Accessibility - is the extent to which faculty are available to students (Hartnett, 1976).

Collegiality - students' perceptions of the relationships between faculty members and graduate students in their department (Gregg, 1970 & 1972).

Faculty treatment - is the way in which faculty relate to students in a collegial manner (Hartnett, 1976).

Graduate students - are those who are enrolled in the College of Education at Iowa State University for the Summer Semester 1994.

<u>Mentoring</u> - is the role the student perceives the faculty to play during academic or social interaction (Aguilar-Gaxiola, 1984).

<u>Perceptions</u> - for this study is used to identify how graduate students perceive their experiences with faculty in their departments based on accessibility, faculty treatment and mentoring.

Assumptions of the Study

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. Graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relations in the College of Education are similar.

2. The subjects responded honestly providing an accurate assessment of graduate students in the College of Education.

3. The information received from the questionnaires was valid.

4. The instrument was reliable.

5. The respondents understood the questions as intended.

Delimitations of the Study

This study had the following delimitations:

1. This study made no attempt to be all inclusive; only those students enrolled in the College of Education for Summer Semester 1994 were included in the study.

2. No attempt was made to contact non-respondents beyond the one follow-up call.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study is limited by:

1. The findings of this study may not be generalized beyond the College of Education at Iowa State University.

Summary

This chapter provided a general overview of the study. The need, background information, problem, purpose and objectives, research questions, hypotheses, and the definition of terms were the key elements in developing this study.

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Over the years increased attention has been given to graduate education. Yet,

literature addressing the graduate environment and more specifically the graduate experience

has been lacking (Altbach, 1970; Hartnett & Katz, 1976; Winston, 1976; Trivett, 1977).

Harvey (1972, p.6) stated:

> Much of the literature on the conditions of graduate
> student life is polemical, based more on opinion than
> documented evidence, and generally few substantive
> suggestions for appropriate change are offered.

A review of the literature found this to be true. Direct evidence concerning graduate

education has been limited (Clark, 1980). However, the search revealed that most of the

direct evidence on graduate education was gathered from large samples of graduate

administrators, faculty, students, and degree recipients. Questionnaires and in-depth

interviews, covering general areas of graduate student life, were used to collect the data.

Berelson (1960) was responsible for conducting one of the first major studies on

graduate education and the graduate experience between 1957 and 1959. Through interviews

and questionnaires, this research surveyed graduate deans, faculty, students, and degree

recipients at 92 universities nationwide. The study focused on the history of graduate

education and graduate education during the time of Berelson's research. Berelson concluded

that problems and issues of graduate education have remained the same over the years, and

based on the findings, recommended that universities should do more to make graduate

education a meaningful experience for the student.

Heiss (1970) reported the next major study on graduate education. The research reported in <u>Challenges to Graduate Schools</u> is based on the opinions of graduate administrators, faculty, and doctoral students from ten universities across the country. Heiss was interested in knowing how graduate schools functioning as rigid organizational structures prepared female and male doctoral students for leadership positions in society. Students were asked to appraise their educational experiences based on their expectations or goals. Heiss found that faculty spent less time with their female graduate students and took them less seriously than their male graduate students.

Creager (1971) conducted the first extensive normative study on graduate education. 33,511 respondents were surveyed at 150 institutions that had graduate programs in academic and technical areas that lead to a master's or doctoral degree. This research covered a broad range of questions concerning graduate education. One of the findings revealed that a graduate student's area of study was significantly related to his/her satisfaction, length of time required to obtain a degree, and attrition rate. Part-time students reported the greatest amount of dissatisfaction which resulted in a higher drop-out rate. Creager concluded that limited research had been done to assess graduate students' perceptions and expectations as reported the students' themselves.

These studies were instrumental in laying the foundation for researching graduate student life, but often portrayed the graduate experience from one perspective. Much of the research focused on the graduate experience and usually addressed the graduate students pursuing the doctoral or a professional degree. In an attempt to provide an in-depth overview of the graduate experience, literature explaining elements within the graduate environment is presented. Furthermore, a review of the studies forming the conceptual framework for this study is provided.

College and Graduate Environment

In the late 1950's and early 1960's increased attention was directed toward the social and psychological quality of the higher education academic environment or climate (Hartnett & Katz, 1976). Researchers were concerned with studying college environments to identify factors that were likely to influence the student's development (Astin, 1968). There are strong arguments that graduate students' academic, personal, and professional development are also influenced by their learning environment (Hartnett, 1976; Hill, 1981; Follett, Andberg & Hendel, 1982).

One of the first systematic approaches to assessing the college climate was the Pace and Stern (1958) College Characteristics Index (CCI). The CCI was based on the idea that the college environment reinforced the personality of a students' needs. For example, an environment characterized by a high achievement level is likely to satisfy a student's need of high achievement rather than one with a low achievement level.

A revision of the CCI by Pace (1963) resulted in the development of the College and University Environment Scales (CUES). These scales were to measure the differences in perceptions among college images according to those students who were familiar with their educational environments (Astin, 1968).

Astin and Holland (1961) used a different approach to exploring the college environment. They developed the Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) which was based on the assumption that the characteristics of the students, faculty, administration, and staff of an institution influenced the image of a college's climate (Astin, 1968).

Using the above research as a framework, Astin (1968) felt that there was a need to look at the college-press from a "stimulus" approach as opposed to the "image" and "student" characteristics approaches. The Inventory of College activities (ICA) instrument was

designed to measure student behaviors that manifested as a result of the college's environmental stimuli.

The assessment instruments used by researchers early on failed to include graduate students' perceptions of the college climate. Studies by Richards and Seligman, Harkey, and Winston assessing the graduate experience attempted to provide empirical evidence in support of the graduate environment. These researchers did this by modifying several of the initial instruments.

For example, Richards and Seligman (1969) developed an assessment instrument based on Astin and Holland's (1961) EAT. Richards and Seligman's intent was to describe the graduate conditions in terms of environmental characteristics instead of student characteristics. Data were collected from 87 graduate schools in 1968. The findings of this study suggested that disagreement existed between graduate students and faculty over the amount of emphasis given to "occupational training." Also, a lack of consistency was found to exist between the degree of emphasis given to such training by institutions of the same type.

Harkey (1971) administered a revised version of the Pace and Stern (1958) CCI to graduate and professional students at the University of Alabama. Harkey's study found that graduate students who were single, under 30 years of age, and post-masters' students perceived the environment as less intellectual.

Winston (1973) created the Graduate Environmental Perception Scales (GEPS) an adaptation of the Pace (1969) CUES. Unlike the Richards and Seligman and Harkey techniques, this instrument intended to measure graduate students' perceptions of their immediate environment, the department. At the University of Georgia, Winston felt that it was the departmental environment that had the greatest impact on graduate students. However, these studies were limited in their assessments of graduate school environments.

Baird (1969) claimed that a student beginning graduate school enters a social system that has its own mores, roles and status positions. These are the values that create the student's environment during their years of advanced study. Baird (1974) is credited with conducting the first longitudinal study of assessing the environments of graduate departments. This study compared the perceptions of 1,840 students who were pursuing graduate studies in the Departments of Arts and Humanities, Biological, Physical and Social Sciences, and Education representing 94 colleges. When comparing departments, Baird found that students in the arts and humanities reported that they studied longer than students in the other graduate fields. They seldom found their coursework boring, but felt that the courses did not complement each other. These students were less satisfied than others with the administrators of their departments and often felt their needs for graduate school were not being met.

Biological science students' perceptions of their departments were generally positive. High ratings were given to the departments' that provided opportunities for research and creative work on an individual basis. They reported that their professors encouraged out of class contact with students. They were impressed with their professor's research ability as well as their dedication. Also, these students were satisfied with the department's support in assisting them with assistantships and financial aid, and academic support in selecting coursework and thesis subjects.

Physical science students felt that their graduate programs provided opportunities for research and creative work. They reported that their professors were "top notch" researchers and were respected by the students. These students perceived professors to be friendly and accessible. They were not satisfied with their departments' new student orientation, but gave high ratings to their departments' help in finding jobs, assistantships and financial aid, and advising.

Like the biological and physical sciences, the social science students described their programs similarly. However, they felt distant from their departments. They reported that their departments were unresponsive to students' needs, and that their professors were more interested in research than teaching. These students most often considered changing departments or fields of study.

Unlike students in the other four departments, the education students were not impressed with their departments. They accused the administration of poorly communicating with them and not involving them in departmental decision-making. They regarded their academic work as dull and not stimulating. These students also gave an overall low rating to their professors; although, they felt their professors were helpful advisors.

In a doctoral dissertation, Reagan (1976) summarized the perceptions of 1,370 graduate students on various aspects of their academic environment in the Schools of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education at Purdue University. The findings of this research indicated that there were no significant differences in the graduate students overall satisfaction with their graduate education, regardless of department, when the following demographic variables were considered; gender, degree objective, area of study, marital status, and academic load. There were also no differences between graduate students level of satisfaction with their graduate education as a function of inter-graduate student competition and using student services. However, Reagan found that differences existed when faculty and graduate students' opinions differed on theoretical issues and academic program requirements. Furthermore, differences also occurred when students' perceptions of faculty advising on academics and career planning were considered.

Female and Male Graduate Students

A 1982 report from the Project on the Status and Education of Women stated that the educational experiences of female graduate students differ from their male colleagues. These differences occur between students attending the same institution, sharing the same classroom, and working with the same graduate advisor (Hite, 1985).

Solmon (1976) suggested that female graduate students are faced with overt discrimination in higher education based on socialization factors. Societal expectations of women are known to create external and internal barriers caused by assumptions affecting their level of degree attainment. Women are assumed to not finish or to take longer to complete their graduate programs due to family obligations. Thus implying that female graduate students are less committed to graduate studies and are taken less serious than their male colleagues (Adler, 1976; Solmon, 1976).

As female graduate students pursue advanced degrees, they are often confronted with a "chilly professional climate" of male dominance (Anderson, 1992). They experience a lack of encouragement from male peers and faculty members because of perceived negative attitudes that women are less competent than men in their academic endeavors (Follett, Andberg, & Hendel, 1982; Hite, 1985). Such barriers prohibit women form gaining support from male peers and faculty in order to survive (Adler, 1976; Rimmer et al., 1982).

In a study conducted at a Midwest university, Hite (1985) found that role conflict, relationships with graduate faculty and peers were major concerns of female graduate students. The perceptions of female students differed from their male colleagues regarding role congruence, faculty and peer support. Students' perceptions were selected from three fields of studies which were classified as traditional, androgynous, and nontraditional. This study found that male graduate students experienced more role congruence; a state of harmony or comfort with the acceptance of different roles in their life-styles, than female

graduate students regardless of their field of study. Female graduate students, in the specified fields of study, perceived less support from faculty than their male colleagues.

However, both female and male students in traditional fields of study such as social sciences, education, sociology, and English perceived the least amount of peer support; whereas, those in non-traditional fields such as physical sciences, botany, chemistry, and statistics reported the most amount of peer support. Interestingly, those in androgynous fields of study such as biological sciences, foods and nutrition, management, and veterinary medicine indicated a middle range of peer support.

Follett, Andberg and Hendel (1982) surveyed 238 veterinary medicine students at a midwestern university comparing attitudes and perceptions of female and male graduate students. The findings indicated that perceived gender differences existed in five areas; peer relationships, role expectations, sex discrimination, self-disclosure, and competitiveness.

Female graduate students were viewed as timid and incapable of completing lab work without the help of their male peers, and were expected to look more feminine. 30 percent of the male graduate students as opposed to 50 percent of the female students believed that sex discrimination occurred in the college. However, these findings were directed at administrators and faculty members not students. More female than male students accused faculty of the opposite sex of making sexist comments. Interesting enough, both female and male graduate students believed that the admission policies of the college were discriminatory, to the female's disadvantage.

Other differences were, male students perceived themselves more competitive than female colleagues; whereas, both females and males revealed that they were willing to share good and poor performance on exams and caring for animals.

Ethnic Groups

Most of the studies that have examined racial differences have dealt with the issue of predicting successful completion of graduate school based on retention and graduation data (Nettles, 1990; Louis & Turner, 1991). Yet, little is known about the ethnic group experiences of graduate students beyond the fact that minorities are underrepresented. As a result, there is a lack of understanding about how differences affect the experience of minority and white students during their graduate programs (Nettles, 1990). Although, majority and minority students share similar experiences and frustrations during their graduate careers, minority students' frustrations are more severe (Green & McNamara, 1978).

As a part of the Wright Institute Survey, Duncan (1976) compared the survey responses of 484 minority graduate students at the University of California at Berkeley with those of white students at Berkeley and three other universities. The study addressed peer and faculty relationships, treatment, training and prejudice, and financial assistance.

Nearly 65 percent of the minority students reported "rarely" or "never" socializing with other graduate students in their department compared to 15 percent of the white students. Asian-Americans' students reported the most social distance; whereas, African-Americans reported the least (p.229). When asked how many of their close friends were in their departments, 44 percent of the minorities responded "none" compared to 11 percent of the whites (p.231). 78 percent of minority students, twice that of majority students, viewed students in their department to be more competitive than cooperative prohibiting them from establishing close relationships (p.231-232). Minority students reported that the lack of social interaction with peers caused them to feel "lonely," "depressed," and "close to tears" (p. 230).

Minority graduate students described their professors as "unfair, indifferent, aloof, unaccepting, manipulative, racist, and disrespectful." White students agreed to the extent that professors were "indifferent and aloof." African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and Native-

Americans resented being viewed as incompetent students. Asian-American students commented on being treated as outsiders who had to be tolerated. Unlike their white peers, minority students felt as if they had to prove themselves before they were accepted (p.233). They felt that they received differential treatment by faculty members. Minority students reported spending less time than white students with their professors. One in fifty minorities claimed they had interacted socially and recreationally with faculty compared to one in sixteen whites. Half of the minority students felt that they "rarely" or "never" were treated as equals; whereas, a fourth of the white students did. Furthermore, one of nine minorities felt that their professors had inspired them to excel academically, while four of nine whites reported such encouragement (p. 234).

Minority students were found to be unhappy and discouraged with their graduate programs. One out of every two minorities strongly desired a change in their department's way of treating them, while one out of nine whites agreed. Also, one out of three minority students compared to one out of eight white students felt that the training of graduate students should be changed (p. 236). 38 percent of minority students had considered dropping out of their programs compared to 13 percent of their white colleagues. The lack of support from faculty and financial pressures were the main reasons minorities contemplated leaving. White students considered quitting due to their uncertain future goals and a lack of progress. Twice as many minority students as white students reported being committed to their programs (p.237-239). When minority students were asked if they had observed any blatant prejudice or discrimination toward them or fellow minority students, they answered with a resounding "yes." White and minority students' perceptions of discrimination differed. Four out of five whites felt that discrimination rarely or never took place, while one out of seven minority students agreed there was little discrimination. Minorities also reported that they had experienced direct prejudice by other students and professors (p .238).

The study also found that minorities held less than four percent of the research and teaching assistantships in their departments. This finding was attributed to the fact that minority students were pursuing degrees in fields with small numbers of available assistantships. In order to gain graduate positions, 54 percent of the minority students compared to 29 percent of the white students stressed the importance of good faculty-student relations (p. 238-239).

Halleck (1976) found that international graduate students, like their minority peers, experienced loneliness, isolation, and frustration during their graduate careers. They are exposed to a new culture that is unfortunately not friendly to those they label as foreigners. The findings also revealed that international students made few American friends and often felt left out. They experienced emotional difficulty that resulted in graduate school failure. Ultimately, such failure caused them to return to their countries feeling disgraced.

Antwi and Ziyati (1993) found similar results among African international students at Ohio University. These students revealed that they experienced difficulty interacting and understanding American faculty and students due to language barriers. Students often felt that they had no one to talk to, because it appeared that their American peers had limited time for them. They also felt that faculty considered it a waste of time to assist international students who were not proficient in English.

Faculty-Student Relationships

Gregg (1970, 1971, 1972) was concerned with the levels of satisfaction, both academic and non-academic, experienced by students within the graduate environment. This researcher felt that there was a need to identify and assess those variables that were related to satisfying the educational experiences of graduate students. Gregg (1972) believed that the department operates as a socializing agent during the graduate experience. It is in the

department where graduate students have a significant amount of contact with faculty and peers. This interaction occurs in the form of two types of role relationships; faculty-student and student-student. However, the focus of this researcher's thesis was on faculty-student relationships also known as collegiality.

In a doctoral dissertation, Gregg (1970) summarized the extent to which the satisfaction of graduate students were associated with the collegiality of faculty-student relationships within the department in which the student was enrolled. This study was conducted at Purdue University. Data were collected from master's and doctoral student enrolled in 10 schools at the West Lafayette campus during the Spring of 1969. The schools were Agriculture, Engineering, Home Economics, Education, Humanities/Social Sciences, Industrial Administration, Pharmacy, Science, Technology, and Veterinary Science/Medicine. Students were then stratified by departments within the 10 schools and randomly selected. The following variables; gender, department size, school/department within the university, and degree objective were used in the data analysis.

The findings of the study revealed that female graduate students perceived faculty-student relationships in their departments to be significantly more collegial than male graduate students. Gregg attributed this to the orientation of female graduate students to their department, and that the meaning of collegiality was perceived differently by females than males. When department size was considered, small departments reported a relatively high level of collegiality. This finding was found to be consistent with the reasoning that the smaller the department, the less competition among students for scarce departmental resources of rewards and favors. Collegiality was perceived to exist in the Schools of Agriculture, Engineering, Education, Humanities/Social Sciences, Industrial Administration, Pharmacy, and Science. Interestingly, the size of the departments within these schools was a major factor. The predicted relationships was found for departments of all three sizes, but it

was not statistically significant for small departments which were in the Schools of Home Economics, Technology, and Veterinary Science and Medicine.

Gregg concluded that collegiality was a highly effective and consistent predictor of both academic and non-academic satisfaction for the master's and doctoral students in this study when gender, size of department, and school within the university were considered.

A nationwide study of graduate and professional education was conducted by the Wright Institute in Berkeley between 1973 and 1975. A questionnaire known as the Wright Institute Survey and extensive interviews with students were used to collect data for this project. As one of the researchers in this undertaking, Hartnett (1976) provided a summary on graduate student relations with faculty in Scholar in the Making. Graduate students in this study revealed that relations with faculty was an important part of their graduate experience. Unfortunately, many of them also reported that it was the most disappointing aspect of their graduate experience (Hartnett & Katz, 1977, p.647). Students wanted to feel accepted and respected by faculty; interact with them as friends and colleagues rather than unapproachable superiors (Hartnett, 1976, p.59).

This study found that faculty-student relationships consisted of two factors; accessibility or the extent to which faculty were available to students, and the way in which faculty tended to treat students. In terms of accessibility, the importance of faculty presence was viewed as a necessity in order for students to establish good faculty-student relations. Yet students claimed that seeing a faculty member was often difficult. They felt that a professor's evaluation of them depended in part on "getting in" with specific faculty members and "adopting" them to look out for their welfare. The inaccessibility of faculty often left student feeling punished and cheated of a professor's attention (p. 64-65).

The second component was the way in which faculty related to students or the extent to which faculty considered graduate students as adults, and competent professional in their

respected fields. Few of the students wanted to be seen as colleagues of faculty, but desired a relationship with faculty that was of a collegial manner. Most of the graduate students objected to faculty expectations of being treated by students with a sense of "awe," and faculty attitudes toward them was one of "prolonged adolescence" (p. 66). Students agreed that faculty should be treated with a certain level of respect. In return, they expected a relationship based on personal and professional interests not on procedures. They also wanted to be treated as responsible adults.

Hartnett pointed out that the problems with faculty accessibility and treatment were not serious with all the students in the study. A lot of the students were not concerned with the faculty-student relations in their graduate environment. Hartnett suggested that for information about a graduate department to be of maximum use to individual students, it must be provided by students and /or faculty who tend to see things from the same perspective (p. 70).

Summary

This chapter included a review of the literature relevant to the understanding and foundation for this study. It provided an in-depth overview of graduate education from the viewpoints of early researchers. Also, a review of the studies used as the conceptual framework for this researcher's thesis was presented.

Although, graduate education has been in existence since 1876, studies specifically addressing the graduate experience have been lacking. A review of the literature failed to provide an abundance of recent studies assessing faculty-student relationships. The works cited in this chapter suggested that further research in this area of study was necessary.

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships (collegiality) in the College of Education at Iowa State University. In this chapter the method and procedures used to conduct this study will be explained.

Development of the Survey

An attitudinal survey was designed by the researcher to focus on three aspects of faculty-student relationships; accessibility, faculty treatment of students, and mentoring.

The instrument was developed based on the following factors: (1) related information from the literature review; (2) other instruments used to collect similar data; and (3) expertise of the researcher's committee members.

During the initial stages of developing the survey, input was received from the researcher's evaluation professor, committee members, colleagues and peers. They provided suggestions for changes and revisions were made to the instrument. This revised version of the questionnaire was given to members of the researcher's thesis committee. These members served as a panel of experts to judge the validity of the instrument and to provide feedback for additions or changes. Corrections were implemented and the instrument was sent to the Human Subjects Committee for approval.

The questionnaire consists of two parts. Part I is comprised of thirty statements covering the three aspects of faculty-student relations and with space for optional comments. Students were asked to respond to the items based on their experiences with faculty in their department. A five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1-agree strongly to 5-disagree

strongly, was used to gather respondent's level of agreement or disagreement with the statement.

The statements on the questionnaire were preceded by the declarative statement, "Based on my experience(s) as a graduate student, in my department." The nine items composed to measure the students' perceptions of faculty accessibility are as follows:

1. I find that faculty go out of their way to help.

5. Opportunities are provided for me to interact socially with faculty.

7. Faculty are available during their scheduled office hours.

8. Faculty are willing to assist me with academic difficulties

12. Faculty make themselves available in addition to their office hours.

15. Faculty attend activities organized by graduate students.

19. I feel comfortable initiating social interactions with faculty.

23. I find the time faculty spend on other academic responsibilities (i.e. consulting, meetings, research) affects their availability.

25. Faculty have an open-door policy.

The eleven items composed to measure the students' perceptions of faculty treatment are as follows:

2. Faculty show their appreciation for my abilities.

6. Faculty are honest and fair in their relations with me.

11. Faculty treat me with respect.

14. Faculty encourage me to participate in departmental decision-making.

16. Faculty treat me like an adult.

18. Faculty have my respect.

21. I am encouraged to express concerns about departmental policies and teaching practices.

22. Faculty treat me as a professional in my respected discipline.

26. My feedback on research and curriculum issues is encouraged by faculty.

28. Faculty inform me of departmental changes.

29. I feel that my professional opinion is valued by faculty.

The ten items that were composed to measure the students' perceptions of faculty mentoring are as follows:

3. I pattern myself after faculty that I respect.

4. Faculty are interested in my academic development.

9. Faculty demonstrate interest in my future career plans.

10. I have established informal relationships with faculty.

13. I find faculty to be helpful advisors.

17. Faculty have established professional relationships with me.

20. Faculty assisted me in adjusting to the environment.

24. Faculty encourage high quality work and offer me constructive criticism.

27. Faculty stimulate my intellectual growth.

30. Faculty provide me with emotional support.

The Statistical Analysis Software (SAS, 1989) program was used to compute Cronbach's coefficient alpha of reliability. This calculation measured the inter-item consistency, or homogeneity, of the questions within the three groupings (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990). Internal consistency alphas were computed for the 30 Likert statements; accessibility (9 items), faculty treatment of students (11 items), and mentoring (10 items).

Part II of the survey is comprised of twelve demographic questions. The respondents were asked to provide information specific or categorical to each one of them. The questions are as follows:

1. What degree are you seeking?

2. Credit hours enrolled for the summer?

3. Current GPA?

4. In which department are you presently enrolled?

5. How long in this department?

6. Currently working on your creative component, dissertation or thesis?

7. Are you a graduate assistant in your department?

8. If yes, which assistantship(s)?

9. Gender?

10. Age group?

11. Citizenship?

12. With which ethnic group do you identify?

Subjects

The subjects were graduate students enrolled in the College of Education at Iowa State University for the Summer Semester 1994. Students from all four departments; Curriculum and Instruction, Health and Human Performance, Industrial Education and Technology, and Professional Studies in Education had the opportunity to participate in the study. These departments were chosen because of the diverse demographics that made-up the graduate student population and the differences of the programs in the College of Education.

Procedures

On July 6, 1994, the researcher's study and questionnaire was approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee ensuring participants' confidentiality and protection from subjected harm.

The sampling method chosen for this study was a stratified proportional random sample. This procedure allowed the researcher to study the differences that might exist between the defined or identified variables in the population ensuring equal representation among these subgroups (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1990).

A list of 381 graduate students enrolled in the College of Education for Summer Semester 1994 was obtained from the Graduate College. The report was in alpha order by department including gender, ethnicity and degree objective. Mailing labels were ordered through the Registrar's Office. The researcher compared mailing labels to the list and eliminated those individuals, who did not have a label or those individuals with an incomplete label, from the list. This process yielded a total of 375 subjects.

These students were then stratified by departments; Curriculum and Instruction, Health and Human Performance, Industrial Education and Technology and Professional Studies in Education. A proportional random sample, considering department size, ethnicity and gender was used to select students from each of the four departments. This resulted in a sample of 150 graduate students enrolled in the College of Education for Summer Semester 1994. Minority student enrollment was low during the summer. In order to ensure adequate representation of these students within the population, adjustments were made to over-sample students representing all four ethnic groups.

The surveys were printed on a 8 1/2 x 11 sheet by the Memorial Union copy center on campus. They were folded in a booklet form. The cover page of the instrument was a letter explaining the study and return process. Also, the participant's cooperation was requested, confidentiality ensured, and the researcher's gratitude expressed to the subjects selected to participate in the study. On July 18, 1994, questionnaires were mailed in a departmental envelope along with a departmental business reply envelope to provide the respondents with ease of returning the surveys. Each return envelope was coded with an identification number

in order to account for returned surveys by department. Non-respondents received a follow-up call two weeks after the first mailing.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

The following questions served as a basis for this research:

1. Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to gender?

2. Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to degree objective?

3. Do graduate students perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to ethnic group?

Hypotheses to be tested

The following hypotheses were formed to support the research questions for this study:

1. There is no significant difference between male and female graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

2. There is no significant difference between master's and doctoral students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

3. There is no significant difference between the ethnic groups' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

The interrelationships among the categories of questions will be examined. They are accessibility, faculty treatment of students, and mentoring.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Analysis Software (SAS, 1989) program was used to analyze the data. Surveys and item responses were coded numerically for data entry. A rating of three was assigned to statements left unanswered by a respondent. According to Gregg (1970), this is the most logical way of handling non-responses instead of disregarding the items. The data file was reviewed manually to determine entry errors.

Cronbach's coefficient alpha of reliability was used to determine the internal consistency of the Likert items within each of the three groups (accessibility, treatment, mentoring). Frequencies, means and standard deviations were calculated to provide a description of survey ratings on individual items.

To describe the demographic data provided by the subjects, frequencies and percentages were computed. This data included gender, age group, ethnic background and citizenship. Also included in the demographic data were department enrolled, degree objective, summer credit hour enrolled, current grade point average, length of time in department, assistantship and research status.

Independent t-tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to test the hypotheses of the study. These indices were used to compare the means between groups to determine statistically significant differences. The level of significance for both statistical analyses was sat at alpha level .05.

Summary

In this chapter the methods and procedures used to collect and analyze the data for this study were explained. A description of the instrument, subjects and procedures was presented. The research questions and hypotheses were restated. Also, the data analysis processes were covered.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which graduate students perceived the collegiality of the relationships with faculty in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction, Health and Human Performance, Industrial Education and Technology, and Professional Studies of the College of Education. Also, the study was concerned with the differences in graduate students' perceptions when gender, degree objective and ethnic groups were considered.

The data was collected, between July 18, 1994 and July 29, 1994, from a randomly selected sample of 150 graduate students. For this research, a questionnaire was designed to measure students' perceptions of faculty accessibility, treatment, and mentoring. The number of surveys returned was 82 which yielded a response rate of 55 percent. Of the returned questionnaires, 81 were usable, thus resulting in a final response rate of 54 percent.

The results of the statistical analysis of the data collected from the surveys are reported in this chapter. The findings are organized around the objectives and research questions. Procedures testing for reliability, frequency, mean, standard deviation, t-test, and one-way analysis of variance were used for this study. A summary of the written responses is presented in Appendix D.

Demographics

The first objective of the study was concerned with collecting selected demographic data to describe graduate students in the College of Education. A summary of the responses is reported in Tables 1-5.

Of the 81 usable surveys, 76 of the respondents completed the demographics questions with limited missing variables. Female graduate students made-up 67.1% of the sample. The primary age group of respondents enrolled in the College of Education for Summer Semester 1994 was 31-35 (23.7%). Nearly 90% of the respondents were U.S. citizens and 80.3% were Caucasian. These data are reported in Table 1. The remaining demographic variables are presented by departments.

The smallest proportion (7.4%) of the respondents reported being enrolled in the Department of Health and Human Performance. These data are reported in Table 2. All five of the students were working toward a Master's degree. Equal percentages (25%) of them were taking five to six summer credit hours. Sixty percent of the respondents had grade point averages ranging from 4.00-3.70 and 3.29 -under 3.00. All students reported being enrolled in the department for a year. Sixty percent of the students reported that they were working on their research. Sixty percent also reported "no" to having a graduate assistant position in the department.

Nine (11.1%) of the total respondents were enrolled in the Department of Industrial Education and Technology. A summary of the demographics for this department is found in Table 3. Most (88.8%) of these students were pursuing a Master's degree. Half of the them were taking three or six summer school hours. Almost 89% (88.8%) of the students grade point averages ranged from 4.00-3.30. The majority (88.8%) of these students had been in the department ranging from less than one year to four years. Over 66% (66.7%) of the respondents indicated that they were working on their research project. Also, 66.7% of the respondents reported "no" to having an assistantship in their department.

Table 1. Description of Total Respondents

Variable	Valid Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	76		
Female		51	67.1
Male		25	32.9
Age	76		
20-25		11	14.5
26-30		11	14.5
31-35		18	23.7
36-40		10	13.2
41-45		12	15.8
46-50		11	14.5
51-55		3	33.9
Citizenship	76		
U.S. Citizen		68	89.5
International Citizen		8	10.5
Ethnic Group	76		
African American		9	11.8
Hispanic American		2	2.6
Caucasian		61	80.3
Other		4	5.3

Table 2. Description of Health and Human Performance Respondents

Variable	Valid Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Degree Objective	5		
Masters		5	100.0
Summer Hours	4		
5		1	25.0
6		1	25.0
8		1	25.0
9		1	25.0
Current GPA	5		
4.00-3.70		1	20.0
3.69-3.30		2	40.0
3.29-3.00		1	20.0
under 3.00		1	20.0
Length of Time in Dept.	5		
1 year		5	100.0
Working on Research	5		
Yes		3	60.0
No		2	40.0
Graduate Assistant	5		
Yes		2	40.0
No		3	60.0
Assistantship Type	2		
Teaching Assistant		1	50.0
Other		1	50.0

Table 3. Description of Industrial Education and Technology Respondents

Variable	Valid Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Degree Objective	9		
Doctorate		1	11.2
Masters		8	88.8
Summer Hours	8		
2		1	12.5
3		2	25.0
4		1	12.5
5		1	12.5
6		2	25.0
10		1	12.5
Current GPA	9		
4.00-3.70		4	44.4
3.69-3.30		4	44.4
3.29-3.00		1	11.2
Length of Time in Dept.	9		
< 1 year		2	22.2
1 year		2	22.2
2 years		2	22.2
3 years		1	11.2
4 years		2	22.2
Working on Research	9		
Yes		6	66.7
No		3	33.3
Graduate Assistant	9		
Yes		3	33.3
No		6	66.7
Assistantship Type	3		
Research Assistant		1	33.3
Teaching Assistant		2	66.7

About 25% of the total respondents, 20(24.7%), were students in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. A summary of the demographic data for this department is presented in Table 4. The majority (64.7%) of these students were working a Master's degree. Over half (53%) of them were enrolled in three to six credits hours during the summer. Almost 67% (66.7%) of the students reported that their grade point averages were between 4.00 and 3.70. Slightly over 50% (50.1%) had been in the department three to five years or more. Half of the students were working on their research projects. Over 70% (77.8%) of the students reported "no" to having an assistantship position in their department.

The majority, 46 (56.8%), of the respondents for this study were students enrolled in the Department of Professional Studies. A summary of this data is displayed in Table 5. Most (67.4%) of these students were pursuing a Master's degree. Two to three (44.1%) credit hours were the most credits taken during the summer by these respondents. Almost 70% (69.8%) of the students had current grade point averages of 4.00-3.70, while 22.7% had been in the department for one year. Half of the respondents were working on their creative component, dissertation or thesis. When asked about their assistantship status, almost 82% (81.8) answered "no" to being a graduate assistant in their department.

Perceptions of Collegiality

The following findings are based on Objective 2, which sought to gather students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education. This objective was concerned with; (A) identifying the extent to which students perceived faculty to be accessible, (B) assessing students' perceptions of their treatment by faculty, (C) identifying students' perceptions of mentoring by faculty in the College of Education.

Table 4. Description of Curriculum and Instruction Respondents

Variable	Valid Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Degree Objective	17		
Doctorate		6	35.3
Masters		11	64.7
Summer Hours	17		
2		3	17.6
3		5	29.5
4		2	11.8
5		3	17.6
6		4	23.5
Current GPA	18		
4.00-3.70		12	66.7
3.69-3.30		5	27.7
3.29-3.00		1	5.6
Length of Time in Dept.	18		
< 1 year		2	11.1
1 year		5	27.7
2 years		2	11.1
3 years		3	16.7
4 years		3	16.7
5 or more years		3	6.7
Working on Research	18		
Yes		9	50.0
No		9	50.0
Graduate Assistant	18		
Yes		4	22.2
No		14	77.8
Assistantship Type	4		
Research Assistant		1	25.0
Teaching Assistant		2	50.0
Other		1	25.0

Table 5. Description of Professional Studies Respondents

Variable	Valid Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Degree Objective	43		
Doctorate		14	32.6
Masters		29	67.4
Summer Hours	43		
1		6	14.0
2		10	23.3
3		9	20.8
4		2	4.7
5		4	9.3
6		4	9.3
7		2	4.7
8		1	2.3
9		1	2.3
10		3	7.0
12		1	2.3
Current GPA	43		
4.00-3.70		30	69.8
3.69-3.30		8	18.6
3.29-3.00		5	11.6
Length of Time in Dept.	44		
< 1 year		5	11.4
1 year		10	22.7
2 years		7	15.9
3 years		9	20.5
4 years		7	15.9
5 or more years		6	13.6
Working on Research	44		
Yes		22	50.0
No		22	50.0
Graduate Assistant	44		
Yes		8	18.2
No		36	81.8
Assistantship Type	8		
Administrative Assistant		1	12.5
Research Assistant		6	75.0
Teaching Assistant		1	12.5

A series of 30 statements addressing these three aspects of the relationships were instrumental in the data collection. Cronbach's alpha was computed to measure the internal consistency reliability of items within the groups. They were as follows; .746 for accessibility, .903 faculty treatment, and .892 mentoring.

These perceptions were analyzed further and the means, and standard deviations of each item indicating the overall average response ratings and variability of scores are reported.

Description of Responses

The respondents' perceptions in regard to how accessible they perceived the faculty to be in the College of Education are summarized in Table 6. On the nine items covering this aspect of faculty-student relationships, mean scores ranged from 2.06 to 2.94. The means presented in the table show that the respondents' ratings fell between 2-(agree somewhat) to 3-(neutral) on a five-point Likert-type scale. Forty-four students found faculty to go out of their way to help. Forty-eight of the students felt that faculty were willing to assist them with their academic difficulties. Sixty-four of the respondents remained "neutral" when asked their perception of whether or not faculty attend activities organized by graduate students. Forty of the students "agreed somewhat" that faculty have an open-door policy.

The summary of perceptions on faculty treatment is presented in Table 7. Mean scores ranged from 1.82 to 3.63 on the eleven items. On the five-point Likert-type scale, respondents tended to answer 1-(agree strongly) to 4-(disagree strongly). Forty-one of the students felt that faculty showed appreciation for their abilities. Between the ratings of 1-(agree strongly) and 2-(agree somewhat), 68 students responded that faculty treated them with respect; 70 felt that faculty treated them like an adult; and 63 agreed that faculty had their respect. Respondents tended to remain neutral or disagree with items that referred to

whether or not faculty informed them of departmental changes or encouraged them to participate in departmental decision-making.

The ten items covering mentoring are summarized in Table 8. Mean range of responses was between 1.98 and 3.03 showing that the majority of respondents' scores were close to 2-(agree somewhat) to 3-(neutral). Between the two ratings, 32 students claimed to pattern themselves after faculty they respected while 22 remained neutral; 38 found faculty to be helpful advisors and 18 remained neutral. Sixty-five of the respondents felt that faculty showed interest in their academic development. Students remained "neutral" when asked if faculty assisted them in adjusting to the environment and if faculty provided them with emotional support. There was agreement from the respondents that faculty encouraged high quality in work and stimulated their intellectual growth.

Relationship Between Variables

The following findings are based on Objective 3 which attempted to determine the differences between selected variables as they are specified in the research questions.

Female and Male Graduate Students

Research question 1 was phrased as such, "Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to gender?" The following hypothesis was created in relationship to this question and stated as follows:

> H1: There is no significant difference between male and female graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

Table 6. Summary of Perceptions on Faculty Accessibility

Statement	n	Mean	SD
1. I find that faculty go out of their way to help.	81	2.33	1.072
5. Opportunities are provided for me to interact socially with faculty.	81	2.93	1.292
7. Faculty are available during scheduled office hours.	81	2.27	1.049
8. Faculty are willing to assist me with academic difficulties.	81	2.06	.871
12. Faculty are available in addition to their office hours.	81	2.48	1.038
15. Faculty attend activities organized by graduate students.	81	2.94	.599
19. I feel comfortable initiating social interactions with faculty.	81	2.72	1.186
23. I find the time faculty spend on other academic responsibilities (i.e. consulting, meetings, research) affects their availability.	81	2.16	.928
25. Faculty have an open-door policy.	81	2.40	1.069

1-agree strongly, 2-agree somewhat, 3-neutral, 4-disagree somewhat, 5-disagree strongly

Table 7. Summary of Perceptions on Faculty Treatment

Statement	n	Mean	SD
2. Faculty show their appreciation for my abilities.	81	2.35	.951
6. Faculty are honest and fair in their relations with me.	81	2.05	.934
11. Faculty treat me with respect.	81	1.88	.914
14. Faculty encourage me to participate in departmental decision-making.	81	3.63	1.042
16. Faculty treat me like an adult.	81	1.82	.882
18. Faculty have my respect.	81	2.03	.974
21. I am encouraged to express my concerns about departmental policies and teaching practices.	81	3.17	1.093
22. Faculty treat me as a professional in my respected discipline.	81	2.32	1.059
26. My feedback on research and curriculum issues is encouraged by faculty.	81	2.77	1.076
28. Faculty inform me of departmental changes.	81	3.09	1.086
29. I feel that my professional opinion is valued by faculty.	81	2.58	1.011

1-agree strongly, 2-agree somewhat, 3-neutral, 4-disagree somewhat, 5-disagree strongly

Table 8. Summary of Perceptions on Mentoring

Statement	n	Mean	SD
3. I pattern myself after faculty that I respect.	81	2.31	1.020
4. Faculty are interested in my academic development	81	2.05	.850
9. Faculty demonstrate interest in my future career plans.	81	2.26	.959
10. I have established informal relationships with faculty.	81	2.58	1.047
13. I find faculty to be helpful advisors.	81	2.28	.990
17. Faculty have established professional relationships with me.	81	2.42	1.071
20. Faculty assisted me in adjusting to the environment.	81	2.91	.990
24. Faculty encourage high quality in work and offer me constructive criticism.	81	1.98	.935
27. Faculty stimulate my intellectual growth.	81	2.00	.837
30. Faulty provide me with emotional support.	81	3.03	1.095

1-agree strongly, 2-agree somewhat, 3-neutral, 4-disagree somewhat, 5-disagree strongly

A t-test was used to compare the means of the variables by groups. The dependent

variable was the mean of the responses of an individual respondent within a group and gender

was the independent variable. Fifty-one (67.1%) of the respondents were female and 25

(32.9%) were males. The analysis of the data provided individual t-values for each group.

As indicated in Table 9, the comparisons of the means between females and males on faculty

accessibility yielded a t-value of 1.783. The values of the comparison for Group 2 is

presented in Table 10. A t-value of 1.233 was reported for faculty treatment. The summary

of the means compared for Group 3 is found in Table 11. As a result of this analysis, a t-value

of 1.327 was provided for faculty mentoring by gender.

Table 9. T-Test Analysis of Gender on Faculty Accessibility

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
	Female	51	2.58	.638		
G1					1.783	.079
	Male	25	2.32	.496		

G1 = Faculty Accessibility

Table 10. T-Test Analysis of Gender on Faculty Treatment

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
	Female	51	2.62	.731		
G2					1.233	.221
	Male	25	2.40	.693		

G2 = Faculty Treatment

Table 11. T-Test Analysis of Gender on Faculty Mentoring

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
	Female	51	2.48	.794		
G3					1.327	.189
	Male	25	2.26	.469		

G3 = Mentoring

As is evidenced by the data reported in Tables 9-11, there was no significant differences found according to gender. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis due to no statistically significant difference at the .05 level.

Doctorate and Masters Students

Research question 2 was stated as follows, "Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to degree objective?" Hypothesis 2 related to this question was stated as follows:

H2: There is no significant difference between doctorate and masters' students perceptions of faculty student-relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University.

A test of the means was performed to determine the relationship between the variables by groups. The mean responses of an individual respondent within a group was the dependent variable and degree objective the independent variable. Twenty-one (28.4%) were doctorate students and 53 (71.6%) were masters' students.

The analysis of the data provided t-values for each group. The comparison of means between doctorate and masters' students yielded a t-value of -.173 for faculty accessibility. These data are reported in Table 12. A comparison of the means between doctorate and masters' students for faculty treatment reported a t-value of .943, as shown in Table 13. The t-value of .656 for faculty mentoring is found in Table 14. An examination of the results found no statistically significant difference at .05, according to degree objective. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis 2 as supported by the data presented in Tables 12-14.

Table 12. T-Test Analysis of Degree Objectives on Faculty Accessibility

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
	Doctorate	21	2.49	.670		
G1					-.173	.870
	Masters	53	2.52	.579		

G1 = Faculty Accessibility

Table 13. T-Test Analysis of Degree Objective on Faculty Treatment

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
	Doctorate	21	2.69	.840		
G2					.943	.349
	Masters	53	2.52	.655		

G2 = Faculty Treatment

Table 14. T-Test Analysis of Degree Objective on Faculty Mentoring

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
	Doctorate	21	2.51	.749		
G3					.656	.512
	Masters	53	2.39	.696		

G3 = Mentoring

Ethnic Groups

Research question 3 was phrased as follows, "Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to ethnic groups?" Hypothesis 3 related to research question 3 was stated as follows:

> H3: There is no significant difference between ethnic groups'
> perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College
> of Education at Iowa State University.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test this hypothesis using the mean responses of an individual respondent within a group as the dependent variable and ethnic group as the independent variable. Nine (11.8%) of the respondents were African-American, two (2.6%) Hispanic, sixty-one (80.3%) Caucasian, and four (5.3%) reported themselves as other.

The analysis of data provided individual f-values for each group. For faculty accessibility, a f-value of 1.44 is reported in Table 15. Faculty treatment yielded a 1.19 f-value which is shown in Table 16. As is indicated in Table 17, 1.50 is the f-value for faculty mentoring.

A comparison of the means found that the greatest response difference, in all three groups, was between African Americans and those students who classified themselves as other. Hispanic Americans and those classified as other had the least mean difference concerning faculty accessibility. The least mean difference for faculty treatment and mentoring was found between Caucasians and Hispanic Americans.

However, given the f-values, there were no statistically significant differences found between ethnic groups. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected at the .05 level.

Table 15. ANOVA Analysis of Ethnic Groups on Faculty Accessibility

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	f-value	p-value
G1	African American	9	2.62	.521	1.44	.239
	Hispanic American	2	2.06	.079		
	Caucasian	61	2.52	.626		
	Other	4	2.00	.240		

G1 = Faculty Accessibility

Table 16. ANOVA Analysis of Ethnic Groups on Faculty Treatment

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	f-value	p-value
G2	African American	9	2.88	.813	1.19	.320
	Hispanic American	2	2.50	.707		
	Caucasian	61	2.53	.707		
	Other	4	2.09	.676		

G2 = Faculty Treatment

Table 17. ANOVA Analysis of Ethnic Groups on Faculty Mentoring

Group	Variable	n	Mean	SD	f-value	p-value
G3	African American	9	2.86	.846	1.50	.223
	Hispanic American	2	2.30	.566		
	Caucasian	61	2.36	.692		
	Other	4	2.15	.480		

G3 = Mentoring

Summary

The findings of graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education were reported. A description of the respondents, summary of each item statement, and the analysis of selected variables were also presented.

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter a summary of the findings is presented, conclusions based on the findings are drawn, and future research is recommended.

Purpose and Research Objectives

The central purpose of the study was to assess the extent to which graduate students perceived the relationships with faculty in the Departments of Curriculum & Instruction, Health & Human Performance, Industrial Education & Technology, and Professional Studies of the College of Education at Iowa State University were collegial. The level of collegiality was measured by focusing on perceptions of faculty accessibility, treatment, and mentoring. Furthermore, the study attempted to determine if there were differences in graduate students' perceptions when gender, degree objective, and ethnic groups were considered.

The research objective related to the purpose of the study were as follows:

1. Collect selected demographic data to describe graduate students in the College of Education

2. Gather graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships (collegiality) in the College of Education.

   A. Identify the extent to which students perceive faculty to be accessible in the College of Education

   B. Assess the students' perceptions of their treatment by faculty in the College of Education.

   C. Identify students' perceptions of mentoring by faculty in the College of Education.

3. Determine the differences between selected variables as specified in the research

questions.

The three research questions and hypotheses related to Objective 3 were as follows:

Q1: Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to gender?
H1: There is no significant difference between male and female graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education.

Q2: Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to degree objective?
H2: There is no significant difference between doctorate and masters students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education.

Q3: Do graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships vary according to ethnic groups?
H3: There is no significant difference between the various ethnic groups' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education.

Procedures

This exploratory research study used an attitudinal survey to gather students'

perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education, Summer Semester

1994. The participants were chosen, by department, using a stratified proportional random

sample. Questionnaires were mailed to a sample of 150 graduate students. Eighty-two

surveys were returned, but only 81 were usable yielding a final response rate of 54 percent.

The data was analyzed using the Statistical Analysis Software (SAS, 1989) program.

Cronbach's coefficient of alpha determined the internal consistency of the Likert items within

the three groups; G1 = faculty accessibility, G2 = faculty treatment, and G3 = faculty

mentoring. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic data. Frequencies,

means, and standard deviations provided descriptions of survey ratings on individual

statements. Independent t-tests and one-way analysis of variance were used to test the hypotheses at alpha level .05.

Summary of Findings

The summary of findings for this study is organized around the stated objectives and research questions.

Demographics

Objective 1 was concerned with collecting selected demographic data to describe the respondents in the College of Education. The majority (67.1%) of the respondents were female. Almost 24% (23.7%) of the students enrolled in the Summer Semester 1994 were in the 31-35 age group. Nearly 90% of the respondents were U.S. citizens and 80.3% were Caucasian.

The Department of Health and Human Performance had the smallest percentage (7.4) of respondents. All of the respondents from this department were pursuing a Master's degree and taking five to six summer credit hours. Sixty percent of them had grade point averages ranging from 4.00 - under 3.00, were working on their research, and did not have a graduate assistant position in their department.

The Department of Industrial Education and Technology had the second smallest proportion (11.1%) of respondents. Over 88% (88.8%) of these students were pursuing a Master's degree, had grade point averages ranging from 4.00 - 3.30, and had been in the department less than one year to four years. Half were taking three or six summer credits. More than 66% (66.7%) indicated that they were working on their research projects, and were not on assistantship in their department.

Those respondents enrolled in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction were 24.7% of the sample. The majority (64.7%) were working on a Master's degree. Fifty-three percent were taking three to six hours during the summer. More than 66% (66.7%) reported grade point averages between 4.00 and 3.70. 50.1% had been in the department three to five years or more. Fifty percent were working on their research. Almost 78% (77.8%) reported that they did not have an assistantship in the department.

The majority (56.8%) of the respondents were enrolled in the Department of Professional Studies. Most (64.7%) were pursuing a Master's degree. Slightly over 40% (44.1%) were taking two to three summer credits. Almost 70% (69.8%) reported grade point averages of 4.00-3.70, and 22.7% had been in the department for one year. Fifty percent of the students were working on their research. More than 81% (81.8%) were not a graduate assistant in their department.

Perceptions of Collegiality

Objective 2 attempted to gather students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships based on faculty accessibility, treatment, and mentoring in the College of Education.

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was .746 for the nine items covering faculty accessibility. Mean scores ranged from 2.06 to 2.94. On the five-point Likert-type scale, 1-(agree strongly) to 5-(disagree strongly), most respondents' ratings were between 2-(agree somewhat) and 3-(neutral). Frequencies of the items indicated the agree somewhat was the most often marked response.

The reliability coefficient was .903 for the eleven items covering faculty treatment. Mean scores ranged between 1.82 and 3.63. Respondents' ratings fell between 1-(agree strongly) to 4-(disagree strongly) on the Likert-type scale. Frequencies of the items indicated that respondents tended to remain 3-(neutral) when responding.

The internal reliability coefficient was .892 for the ten items on faculty mentoring.

Mean range of responses were between 1.98 and 3.03 indicating that the respondents' scores

were close to 2-(agree somewhat) to 3-(neutral). Frequencies of the items pointed out that 2-

(agree somewhat) was the most often marked response.

Relationship Between Variables

The third objective focused on determining differences between selected variables.

The summary of the following findings is based on the analysis of the previously stated

research questions and hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1 was tested by comparing the means of female and male respondents for

the three groups. The results of the data supported the null hypothesis. There was no

significant difference in graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships based

on gender.

A comparison of means was also used to test Hypothesis 2. The result of the

statistical analysis confirmed that there was no significant difference in graduate students'

perceptions of faculty-student relationships according to degree objective.

The data analyzed for Hypothesis 3 failed to reject the null hypothesis when no

significant difference was found between the ethnic groups' perceptions of faculty-student

relations.

Discussion and Conclusions

A major finding of this study was that graduate students perceived that collegiality

existed in the College of Education at Iowa State University. Thus answering the question, as

stated in the statement of the problem, "Do graduate students perceive that collegiality exists

in the College of Education at Iowa State University?" Students perceived that faculty were

accessible, treated them fairly, and provided mentoring. Also, there were no significant differences of graduate students' perceptions of collegiality by gender, degree objective or ethnic groups when these variables were compared against the three groups (faculty accessibility, treatment, and mentoring) Likert items.

Based on the findings of this study it would appear that overall graduate students have positive perceptions of their relations with faculty in the College of Education. Yet, the written comments, presented in Appendix D, indicate a certain degree of dissatisfaction among some of the respondents. These comments were solicited at the end of the survey instrument giving respondents an option to provide feedback on their experiences with faculty in the College of Education.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are a result of this study and yielded some implications for future research.

1. Follow-up with the participants of this study through focus group or phone interviews is needed to gather personal perceptions of their experiences with faculty in the College of Education. Perceptions are reality, but are not easily distinguishable in quantitative data. Therefore, a qualitative method in addition to the quantitative method should be utilized to more accurately reflect graduate students' perceptions of their environment.

2. A more in-depth study of graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relations in the College of Education should be conducted. Faculty student-relationships need to be examined along other dimensions in addition to that of collegiality.

3. Further research assessing the graduate student experience is needed. For example, assistantships, guidance with thesis or dissertation research, mentoring, and peer relationships are other areas that could be examined.

4. Further research should be conducted during an academic year to assess the perceptions of full-time vs. part-time graduate students. For example, traditional (on-campus) students perceptions of faculty-student relations may differ than non-traditional (off-campus) students.

5. Further research is needed using larger samples to determine if the climate in the College of Education is different now than in the 1970's and 1980's.

6. Further research replicating this study using other graduate departments at Iowa State University to increase the generalizations of the findings beyond the College of Education should be initiated.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. E. (1976). Women students. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 197-216). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Aguilar-Gaxiola, S. (1984). The roles of mentors in the lives of graduate students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 529)

Altbach, P. G. (1970). Commitment and powerlessness on the American campus: The case of the graduate student. Liberal Education, 56, 562-582.

Anderson, D. (1992). The PACE (Perceptions, Attitudes, Concerns, and Emotions) of selected doctoral students at Iowa State University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.

Antwi, R., & Ziyati, A. (1993). Life experience of African graduate students in a multi-cultural setting: A case study. Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association and the Central States Communication Association, Lexington, KY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 361 791)

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavieh, A. (1990). Introduction to research in education (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Astin, A. W. (1968). The college environment. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Baird, L. L. (1976). Who goes to graduate school and how they get there. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 19-48). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Baird, L. L. (1974). Comparisons of the perceived environments of graduate departments of arts and humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, social sciences and education. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 227).

Baird, L. L. (1969). A study of the role relations of graduate students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 15-21.

Bargar, R. R., & Mayo-Chamberlain, J. (1983). Advisor and advisee issues in doctoral education. Journal of Higher Education, 54(4), 407-432.

Berelson, B. (1960). Graduate education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bowen, H. R. (1984). Graduate education and social responsibility. New Directions for Higher Education, 46(2), 113-119.

Bowerman, B. L., & O' Connell, R. T. (1990). Linear statistical models: An applied approach (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: PWS-KENT.

Buchanan, D. A. (1989). A study of graduate student perceptions of the Oklahoma State University environment. Stillwater: Oklahoma State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 284)

Cesa, I. L., & Fraser, S. C. (1989). A method for encouraging the development of good mentor-protégé relationships. Teaching of Psychology, 16(3), 125-128.

Clark, A. (1980). Adult development and the experience of graduate education. A review of the literature. San Francisco, CA: Association for Humanistic Psychology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 067)

Creager, J. A. (1971). The American graduate student. A normative description. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 055 566)

Cohen, S., Kamieniecki, S., & Glen, N. (1980). Graduate student-faculty relationships: A classification scheme. Teaching Political Science, 7(2), 131-152.

Debord, L. W., & Millner, S. M. (19). Educational experiences of African-American graduate students on a traditionally white campus: Succor, sociation, and success. Equity & Excellence in Education, 26, 60-71.

Duncan, B. L. (1976). Minority students. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 227-239). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Follett, C. V., Andberg, W. L., & Hendel, D. D. (1982). Perceptions if the college environment by women and men students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 23, 525-531.

Fowler, F. C., & Patterson, F. (1989). Graduate student attitudes: An exploratory study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Little Rock, AR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 969)

Gregg, W. E. (1972). Several factors affecting graduate student satisfaction. Journal of Higher Education, 43(6), 483-498.

Gregg, W. E. (1971). Graduate student satisfaction: Academic and non-academic. Paper presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 050 656)

Gregg, W. E. (1970). Social context of graduate education. Dissertation Abstracts International, 31, 4285A. (University Microfilms No. 71-02,608)

Green, K. C., & McNamara, P.P. (1978). The student experience. New Directions for Higher Education, 23, 29-40.

Grigg, C. M. (1965). Graduate education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Halleck, S. L. (1976). Emotional problems of the graduate student. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholar in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 161-176). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Harkey, K. E. (1971). A descriptive survey of environmental perceptions of a selected group of graduate students. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Al.

Hartnett, R. T. (1976). Environments for advanced learning. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 49-84). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hartnett, R. T., & Katz, J. (1976). Past and present. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 3-15). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hartnett, R. T., & Katz, J. (1977). Education of graduate students. Journal of Higher Education, 48(6), 646-664.

Harvey, J. (1972). The student in graduate school. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 057 258)

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

Hill, W. C. (1981). Student perceptions of advanced studies: A research to date summary. Evanston: Northwestern University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 505)

Hite, L. M. (1985). Female doctoral students: Their perceptions and concerns. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 18-22.

Katz, J., & Hartnett, R. T. (1976). Recommendations for training better scholars. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 261-280). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Lipschultz, S. S. (1988). Improving the climate for graduate education at a major research university. CGS Communicator, 21(4), 1-3. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 526)

Louis, K. S., & Turner, C. S. V. (1991). A program of institutional research on graduate education. New Directions for Institutional Research, 72, 49-64.

McFee, A. (1961). Perceptions of a college environment. Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 25-29.

Merriam, S., Thomas, T., & Zeph C. (1987). Mentoring in higher education. Review of Higher Education, 11(2), 199-210.

Nettles, M. T. (1990). Success in doctoral programs: Experiences of minority and white students. American Journal of Education, 98(4), 494-522.

Pace, C. R. (1969). College and university environment scales: Technical manual (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Reagan, J. (1975). An analysis of graduate student satisfaction with selected aspects of the academic environment in the school of humanities, social science and education at Purdue University. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 6485A. (University Microfilms No. 76-07,124)

Richards, J. M., & Seligman, R. (1969). Measurement of graduate school environments. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 028 726)

Rimmer, S. M., Lammert, M., & McClain, P. (1982). An assessment of graduate students needs. College Student Journal, 16, 187-192.

Roney, R. R. (1989). Results of 1989 study at the University of Tennessee: Concerns of college of education graduate students. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Little Rock, AR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 984)

Sanford, N. (1976). Graduate education, then and now. In J. Katz and R. T. Hartnett (Eds.), Scholars in the making: The development of graduate and professional students (pp. 243-258). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Smart, J. (1987). Student satisfaction with graduate education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 218-222.

Solmon, L. C. (1976). Male and female graduate students: The question of equal opportunity. Special Studies in U.S. Economic, Social, and Political Issues. New York: Praeger.

SAS Institute, Inc. (1989). Statistical analysis software - Release 6.07.01. Cary, NC.

Thorndike, R. M., R. L., Cunningham, G. K., & Hagen, E. P. (1991). Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education (5th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Trivett, D. (1977). Graduate education in the '70's. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 145 763)

Turner-Viernes, C. S., & Thompson, J. R. (1993). Socializing women doctoral students: Minority and majority experiences. The Review of Higher Education, 16(3), 355-370.

Wilson, R. C., Gaff, J. G., Dienst, E. R., Wood, L., & Bavry, J. L. (1975). College professors and their impact on students. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Winston, R. B., Jr. (1973). Students and faculty perceptions of graduate school environments (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 5672A.

Winston, R. B., Jr. (1976). Graduate school environments: Expectations and perceptions. Journal of College Student Personnel, 17(1), 43-48.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Praise God from whom all blessings flow. I am eternally grateful to the Lord for given me the strength to complete this thesis. For it is through him that all things are possible.

I am extremely grateful to my committee members. To my major professor, Dr. William Paige for his guidance throughout my graduate program and thesis process. To Dr. Sharon Drake for her continued support both personally and professionally throughout my program. To Dr. Susan Carlson for agreeing to serve on my committee at the end and supporting me throughout my graduate career.

I would like to thank my friends, especially DeRionne, Missy, Natalie, Robyn, and Trina for believing in and assisting me when times got tough. I am also appreciative to those acquaintances who provided encouraging words and a lending hand.

My gratitude and sincere appreciation is extended to my co-workers in Student Athlete Services and Training and Development, and my fellow colleagues for encouraging, helping and understanding me during my time of need.

Finally, a special thanks to Dr. George Jackson for his tireless support throughout both my undergraduate and graduate careers at Iowa State.

APPENDIX A. HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL FORM

Information for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects
Iowa State University
(Please type and use the attacned instructions for completing this form)

1. Title of Project Graduate students' perceptions of faculty-student relationships in the College of Education

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are protected. I will report any adverse reactions to the committee. Additions to or changes in research procedures after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review. I agree to request renewal of approval for any project continuing more than one year.

Pamela Olivia Hayes	6/29/94	
Typed Name of Principal Investigator	Date	Signature of Principal Investigator

Industrial Education & Technology	321 Beardshear Hall	294-8014
Department	Campus Address	Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of other investigators   Date   Relationship to Principal Investigator

     6-29-94   Major Professor

4. Principal Investigator(s) (check all that apply)
   ☐ Faculty   ☐ Staff   ☒ Graduate Student   ☐ Undergraduate Student

5. Project (check all that apply)
   ☐ Research   ☒ Thesis or dissertation   ☐ Class project   ☐ Independent Study (490, 590, Honors project)

6. Number of subjects (complete all that apply)
   ___ # Adults, non-students   150 # ISU student   ___ # minors under 14   ___ other (explain)
        ___ # minors 14 - 17

7. Brief description of proposed research involving human subjects: (See instructions, Item 7. Use an additional page if needed.)

The purpose of this study is to assess graduate students' perceptions of their experiences with faculty-student relationships in the College of Education at Iowa State University. A thirty item instrument including twelve demographic questions(see attachment) was designed to gather information for this study. A list of students will be obtained from the Graduate College upon approval of the study and questionnaire. Participants will be randomly selected from the Departments of Curriculum & Instruction, Health & Human Performance, Industrial Education & Technology, and Professional Studies in Education. The survey will be mailed to each subject. Their involvement is voluntary depending on if they choose to or not to complete the questionnaire. A follow-up letter will be sent to non-respondents ten days after the first mailing.

(Please do not send research, thesis, or dissertation proposals.)

8. Informed Consent: ☐ Signed informed consent will be obtained. (Attach a copy of your form.)
           ☒ Modified informed consent will be obtained. (See instructions, item 8.)
           ☐ Not applicable to this project.

9. Confidentiality of Data: Describe below the methods to be used to ensure the confidentiality of data obtained. (See instructions, item 9.)

A cover letter on the front page of the questionnaire will explain measures to be taken to ensure participant's confidentiality. An identification number on the return envelope will be used to contact non-respondents. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, the individual's name will be checked off the mailing list and the envelope will be discarded.

10. What risks or discomfort will be part of the study? Will subjects in the research be placed at risk or incur discomfort? Describe any risks to the subjects and precautions that will be taken to minimize them. (The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to subjects' dignity and self-respect as well as psychological or emotional risk. See instructions, item 10.)

N/A

11. CHECK ALL of the following that apply to your research:
   ☐ A. Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
   ☐ B. Samples (Blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
   ☐ C. Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
   ☐ D. Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
   ☐ E. Deception of subjects
   ☐ F. Subjects under 14 years of age and/or   ☐ Subjects 14 - 17 years of age
   ☐ G. Subjects in institutions (nursing homes, prisons, etc.)
   ☐ H. Research must be approved by another institution or agency (Attach letters of approval)

If you checked any of the items in 11, please complete the following in the space below (include any attachments):

Items A - D   Describe the procedures and note the safety precautions being taken.

Item E   Describe how subjects will be deceived; justify the deception; indicate the debriefing procedure, including the timing and information to be presented to subjects.

Item F   For subjects under the age of 14, indicate how informed consent from parents or legally authorized representatives as well as from subjects will be obtained.

Items G & H   Specify the agency or institution that must approve the project. If subjects in any outside agency or institution are involved, approval must be obtained prior to beginning the research, and the letter of approval should be filed.

Checklist for Attachments and Time Schedule

The following are attached (please check):

12. [x] Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
   a) purpose of the research
   b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #'s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see Item 17)
   c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research and the place
   d) if applicable, location of the research activity
   e) how you will ensure confidentiality
   f) in a longitudinal study, note when and how you will contact subjects later
   g) participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject

13. [ ] Consent form (if applicable)

14. [ ] Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)

15. [x] Data-gathering instruments

16. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

First Contact

July 15, 1994
Month / Day / Year

Last Contact

July 29, 1994
Month / Day / Year

17. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

N/A
Month / Day / Year

18. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer   Date   Department or Administrative Unit

6/29/94 J. Ed. T.

19. Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee:

X Project Approved   ___ Project Not Approved   ___ No Action Required

Patricia M. Keith
Name of Committee Chairperson

7/6/94
Date

Signature of Committee Chairperson

APPENDIX B. LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

College of Education
Department of Industrial
Education and Technology
114 I. Ed. II
Ames, Iowa 50011-3130
515-294-1033
FAX 515-294-1123

July 11, 1994

Dear Graduate Colleague:

Assessing graduate students' perceptions of factors that contribute to their ability to be successful in graduate school has become an emerging subject of inquiry in higher education. Previous studies reveal that graduate students perceive faculty-student relationships as the single most important factor of the quality of their graduate education. However, many also report that this relationship is the single most disappointing aspect of their graduate experience. This study is designed to gather information about the faculty-student relationships in the College of Education. The data of the survey will be used for the researcher's thesis project.

Your name was selected in a random sample of all graduate students enrolled in the Departments of Curriculum & Instruction, Health & Human Performance, Industrial Education & Technology, and Professional Studies for the Summer Semester 1994. As a representative of your department, your participation, although voluntary, is critical to the success of the study. It is important that you complete the instrument based on your experiences to accurately represent perceptions of faculty-student relations in your department.

Be assured that your questionnaire will be handled in strict confidence. Group data compiled from individual responses and comments will be used in the study. Your name will never appear on the survey to ensure complete anonymity. The identification number on the return envelope will be used to contact non-respondents. Upon receipt of the questionnaire, you will be checked off the mailing list and the envelope will be discarded.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would take a few minutes of your time to complete and return the survey by July 29, 1994. A self-addressed postage paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you have any questions, please contact me at 294-8914 or 292-6129. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Pamela O. Hayes
Graduate Student

William D. Paige, Ph. D
Major Professor

Enclosure

68

APPENDIX C. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Faculty-Student Relationships (Collegiality)

Please indicate how you feel about the following statements with reference to your experience of faculty-student relationships in your department at Iowa State University. Circle <u>one</u> of the five numbers following each statement to indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements.

The scale is as follows:
1-agree strongly; 2-agree somewhat; 3-neutral; 4-disagree somewhat; 5-disagree strongly

Based on my experience(s) as a graduate student, <u>in my department</u> .....

1.	I find that faculty go out of their way to help.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	faculty show their appreciation for my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I pattern myself after faculty that I respect.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	faculty are interested in my academic development.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	opportunities are provided for me to interact socially with faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	faculty are honest and fair in their relations with me.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	faculty are available during their scheduled office hours.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	faculty are willing to assist me with academic difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	faculty demonstrate interest in my future career plans.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I have established informal relationships with faculty.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	faculty treat me with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	faculty make themselves available in addition to their office hours.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I find faculty to be helpful advisors.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	faculty encourage me to participate in departmental decision-making.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	faculty attend activities organized by graduate students.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	faculty treat me like an adult.	1	2	3	4	5

17. faculty have established professional relationships with me.   1   2   3   4   5

18. faculty have my respect.   1   2   3   4   5

19. I feel comfortable initiating social interactions with faculty.   1   2   3   4   5

20. faculty assisted me in adjusting to the environment.   1   2   3   4   5

21. I am encouraged to express my concerns about
    departmental policies and teaching practices.   1   2   3   4   5

22. faculty treat me as a professional in my
    respected discipline.   1   2   3   4   5

23. I find that the amount of contact that I have with
    faculty is influenced by their performing academic
    duties outside of the department.
    (i.e. consulting, meetings, research)   1   2   3   4   5

24. faculty encourage high quality in work and offer
    me constructive criticism.   1   2   3   4   5

25. faculty have an open-door policy.   1   2   3   4   5

26. my feedback on research and curriculum
    issues is encouraged by faculty.   1   2   3   4   5

27. faculty stimulate my intellectual growth.   1   2   3   4   5

28. faculty inform me of departmental changes.   1   2   3   4   5

29. I feel that my professional opinion is
    valued by faculty.   1   2   3   4   5

30. faculty provide me with emotional support.   1   2   3   4   5

Please use the available space to make comments on your experiences with the faculty in your department. Feel free to use the back of this sheet if more space is needed.

Thank you for completing the survey. Please return completed questionnaire through the U. S. mail by July 25, 1994.

Demographic Information

1. What degree are you seeking?
   ___ Doctorate   ___ Masters   ___ Specialist

2. Credit hours enrolled for the summer? ____

3. Current GPA?
   ___ 4.00 - 3.70   ___ 3.20 - 3.00
   ___ 3.60 - 3.30   ___ under 3.00

4 In which department are you presently enrolled?
   ___ Curriculum & Instruction   ___ Industrial Education & Technology
   ___ Health & Human Performance   ___ Professional Studies in Education

5. How long in this department?
   ___ 1 year   ___ 2 years   ___ 3 years   ___ 4 years
   ___ other(specify) _____

6. Term you plan to graduate? _____

7. Currently working on your creative component, dissertation or thesis?   ___ Yes   ___ No

8. Are you a graduate assistant in your department? ___ Yes   ___ No

9. If yes, which assistantship(s)?
   ___ Administrative Assistantship
   ___ Research Assistantship
   ___ Teaching Assistantship
   ___ Other(specify) _____

10. Gender?
    ___ Female   ___ Male

11. What is your age?
    ___ 20 - 25   ___ 41 - 45
    ___ 26 - 30   ___ 46 - 50
    ___ 31 - 35   ___ 51 - 55
    ___ 36 - 40   ___ over 55

12. Citizenship?
    ___ U.S. Citizen   ___ International Citizen

13. With which ethnic group do you identify?
    ___ African American
    ___ Asian American
    ___ Hispanic American
    ___ Native American
    ___ Caucasian (not Hispanic origin)
    ___ Other (specify) _____

APPENDIX D. RESPONDENTS' COMMENTS

Department A:

- I feel all faculty I have worked with have been supportive and helpful except for Dr. ... He shows no respect or guidance for his students.
- I am an unusual student. I commute from Iowa City during the school year and take the majority of classes during summer. I am not an on-campus student so I don't know a lot of activities that go on.
- I liked the format of the survey.
- Faculty are too busy; have too much to do. Too often the instructor expected to teach a course is replaced because of demands other than teaching.
- Some faculty in ... dept. are overworked. I respect them highly, but find them extremely busy with lines of people waiting to see them and answer important certification and program questions. They need more staff.
- Thus far my experiences have been mixed - Dr. ..., Dr. ..., Dr. ... have been exceptionally helpful and supportive.
- I am an off-campus grad. student. I know that I am an un-welcome addition to ISU and I know that if I finish my degree it will be in spite of faculty not because of them!
- I found it difficult to give all faculty the same rating. Most of my professors and all of my committee members receive very high ratings for my positive educational experience at ISU. But, there were a few professors whom I felt lacked in knowledgeable experience in what is currently happening in the educational field and really bring down the quality of the special education program at ISU.
- I have enjoyed my time here at Iowa State. In general I have gotten from faculty what I need. They have been a great group to work with.
- This is the most aloof faculty I have ever had displeasure to work with. They have a much more inflated view of themselves than they deserve. No one is really a national figure in any field. But they have national sized egos. Question 14: Faculty encourage me to participate in departmental decision-making - NEVER!

Department B: -

- In the short time that I have been in the ... department, I have found my experience to be both challenging (in terms of being 1 of probably 4 African-Am.); and rewarding because of my strong desire to not only excel in the classroom but, to also take the information I am receiving and using it to enhance my career goal of becoming a Division I athletic director.

Department C:

- No Comments

Department D:

- I am just getting started in graduate school, so I don't know how helpful this will be for you. Many didn't pertain to me. Good luck!
- I felt the faculty in my department were very professional and supportive. I felt less support with classes that were not within the education department. Overall I felt accepted, respected, and felt my experience was very positive. (Continuing on for a possible 2nd masters)
- I have become quite discouraged with my program. My department offers no mentoring or support for its minority students. Moreover, professors value their research or consulting efforts far more than they value their roles as teachers and mentors for students. Question 7: Are you a graduate assistant in your department? - No. Because the professors exercised such strong demands for my participation in their research, I chose to fulfill my assistantship outside my department. I had become so busy with projects for the benefit of my professors that my program was a distant second. Their projects were always 1st, my degree (the reason I came here) was a secondary effort.
- I have had good experiences within my department (with the faculty). My only negative ones have been with faculty outside of the education college.
- Generally are very nice, easy to speak to, very helpful.
- They are often unavailable when needed. Some do not return phone calls and letters. I don't feel like I am a priority for them.
- My acceptance to ... was a little unusual. I started as an undecided student while my application was pending. I did not and do not have an advisor assigned, and do not yet have a committee or POS. I could have used an advisor to help in course selection. I think HG ED 500 should be the 1st course taken, but graduate catalogue states a 9 hrs. in HG ED prerequisite. Also, I took a couple of CO ED courses that did not really contribute to graduation requirements.
- Most of the above responses (survey items) are a result of 3-4 key faculty members. Two others would rate horribly.
- Excellent institution!
- Faculty needs in-service on teaching strategies and presentation options. All faculty and support staff should have internet e-mail!!
- There is a wide range of abilities/personalities. Some have my greatest respect others not at all. Some do a great job of modeling what they teach, others not at all.
- I think faculty should be more involved in research and having graduate students work with them since it is our discipline. Research should be shared with students as an ongoing process. Maybe then a thesis would be more of a natural and understood process.
- My experience here has been good, some of my answers are neutral because, basically prior to graduate studies I was a professional at the same level, therefore expectations from faculty may vary from the norm. In other words I only expect the faculty to teach and the rest, for the most part is up to me.
- I have the utmost respect for all of the faculty I have encountered at ISU.
- Friendly. Try to be available.

- I always have to make appointments that may be 3 weeks in advance. Many times they get canceled. Sometimes little rules may change about my program requirements and I'll never know until it's too late. My department doesn't have a leader and doesn't have enough money. It appears to get pushed aside by the College. There are many things that could be done to change attitudes and improve conditions if the department was provided more support.

- It is difficult to assess because some professors were very good and others were not. Some professors were good at times and not at other times. The few times I was not treated with respect tend to overshadow the many times I was treated with respect.

- Most faculty members are very encouraging but it would help if they could become more personal.

- Question 18: Faculty have my respect - Some do. Question 27: faculty stimulate my intellectual growth - Some do. Question 28: Faculty inform me of departmental changes - Only if I ask the right questions. Question 29: I feel that my professional opinion is valued by faculty - At times.

- Question 23: I find the time faculty spend on other academic responsibilities (i.e. consulting, meetings, research) affects their availability. * And their preparation for class.

- Some faculty are very good about the topics listed above (survey items) - some are not. This makes your survey dif. to complete.

- It is important to note that these answers relate specifically to my experience with particular teachers in my department. The experience I had in RES 550 was so completely different (extremely negative) with one particular professor that I could not include my evaluation of him in this survey as it would unfairly judge the excellent professors I have had.

- My advisor has given me excellent support but I have been disappointed with quality of an instructor or 2 and 1 course did not get taught as identified in the course book.

- ... has been totally supportive from my early coursework. I would not have my Ph. D. if it were not for his insistence and encouragement. Question 23: I find the time faculty spend on other academic responsibilities (i.e. consulting, meeting, research) affects their availability - It should.