

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1956

A Student Evaluation of Graduate Education Courses at South Dakota State College by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students Who had Taken Work Prior to January 1, 1956

Donald F. Gerriets

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Gerriets, Donald F., "A Student Evaluation of Graduate Education Courses at South Dakota State College by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students Who had Taken Work Prior to January 1, 1956" (1956). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2349.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/2349>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

283281
1533
C.2

**A STUDENT EVALUATION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION
COURSES AT SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE BY
1956 SUMMER SESSION GRADUATE STUDENTS
WHO HAD TAKEN WORK PRIOR TO
JANUARY 1, 1956**

By
Donald F. Gerriets

**A problem submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Science at South Dakota
State College of Agriculture
and Mechanic Arts**

July, 1956

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE LIBRARY

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his indebtedness to Mr. R. M. Clugston, Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology, South Dakota State College, Brookings, South Dakota, for his many valuable criticisms and assistance in making this study.

The writer also wishes to express his sincere thanks to Dr. C. R. Wiseman, Professor of Education, whose course in Research Methods proved to be of practical value in the writing of this problem.

Gratitude is also expressed to all of the teachers in the Education and Psychology Department for permitting the interruption of their classes with this opinionnaire and to the graduate students whose cooperation made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENT	1
LIST OF TABLES	ii
SECTION I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Definition of Terms	4
Limitations	5
Related Literature	6
Procedure	7
SECTION II. FINDINGS	9
Course Evaluations Based on Different Factors in Selected Groups	9
Amount of Experience	14
Position Held	15
Year in Which the Courses Were Taken	15
Financial Recognition of a Masters Degree	16
The Importance of the Content of the Course Versus the Instructor	17
The Influence of Different Factors in the Average Number of Courses Completed at South Dakota State College	17
Amount of Experience	18
Position Held	18
Financial Recognition of Masters Degree	19
The Importance of the Content of the Course Versus the Instructor	20

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

SECTION III	22
Summary	22
Conclusions	23
Recommendations For Further Study	23
LITERATURE CITED	25
APPENDIX A	26
A Sample of the Opinionnaire Used in Making This Study	27

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. A Student Evaluation of Graduate Education Courses by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at South Dakota State College	11
II. Total Number of 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students Who Have Taken Each Course and an Student Evaluation of these Graduate Courses in Education and Psychology in Rank Order, Based on Their Index Numbers	13
III. The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed at S.D.S.C. by Summer Session Graduate Students Based on their Years of Experience	14
IV. The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed at S.D.S.C. by Summer Session Graduate Students Based on the Position They Held During the 1955-56 School Year	15
V. The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at S.D.S.C. Based on the Year in Which the Courses Were Taken	15
VI. The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed at South Dakota State College by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students, Based on their School's Financial Recognition of a Masters Degree	16
VII. The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at S.D.S.C. Based on their Opinion as to the Greater Importance of the Content of the Course or the Instructor	17
VIII. The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at S.D.S.C. Based on Their Years of Experience	18
IX. The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed by Students Attending the 1956 Summer Session Based on the Position They Held During the 1955-1956 School Year	18
X. The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed at S.D.S.C. by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students, Based on Their School's Financial Recognition of a Masters Degree	19
XI. The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students Based on Their Opinion as to the Greater Importance of the Content of the Course or the Instructor	20

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

According to the Office of Admissions and Records, the enrollment in Graduate Education courses at South Dakota State College has greatly increased in the past few years. The number of students receiving their Masters Degree in Education has greatly increased since the first one was granted in 1930.

A sampling of some of the years revealed that one student received his Masters Degree in 1948, two in 1949 and five in 1951. In 1955 the number of graduates had risen to nine. By the end of the 1956 Summer Session, twenty-six students will have been granted a Masters Degree in Education and it is likely that the trend will continue in future years.

The importance of the Graduate Education Program is not concerned only with the graduate students, but also those who are the recipients of their instruction.

It was felt that a student evaluation of the courses would present a satisfactory basis for judging the success of the Graduate Education Program.

It would appear that the best method of evaluating a Graduate Program in Education would be by an examination of the ultimate product--the student in the elementary or secondary school. Such a study is so involved and time-consuming as to be impractical.

This study was based on the opinions of mature adults who have had opportunities to test the value of these courses under actual school situations. After all, who is more competent to judge the practical value of a course than the individual who makes use of it?

Finally, it must be emphasized that this study represents the opinions of people. The fact that it is based on judgment does not detract from its value. Graduate students will continue to influence others and to be influenced themselves by the opinions which they have formed. This study is an attempt to discover those opinions, with the hope that the Graduate Program in Education and Psychology may continue to be of the greatest possible value in meeting the needs of teachers and administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study of the Graduate Program in Education and Psychology at South Dakota State College is four-fold:

1. To serve as a guide in future curriculum development.
2. To enable graduate students to select those courses that are most likely to meet their needs.
3. To encourage the use of material in graduate courses that will meet the needs of teachers and administrators in the school.
4. To show the relationship between some of the factors involved in this study and the number of graduate courses taken.

It is important that the administration and faculty know how the needs of the graduate students have been met. The criticism or praise

of a few individuals would shed little light upon the total situation. It is the author's desire to obtain enough information so that the perspective of the graduate student can be seen. This study is not an attempt to rate the efficiency of the faculty. It is merely an attempt to discover how practical these courses have been in actual school situations. It is conceivable that a course with an excellent job of instruction might rate low in the opinion of some students, when judged by its practical value in the classroom.

The curriculum of the Graduate Education Division, like those of the elementary school, the high school, and the college has been developed for the purpose of meeting the needs of the students. The problem lies in determining when these needs have been met. The degree of satisfaction that the graduate students express will help to serve as an index in determining the success of the Graduate Program in Education and Psychology.

The following statement was made by Ryland W. Crary:

"Continuing adaptation of the curriculum is actually the only way to insure stability of educational experience. Stability is not insured by static program. ~~Wherever elements of a static program become nonfunctional, they produce spotty, irregular learning situations, frustrating to the learner and damaging to his security.~~ Our objectives may be more constant, and vital, if we are continually evaluating our program in terms of the effects on the learners."¹

Many students who begin taking graduate work have little understanding of the graduate program. The courses he pursues should contribute to fulfilling his needs. These needs will vary according to the individual and the end that he has in view. It is hoped that the opinions

¹ Ryland W. Crary, Curriculum Adaptation to Changing Needs, School Life, XXIV, (September 1953) p. 157.

4

of the students who have taken these courses and have applied them in their schools will help to serve as a guidepost in choosing courses which are most likely to be of value to him.

A valuable source of information is the student questionnaire. It can be used by the teacher to evaluate his own teaching. Ralph W. Dexter² told how it resulted in many changes in his teaching, including changes in textbooks, use of tests, lecture methods, and class discussions.

Definition of Terms

Practical Value. When reference was made to the term Practical Value, the concept explained here was the one the author used in this study.

William H. Kilpatrick gives a good explanation of what the author means by practical value:

"A thing has not really been learned until it can and will assert itself in appropriate conduct.... Significant suggestions can come from the words of others, but wisdom must be one's personal accumulation from many successive personal experiences critically studied.... Specifically, no generalization can be given to another except as that person's own previous experience has fitted him to understand and use what is given to him."³

Webster's Dictionary⁴ gives the following definition of the word "practical": "Of, pertaining to, or consisting or manifested in, practice or action;—opposed to theoretical, ideal, or speculative."

² Ralph W. Dexter, A Questionnaire For the Criticism and Evaluation of a College Course, School Science and Mathematics, XLIV: (October 1944), p. 640-5.

³ William H. Kilpatrick, What We Want of Our Teachers, New Republic, XLIV, December 21, 1953, p. 12.

⁴ Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition Unabridged, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1955, p. 1937.

Some of the practical values of a course might be illustrated by having graduate students ask themselves the following questions:

- a. Do you feel that the students have received a better academic education as a result of your taking the course?
- b. Do you have a better understanding of the students' problems and a greater ability to help solve them?
- c. Are you able to do your work more efficiently and with less strain and worry?
- d. Are you happier in your work and do you receive a greater satisfaction from it?

Graduate Student. For the purpose of this study, unless otherwise implied in the context, the words Graduate Student or Student refers only to 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students who have taken Graduate Education courses in Education and/or Psychology prior to January 1, 1956 and were engaged in the teaching profession during the 1955-56 school term.

Course. The word Course refers only to Graduate Courses in Education and Psychology taken at South Dakota State College prior to January 1, 1956.

Limitations

The author feels that this study has certain limitations which must not be overlooked.

The opinionnaire was given to somewhat of a select group. The proportion of women who participated in the study was very small.

This study did not consider those who did not continue their graduate work. Those who left school would probably have a more critical

attitude than those who returned.

Some of the factors that could have influenced the values placed on the various courses are:

1. An overlapping or duplication of instruction in the different classes.
2. An inability to pinpoint or remember the source of these values.
3. A lack of opportunity to actually apply them in the past but the possibility that some of the lessons may have future value.
4. Biases formed by pleasant or unpleasant classroom situations.
5. Opinions based on differences in instructional methods or techniques.

Related Literature

A study made by Lewis J. Menzel⁵ in 1950 at South Dakota State College is somewhat similar to this one in that it deals with the attitudes and opinions of students. It is entitled, "Survey of Veterans Attitudes and Opinions Relative to Their Education at South Dakota State College." His questionnaire was given to both graduate and undergraduate students and dealt with departments such as Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Engineering instead of separate courses as this study does. The nature of his thesis was so different that it was not practicable to compare his study with this one.

⁵ L. J. Menzel, "Survey of Veterans Attitudes and Opinions Relating to Their Education at South Dakota State College", Research Problem, South Dakota State College, 1950.

Warren O. Covert⁶ sent a questionnaire to high school graduates six years after they left high school. They listed the courses that had helped them the most and those that had helped them the least. Home-making, Industrial Arts, and Agriculture were of greatest value and foreign languages of least value.

"In terms of the responses to the "Why" question, it was apparent that a great many of these youth measured the value of their courses in terms of the help they received on their jobs or in further education."⁷

Mr. Covert⁸ felt that his findings indicated the need of a different way of presenting some subjects and guidance services to students.

"Many of the values claimed were apparent only to the teacher.... Although there are many valid objections to this type of questionnaire study, such a project does gather the opinions of the graduates and presents another view of the school program which is too infrequently seen by the teachers."⁹

The author was unsuccessful in finding a study similar to this one.

Procedure

The information for this study was obtained by distributing

⁶ Warren O. Covert, "Grad's Opinions: Survey Provides Food For Thought," *Clearing House*, XIII (May 1949) 519-22.

⁷ Ibid. p. 519.

⁸ Ibid. p. 522.

⁹ Ibid. p. 521.

circumgraphed opinionnaires to all the graduate students in Education and Psychology who were attending the 1956 Summer Session and had taken graduate courses at South Dakota State College prior to January 1, 1956. The students were asked to rate only those courses taken for graduate credit at South Dakota State College prior to January 1, 1956.

Rating the course consisted of putting a check under one of the column headings. These headings were as follows:

No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Consider- able Value	Great Value
-------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------------------	----------------

The students were asked to base their answers on the practical value which they felt resulted from their graduate work in Education and Psychology.

The author received permission from Dr. J. Howard Krumer, head of the Department of Education and Psychology, to circulate the opinionnaire among the college classes. Dr. Krumer addressed a letter to the Education and Psychology Staff asking them to cooperate by allowing fifteen minutes of their time to circulate and collect the opinionnaires. In most cases this was done at the beginning of the class period.

The writer attended a Graduate Education Luncheon on the South Dakota State College campus. Opportunity was given to explain the study and solicit the group for any eligible graduate students who had not received an opinionnaire. Four students received and returned the opinionnaires, bringing the total to sixty. This resulted in what was believed to be almost total coverage of all 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students.

In order to obtain unbiased opinions, the students were asked not to sign their names.

SECTION II

FINDINGS

Course Evaluations Based on Different Factors in Selected Groups

Introduction

The results of sixty opinionnaires were first placed on a tally sheet to determine the total number of students taking each course and to obtain a summary of the practical value of each course.

In order to make it easier to compare the various courses, an arbitrary value was given to each column. A value of one was given to column one, two to column two, etc. This value was then multiplied by the number of students who had taken the course. These products were then added together and divided by the total number of students who had taken the course. The quotient was termed the Index Number.

For example:

	1	2	3	4	5	
Course	No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Consid- erable Value	Great Value	Total
Public School Administration	1	3	16	21	6	47
	1x1	2x3	3x16	4x21	5x6	
	1 plus	6 plus	48 plus	84 plus	30	= 169
	$\frac{169}{47} = 3.60$ Index Number					

An Index Number of 3.60 would indicate that the average rating placed on the practical value of Public School Administration was somewhere

between Some Value and Considerable Value. Since 3.50 is the halfway mark between the numbers three and four, an Index Number of 3.60 would place the average practical value of Public School Administration closer to the Considerable Value column than the Some Value column.

The Index Numbers were figured for all courses listed by at least ten students. The courses were then placed in order, with the one having the highest value first on the list. The total number of students who had taken the course was given on Table II.

There appeared to be very little relationship between the number of students taking a course and its Index Number.

Table II shows that the students rated Workshop in Education first, and Administration of School Guidance Program second.

The absence of students taking some of the courses can be explained by the fact that these courses were recent additions. Others, such as the thesis, are usually completed at the end of the graduate work.

The opinionnaires were sorted according to the amount of experience the students had. It was discovered that they could be conveniently placed into three groups. Those having five years of experience were so ~~numerous~~ that they were placed in a group by themselves. It was necessary to group the others in order to have a large enough total with which to work. The courses were placed on a tally sheet and the totals were added for each column.

The Index Number was figured for each of the three groups by the method previously mentioned. In order to make it easier to compare the three groups, the evaluations were also figured on a percentage basis.

TABLE I

**A Student Evaluation of Graduate Education Courses
By 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students
At South Dakota State College**

Opinionnaire

Explanation: Rate only those graduate courses taken at South Dakota State College prior to January 1, 1956. Base your evaluation on the practical value each course has had in your job as a teacher or as an administrator.

Title of Course	Totals	1	2	3	4	5	Index Number
		No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Considerable Value	Great Value	
1. Advanced Driver Education	1					1	
2. Public School Administration	43	1	3	16	21	6	3.60
3. Principles of Vocational Ed.	13			5	4	4	3.92
4. H. E. Morgan & Administration	21		3	3	13	2	3.43
5. Educational Measurements	15			6	6	3	3.80
6. Psychological Testing	16		2	4	7	3	3.69
7. Educational Pub. Relations	6				4	2	
8. Educational Statistics	29	1	2	14	8	4	3.41
9. The School Curriculum	15	1	1	5	7	1	3.40
10. Workshop in Education	13			4	3	6	4.15
11. Education Seminar	1			1			
12. Seminar in Education							
13. Prin. of College Teaching							
14. Organ. & Admin. of Ele. Ed.	17		5	4	7	1	3.24
15. Advanced Ed. Psychology							

TABLE I (Continued)

Title of Course	Totals	1	2	3	4	5	Index Number
		No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Considerable Value	Great Value	
16. Adm. of School Guidance Prog.	38	1	1	3	21	12	4.11
17. Ele. School Supervision	26		3	5	14	4	3.73
18. Sec. School Supervision	22		5	6	13	5	3.62
19. Business Adm. of Schools	8				6	2	
20. School Bldgs. and Grounds	2		1	2	2	1	
21. Research Meth. in Education	19	1		6	11	1	3.58
22. Adult Ed. in Vocational Ag.	9			2	6	1	
23. Supv. Farm Pract. & FFA Programs	9			1	5	3	
24. Curriculum in Vocational Ag.	4			1	2	1	
25. Research Prob. in Ed. or Ag. Ed.	2			1	1		
26. Research in Ag. Education							
27. Thesis in Education							
28. Psychological Testing							
29. Mental Hygiene	11	1	1	4	4	1	3.27
30. Social Psychology							
31. Psychology of Adolescence							
32. Abnormal Psychology							
33. Advanced Ed. Psychology							
Totals:		6	27	93	165	67	

TABLE II

Total Number of 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students
Who Have Taken Each Course and an Student Evaluation
of these Graduate Courses in Education and Psychology
in Rank Order Based on Their Index Number

Graduate Courses in Education and Psychology	Total Number of Students Who Have Taken Each Course	Index Number
1. Workshop in Education	13	4.15
2. Adm. of School Guidance Program	38	4.11
3. Principles of Vocational Ed.	13	3.92
4. Educational Measurements	15	3.80
5. Elementary School Supervision	26	3.73
6. Psychological Testing	16	3.69
7. Secondary School Supervision	29	3.62
8. Public School Administration	43	3.60
9. Research Methods in Education	19	3.58
10. High School Organization and Administration	21	3.43
11. Educational Statistics	29	3.41
12. The School Curriculum	15	3.40
13. Mental Hygiene	11	3.27
14. Organization and Administration of Elementary Education	17	3.24

Four more groups were separated on the basis of the following factors:

Position Held.

Year In Which Courses Were Taken.

Financial Recognition of a Masters Degree.

Importance of the Content of the Course Versus the Instructor.

The opinionnaires were separated and tallied for each group. The totals were added and the Index Numbers and percentages figured in the same way as the example above.

Amount of Experience

TABLE III

The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses
Completed at S.D.S.C. by Summer Session Graduate
Students Based on their Years of Experience

Years of	Total	1 No Value	2 Little Value	3 Some Value	4 Considerable Value	5 Great Value	Index Number
Four or less	19	1.5%	10.4%	25.4%	43.3%	19.4%	3.69
Five	14	2.9%	4.3%	36.2%	40.6%	15.9%	3.62
Six or more	23	1.1%	3.9%	24.3%	47.0%	23.8%	3.88

The amount of experience appeared to have little effect upon the practical values placed on the courses. Those with six years or more of experience tended to rate the courses slightly higher.

Position Held

TABLE IV

The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses
Completed at S.D.S.C. by Summer Session Graduate
Students Based on the Position They Held
During the 1955-56 School Year

Position Held	Number	1 No Value	2 Little Value	3 Some Value	4 Consider- able Value	5 Great Value	Index Number
B.S. Teachers	35	.6%	8.5%	26.7%	44.2%	20.0%	3.75
Principals	15	1.8%	8.7%	19.3%	47.4%	22.8%	3.81
Superintendents	6	4.3%	4.3%	31.5%	39.1%	20.5%	3.66

The principals rated the courses the highest and the superintendents rated them the lowest. The differences, however, were not great.

Year In Which The Courses Were Taken.

TABLE V

The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed
by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at S.D.S.C.,
Based on the Year in Which the Courses Were Taken

Year Courses Were Taken	1 No Value	2 Little Value	3 Some Value	4 Consider- able Value	5 Great Value	Index Number
1955	1.4%	5.0%	29.8%	36.2%	27.7%	3.84%
1956	0	7.7%	7.7%	50.0%	34.6%	4.12%
1953	6.5%	12.9%	32.3%	54.8%	3.2%	3.65%
1952 or before	0	3.0%	39.4%	42.4%	15.2%	3.70%

The number of courses listed for 1952 or before was so small that it was necessary to group them.

The students who took their courses in 1954 placed the highest rating on the practical value of the courses. Among the other three groups, the difference was quite small.

Financial Recognition of a Masters Degree.

TABLE VI

The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed at South Dakota State College by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students, Based on their School's Financial Recognition of a Masters Degree

<u>Financial</u> <u>Recognition of</u> <u>Masters Degree</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Index</u> <u>Number</u>
		No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Consider- able Value	Great Value	
Recognition	35	2.6%	6.2%	24.2%	49.5%	17.5%	3.73
No Recognition	23	.7%	5.8%	28.1%	43.2%	22.3%	3.81

There was little difference placed on the practical value of courses by students from schools that gave financial recognition to students who had Masters Degrees and those that did not.

The Importance of the Content of the Course Versus the Instructor.

TABLE VII

The Average Practical Value of Graduate Courses Completed by
1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at S.D.S.C.
Based on their Opinion as to the Greater Importance
of the Content of the Course or the Instructor

Student's Opinion	Number of Replies	1 No Value	2 Little Value	3 Some Value	4 Consider- able Value	5 Great Value	Index Number
Instructor More Important	38	1.0%	5.6%	30.3%	41.0%	22.1%	3.73
Content More Important	17	0.8	9.1%	20.5%	52.9%	17.4%	3.79

The opinions on the importance of the instructor or the content of the course had little effect upon the valuations placed upon the course, however, it should be noted that more than twice as many graduate students considered the instructor more important than the content of the course

The Influence of Different Factors in the Average Number of Courses Completed at South Dakota State College..

The opinionnaires were sorted and tallied according to the following factors:

1. Amount of Experience.
2. Position Held.
3. Financial Recognition of a Master's Degree.
4. The Importance of the Content of the Course Versus the Instructor.

The total number of courses for each group was figured and divided by the number of students in each group. This quotient represented the average number of courses taken by each group.

Amount of Experience.

TABLE VIII

The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed
by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students at S.D.S.C.,
Based on Their Years of Experience

<u>Years of Experience</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Average Number of Courses</u>
4 Years or Less	19	3.53
5 Years	14	4.93
6 Years or More	23	7.89

Teachers and administrators with six years or more of experience had taken an average of more than twice as many graduate courses at South Dakota State College as those who had four years or less experience.

Position Held.

TABLE IX

The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed
by Students Attending the 1956 Summer Session,
Based on the Position They Held
During the 1955-1956 School Year

<u>Position Held</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Average Number of Courses Completed at S.D.S.C.</u>
High School Teachers	35	5.8
Principals	15	6.0
Superintendents	6	13.4

The average principal had taken little more graduate work than the average high school teacher. The average superintendent had taken more than twice as much graduate work at South Dakota State College as either the average teacher or principal.

Financial Recognition of Masters Degree.

TABLE I

The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed
at S.D.S.C. by 1956 Summer Session Graduate Students
Based on Their School's Financial
Recognition of a Masters Degree

Financial Recognition of Masters Degree	Number of Responses	Average Number of Courses at S.D.S.C.
Recognition	35	5.54
No Recognition	28	6.04

Although those who came from schools that did not give financial recognition to Masters Degrees had taken more courses, it must not be concluded that recognition of the Masters Degree was not an incentive. None of the six superintendents worked in schools that gave financial recognition of their Masters Degree. The amount of training that they had taken was very likely a factor in obtaining their higher salaried positions.

It is usually true that the larger schools have salary schedules. Many who were working in schools that did not have salary schedules were probably planning to move to better positions in larger schools.

The Importance of the Content of the Course Versus the Instructor.

TABLE II

The Average Number of Graduate Courses Completed
by 1956-Summer Session Graduate Students—
Based on Their Opinion as to the Greater
Importance of the Content of the Course
or the Instructor

	Number of Responses	Average Number of Courses Taken at S.D.S.C.
Instructor More Important	37	5.13
Content More Important	17	7.12

More than twice as many students agreed that the instructor was more important than the content of the course. It was interesting to notice that those who considered the content of great importance had taken an average of two more courses than those who thought that the instructor was more important. Table VII showed that both groups placed almost the same practical value on the courses which they had taken.

Suggestions Made by Graduate Students for the Improvement of
the Graduate Education Curriculum at South Dakota State College

The students were asked in the opinionnaire to name other courses which they thought should be taught at the graduate level.

Of the sixty opinionnaires returned, twenty contained some type of suggestion.

Three high school teachers asked for more elementary courses at the graduate level.

Three principals asked for courses in school law.

Four students asked that graduate classes present less theory and more material of practical value.

The courses or suggestions listed below were mentioned only one time.

- *1. Public Relations.
- *2. School Finance.
3. Audio-visual.
- *4. Industrial Arts.
- *5. History of Industrial Arts.
6. Speech.
- *7. Mathematics.
8. Math Methods.
- *9. Technical Ag. Courses.
10. Practical Farm Shop Courses.
- *11. Advanced Psychology. (During the school year to in-service teachers).
12. Teaching Problems.
- *13. Methods of teaching at advanced levels.
14. Methods of setting up class schedules.
- *15. Subject content courses of subjects taught.
16. More guidance courses.

*These courses are now offered at the graduate level. This fact was probably overlooked or else the need for more courses of that type was felt.

SECTION III

Summary

The ratings given by graduate students did not appear to be greatly affected by:

1. The amount of experience.
2. The type of position held.
3. The year in which the work was taken.
4. Financial recognition of the Masters Degree by the school.
5. The students' opinions regarding the importance of the instructor or the content of the course.

The average number of courses taken by the selected groups:

1. Increased with the amount of teaching experience.
2. Was more than twice as much for superintendents as for either high school teachers or principals.
3. Was about the same in schools which gave financial recognition of the Masters Degree as those which did not.
4. Those who thought that the content of the course was more important than the instructor averaged two more graduate courses at South Dakota State College.

The greatest criticism came from those who felt that courses should be made more practical and less theoretical.

Conclusions

1. Most graduate students in Education and Psychology appear to be fairly well pleased with the practical value of the graduate courses at South Dakota State College.
2. Some courses were of more practical value than others.
3. The practical value of the courses, rather than the outside factors, appeared to be the main criterion in evaluating the courses.
4. The average number of graduate courses completed appeared to be influenced by several different factors.
5. Graduate students have needs that have not been met by the present Graduate Education Program.

Suggestions for Further Study

This is a status study and does not attempt to explain why some courses rate lower than others. A study to discover how some courses could be made more practical would be valuable.

This study was administered to a select group. A similar study including those who have already received their Masters Degree, those attending during the regular term, and those who have discontinued their graduate work would be more conclusive.

Although the writer does not feel that any recommendations can be made which are conclusive, he would like to make some suggestions that are believed to be worthy of consideration:

1. That counseling and guidance services be made more readily available to graduate students.
2. That members of the faculty consider the evaluation of their own courses with the help of student questionnaires.

LITERATURE CITED

- Covert, Warren O. Grad's Opinions, Survey Provides Food For Thought, Clearing House, XLIII, May 1949.
- Gary, Ryland W. Curriculum Adaptation to Changing Needs, School Life, XLIV, (September 1953).
- Dexter, Ralph W. A Questionnaire for the Criticism and Evaluation of a College Course, School Science and Mathematics, XLIV, (October 1944).
- Kilpatrick, William H. What We Want of Our Teachers, New Republic, XLIV, December 21, 1953.
- Hansel, L. J. Survey of Veterans Attitudes and Opinions Relating to Their Education at South Dakota State College, Problem written in partial fulfillment for the Master of Science Degree at South Dakota State College, June, 1950.
- Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition Unabridged, G. & C. Merriam Company, Massachusetts, 1955.

APPENDIX A

A STUDENT EVALUATION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION
COURSES AT SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE

Opinionnaire

Explanation: Rate only those graduate courses taken at South Dakota State College prior to January 1, 1956. Base your evaluation on the practical value each course has had in your job as a teacher or as an administrator.

			1	2	3	4	5
Title of Course	Course Number	Year Taken	No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Considerable Value	Great Value
1. Advanced Driver Education	149						
2. Public School Administration	160						
3. Principles of Vocational Ed.	161						
4. H. S. Organ. & Administration	163						
5. Educational Measurements	164						
6. Psychological Testing	165						
7. Institutional Pub. Relations	165						
8. Educational Statistics	168						
9. The School Curriculum	169						
10. Workshop in Education	170						
11. Education Seminar	175						
12. Seminar in Ag. Education	176						
13. Prin. of College Teaching	185						
14. Organ. and Admin. of Ele. Ed.	220						
15. Advanced Ed. Psychology	240						

			1	2	3	4	5
Title of Course	Course Number	Year Taken	No Value	Little Value	Some Value	Considerable Value	Great Value
16. Adm. of School Guidance Prog.	245						
17. Ele. School Supervision	260						
18. Sec. School Supervision	261						
19. Business Adm. of Schools	262						
20. School Bldgs. and Grounds	264						
21. Research Meth. in Education	270						
22. Adult Ed. in Vocational Ag.	272						
23. Supv. Farm Pract. & FFA Programs	273						
24. Curriculum in Vocational Ag.	277						
25. Research Prob. in Ed. or Ag. Ed.	280						
26. Research in Ag. Education	282						
27. Thesis in Education	299						
28. Psychological Testing	165						
29. Mental Hygiene	166						
30. Social Psychology	167						
31. Psychology of Adolescence	170						
32. Abnormal Psychology	171						
33. Advanced Ed. Psychology	240						

☐ Male ☐ Female Years of Experience

Does your school give financial recognition to advanced degrees?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Teaching field last year:

1. Elementary: Grade or grades taught last year

2. High School: Subjects taught last year

3. Supervision: ☐ Ele. Principal ☐ H. S. Principal ☐ Supt.

What other courses do you think should be taught at the graduate level?

Which is more important in determining the value of a course?

☐ Content of the course ☐ The instructor