

THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY
THROUGH EXTENSION

by

VIRON ALONZO MOORE

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

June 1953

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor and Dean of Education

In Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

Chairman of School Graduate Committee

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented May 12, 1953

Typed by Helen G. Brown

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An expression of deep appreciation must be made to all persons, known and unknown, through whose fine cooperation this survey and report have been made possible.

The writer is especially appreciative of the assistance of Dr. F. R. Zeran, the major adviser, for his constant help and guidance in the development of this project and of Dr. J. F. Cramer, Dr. H. R. Laslett, and Dr. R. R. Reichart for many constructive suggestions and much valuable help during the planning and writing of the thesis. The other members of my graduate committee, Dr. H. P. Hansen, Dr. J. G. Jensen, and Mr. S. E. Williamson have also provided valuable assistance.

This survey and report would have been impossible if the help of those who answered the questionnaires had not been so kindly given. The writer is grateful for their help. The work of Mrs. Helen G. Brown, who took much time in addition to her regular work to type this report, is also appreciated.

Many others, such as the librarians at Oregon State College, the deans of many graduate schools, and the directors of many extension divisions, have greatly aided in completing this research. Thanks are also due to family and friends for their patience and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Importance of the Study	1
	Purpose, Assumptions, and Limitations of the Study	4
	Definitions of Terms Used	6
	Scope of the Study	7
	Reasons for Using the Questionnaire Method	8
	Administering the Questionnaire	9
	Treatment of the Data	11
II	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	12
	The University Extension Movement	12
	The Literature and Studies Related to the Problem	21
	The Contemporary Situation	44
	Summary	60
III	THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS	65
	The Graduate Extension Instructor	67
	Achievement in Graduate Extension Work	85
	Organizational and Physical Arrangements for Graduate Extension Classes	98
	Summary	106
IV	THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY DEANS OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS	109
	Staff Requirements	110
	Course Requirements and Approvals	113
	The Status of Graduate Extension Credit	118
	Organizational and Physical Provisions for Graduate Extension Classes	124
	Planning the Student's Program	131
	Summary	134

CHAPTER	PAGE
V THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS	137
The Graduate Extension Student	137
Student Evaluation of Instruction and Facilities	145
The Students' Use and Evaluation of Extension Services	154
Summary	161
VI THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION DIVISIONS	162
The Cooperating Extension Divisions	164
The Graduate Extension Program	170
Problems of Administration	175
Comments and Suggestions of Directors of Extension	182
Summary	192
VII SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	196
Summary of Findings	196
Conclusions	205
BIBLIOGRAPHY	211
APPENDICES	215
APPENDIX A List of Institutions Replying to Pre- liminary Inquiry Letters	216
APPENDIX B Preliminary Inquiry Letter Written to Directors of Extension	220
APPENDIX C Preliminary Inquiry Letter Written to Deans of Graduate Schools	222
APPENDIX D Letter to Directors of Extension Accompany- ing Questionnaires for Graduate School Faculty Members, Graduate School Deans, and Graduate Extension Students	224
APPENDIX E Questionnaire for Graduate School Faculty Members	227
APPENDIX F Questionnaire for Deans of Graduate Schools	233

	PAGE
APPENDIX G Questionnaire for Students Registered in Graduate Extension Classes	242
APPENDIX H Letter to Directors of Extension Accom- panying Director's Questionnaire	247
APPENDIX I Questionnaire for Directors of Extension	249

TABLE OF TABLES

Table	Title	Page
I	Numbers of Replies Received From the Graduate Deans and Extension Directors of Seventy-six Institutions in Reply to a Preliminary Inquiry Letter	45
II	Returns From Questionnaires Sent to 350 Graduate School Faculty Members of Fourteen Institutions	66
III	The Sex Distribution of 211 Graduate Extension Instructors	67
IV	The Age Distribution of 211 Graduate Extension Instructors	68
V	Academic Status of 211 Graduate Extension Instructors	69
VI	Highest Academic Degrees Held by 211 Graduate Extension Instructors	71
VII	Academic Ranks of 211 Graduate Extension Instructors	72
VIII	Experience of 211 Graduate Extension Instructors in Higher Education	73
IX	Positions Held by 211 Graduate Extension Instructors According to Fields and Ranks Presented	75
X	Relationship of Extension Teaching to the Regular Assignment as Reported by 211 Instructors	76
XI	Comparison of Amount of Preparation, Size of Class, Amount of Time Spent with Graduate Students in Extension and in Campus Situations	78
XII	Reasons for Instructing Graduate Extension Courses as Reported by 211 Instructors	80
XIII	Arrangements for Compensation and Influence on Availability of 211 Instructors	83
XIV	Quality of Graduate Extension Instruction as Reported by 211 Instructors	85

Table	Title	Page
XV	Distances Traveled to Teach Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 211 Instructors	88
XVI	Comparison of the Achievement of Graduate Extension Students with Campus Graduate Students as Reported by 211 Instructors	89
XVII	Comparison of Grade Distributions in Identical Graduate Classes Taught Through Extension with Daytime On-campus Classes	90
XVIII	Comparison of Performance of Graduate Extension Students with Graduate Campus Students as Reported by 211 Instructors	92
XIX	Age Spread of Students Attending Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 211 Instructors	95
XX	Characteristics of Graduate Extension Class Membership in Terms of Spread of Abilities, Test Scores, and Grade Distribution Compared with Campus Graduate Classes as Reported by 211 Instructors	96
XXI	Sex Distribution in Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 211 Instructors	98
XXII	Frequency and Duration of Meetings of Graduate Extension Courses as Reported by 211 Instructors	99
XXIII	Class Organization in Terms of Instruction Method as Reported by 211 Instructors	100
XXIV	Administrative Arrangements for Meeting Students as Reported by 211 Instructors	101
XXV	Library Provisions for Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 211 Instructors	103
XXVI	Adequacy of Classrooms for Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 211 Instructors	105
XXVII	Status of Staff Members Approved in Fourteen Institutions Who Instruct Graduate Extension Classes	111
XXVIII	Minimum Academic Degree Requirements of Fourteen Graduate Schools for Instructing Graduate Extension Courses	112

Table	Title	Page
XXIX	Minimum Academic Rank Requirements at Fourteen Institutions for Instructing Graduate Extension Courses	113
XXX	Course Requirements at Fourteen Institutions for Graduate Extension Work	114
XXXI	Approving Authorities in Fourteen Institutions for Graduate Extension Work	117
XXXII	Sources of Requests for Permission to Organize Graduate Extension Classes in Fourteen Institutions	118
XXXIII	Acceptance and Use of Graduate Extension Credits in Fourteen Institutions	119
XXXIV	Semester Hours of Graduate Extension Credit Applicable Toward Various Academic Degrees in Fourteen Institutions	122
XXXV	Organizational Plans Through Which Graduate Extension Work is Offered by Fourteen Institutions	124
XXXVI	Library Provisions for Graduate Extension Classes in Fourteen Institutions	126
XXXVII	Concerning Laboratories Provided for Graduate Extension Classes in Fourteen Institutions	129
XXXVIII	Concerning Graduate Work Through Correspondence Study in Fourteen Institutions	130
XXXIX	Planning the Graduate Extension Students' Programs in Fourteen Institutions	132
XL	The Sex Distribution of 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	138
XLI	The Marital Status of 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	139
XLII	Number of Children of 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	140
XLIII	Age Distribution of 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	140
XLIV	Employment Status of 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	141
XLV	Highest Academic Degrees Held by 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	142

Table	Title	Page
XLVI	Degrees for Which 1,475 Graduate Extension Students are Studying	143
XLVII	Reasons of 1,475 Students for Taking Graduate Extension Work	144
XLVIII	1,149 Students Compare Graduate Extension Work with Similar Campus Work	146
XLIX	Library and Laboratory Facilities Provided for 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	149
L	Frequency of Meetings of Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 1,475 Students	151
LI	Locations of Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 1,475 Students	152
LII	Adequacy of Classrooms of Graduate Extension Classes as Reported by 1,475 Students	153
LIII	Planning the Programs of 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	154
LIV	Semester Hours of Graduate Extension Credit Applicable Toward Advanced Degrees as Reported by 1,475 Students	156
LV	Number of Semester Hours of Graduate Credit Already Earned by 1,475 Graduate Students Through Extension Classes	157
LVI	Extension Services Used by 1,475 Graduate Extension Students	158
LVII	Ratings of Extension Services Given by 229 Graduate Students	160
LVIII	Types of Institutions Represented by Thirteen Extension Divisions	165
LIX	A Comparison of Extension Division Student Enrollments with Campus Enrollments in the Institutions They Represent for the Academic Year 1951-1952	167
LX	A Comparison of Total Student Extension Enrollments with Graduate Extension Enrollments in Thirteen Extension Divisions for the Academic Year 1951-1952	169

Table	Title	Page
LXI	Fields Having the Largest Graduate Student Enrollments During the Academic Year 1951-1952 in Thirteen Extension Divisions	170
LXII	Specially Organized Graduate Extension Programs Conducted by Thirteen Extension Divisions	172
LXIII	The Number of Locations, Number of Classes, and Graduate Extension Enrollments, According to Organizational Arrangements in Eleven Extension Divisions for the Fall Term, 1952	173
LXIV	Factors Limiting the Extent of the Graduate Extension Programs in Thirteen Extension Divisions	176
LXV	Methods of Approving the Scheduling of Graduate Extension Classes in Thirteen Extension Divisions	178
LXVI	Supervision of Graduate Extension Instruction in Thirteen Extension Divisions	180
LXVII	Status of Graduate Extension Credit in Thirteen Extension Divisions	181

THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Study

The right of all the people to learn at all levels is the principle upon which the extension movement is founded. Literally, the word, "extension", implies that the traditional functions of teaching students are extended beyond the campus boundaries and that a wider clientele is to be served.

From simple beginnings, extension education has grown to include all kinds of instruction from hundreds of state institutions, independent institutions, and secondary schools. Today there is rather wide acceptance of extension education at the undergraduate level and a lesser acceptance of extension education at the graduate level.

Because of the very nature of graduate extension study, the problems of acceptance, organization, administration, instruction, and evaluation have become the immediate concern of the graduate schools everywhere—not only for those who may be asked to accept credits toward advanced degrees, but also for those responsible for its quality.

There is an increasingly greater number of college graduates in our professional and work-a-day world who desire opportunity for advanced study. These persons cannot or should not resign from their positions

to return to the campuses to study. They believe it is possible for the university to bring graduate instruction to them and that with graduate faculty leadership in extension classes, they can reach a high and creditable level of achievement.

Houle (47, pp.12-13), referring to the university extension movements in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States, says:

There is occurring in all three countries a great increase in the number of adults who wish or demand to be taught, and this is only the advance wave of a new social phenomenon, adult education on the most massive scale. As people learn, they want to know more. The enormous spread of literacy, the increase in age of compulsory attendance at school, the lateral expansion of secondary schools and college and junior college study, all are visibly operating toward the creation of a vast clientele for formal adult education. These men and women, striving to learn, to improve their own resources as individuals, as workers, and as social beings, will not be put off.

Even though a considerable number of people are being reached today through their extension divisions, it was the opinion of the President's Commission on Higher Education that these activities were insignificant in comparison to the needs to be met. The Commission made a plea for a much greater activity by the university in the adult education field, which, if met, would mean an additional expansion of extension education in the future. The Commission states (16, p.38): "The time has come to expand considerably our program of adult education, and to make more of it the responsibility of our colleges and universities." The report goes on to say (16, p.97):

The present status of university extension services makes it painfully clear that the colleges and universities do not recognize adult education as their potentially greatest service to democratic

society This state of affairs cannot be permitted to continue. The colleges and universities should elevate adult education to a position of equal importance with any other of their functions. The extension department should be charged with the task of channeling the resources of every teaching unit of the institution into the adult education program.

The expanding role of university extension necessitates that research be conducted in many areas of its activity. Graduate study through extension is one of these areas, and it is believed that research which will aid in determining the status of this important aspect of university extension education will provide a basis upon which an improved program may be developed.

As long as there are educational leaders in our institutions of higher learning who believe that all graduate level work should be conducted in the environment of the campus with its great library and the opportunity it affords to associate with people who are following the "business" of learning, the problem will remain unresolved.

Such information as this study proposes to discover should prove very helpful to college presidents and deans of graduate schools everywhere because they are responsible for developing acceptable policies to guide the institutions they control. Faculty members of the graduate schools who serve on extension councils and budget committees desire insights to enable them to make wise decisions and finally to instruct well. Extension administrators need to have pride and confidence in the status of their graduate work and the graduate students in extension must rest assured that their studies are respectable and acceptable.

Other studies which have been made have surveyed deans of graduate schools, departmental heads, and extension directors concerning various problems in extension education. Nearly all of these studies are too old to be of significance today. The only current study known to the writer which holds great promise is one which was proposed to the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, in November, 1952, by its Committee on Off-Campus Graduate Study. A preliminary survey has already been made for this group by Rees (31, pp.7-11) and the results he obtained are reported in Chapter II of this study. The final report of the "Rees Committee" will include an evaluation of off-campus graduate study in land-grant colleges and universities belonging to the Association.

The present study is unique in that, while it obtained data from a limited number of deans of graduate schools and extension directors who represented a limited number of selected institutions, it included responses from 211 graduate school faculty members and 1,475 graduate extension students. Much of the information obtained in this study has not been included in any previous study.

The Purpose, Assumptions, and Limitations of the Study

The Purpose

The purpose of this study is to ascertain in some measure the status of graduate study through extension, and to present the information obtained in such a manner that it may be of material value to such administrative and supervisory personnel as are charged with the responsibility of developing and providing a satisfactory graduate extension program.

More specifically, the purpose of this study is to determine:

- (a) the attitudes of staff members instructing graduate extension courses toward the quality of instruction and student achievement,
- (b) the controls and requirements exercised by the graduate schools,
- (c) how graduate students use and evaluate the services of university extension, and (d) the scope of the graduate extension program, its limitations, and its supervision as reported by extension directors.

Assumptions

Any research investigation is likely to be preceded by assumptions in the mind of the investigator. The following are applicable to this study:

1. That much graduate study offered through university extension is successful.
2. That instructional staffs and administrative staffs, alike, are not in agreement concerning the quality of graduate extension work or the amount a student should be permitted to take.
3. That there is great variation in the amounts and in the kinds of graduate extension work offered through the many extension divisions.
4. That pressure is being exerted increasingly on extension divisions and campuses for a greater graduate program through extension.
5. That graduate students, graduate school faculty members, deans of graduate schools, and directors of extension are competent to respond to the questionnaires directed to them.
6. That, because of the great distances and the large number of persons to be contacted in the study, the questionnaire is the best instrument to use.

Limitations

This is a questionnaire study providing opportunity for objective responses and, in many instances, giving opportunity for explanations and for expressions of opinions. Like all questionnaire studies, it is subject to certain limitations and weaknesses. Among these limitations and weaknesses are tendencies to (a) respond in a manner which seems desirable, (b) desire to create a good impression, (c) assign different meanings to given words, and (d) respond emotionally to certain items (2, pp.4-5).

This study is limited to the graduate level instruction offered to graduate students through university extension for which credit may be earned and applied toward an advanced degree at a college or university. It is further limited to studying the status of such instruction in a selected group of extension divisions.

Definitions of Terms Used

A careful definition of terms is basic in any study. Such definitions as are given provide a basis for better understanding and interpretation of the study. Some of the terms used in this study are defined by the writer:

Extension division. The organizational unit of a college or university which administers some or all of the institution's activities for persons not in residence, these activities being conducted on or off campus.

Extension center. A place in a city or other concentration of population where a number of extension division activities are conducted, and where a full or part-time member of the extension staff who administers the program is in residence.

Graduate extension. The program of study offered through extension for which graduate credit toward an advanced academic degree may be earned and applied.

Graduate extension movement. The trend in higher education to serve at the graduate level college or university graduates not in residence. These services are provided through university extension.

Non-center extension class. A class organized outside of and independently of an extension center. Such classes are usually organized off campus.

Organizational pattern. The particular type of plan, such as correspondence study, short course, or evening class, used to provide instruction to the student.

University extension. (See "Extension division")

University extension movement. The trend in higher education to serve persons not in residence, either through off-campus activities or by bringing these persons to the campus for short periods of time.

Scope of the Study

This study consists of a review of the historical background of extension education in America, with special reference to graduate study, and a questionnaire study of "The Status of Graduate Extension Study".

The material included in the section on historical background was secured primarily from (a) the literature and studies related to the problem, and (b) 136 personal letters received by the writer from sixty-nine deans of graduate schools and sixty-seven directors of extension.

The questionnaire study on "The Status of Graduate Work Through Extension" included information gathered from four different sets of questionnaires which were mailed to 2,800 graduate extension students, 350 graduate school faculty members, and the graduate school deans and the directors of the extension divisions of fourteen selected institutions.

The fourteen participating institutions were selected on the basis of geographic location, enrollment in graduate extension work, number of faculty members teaching graduate extension classes, organizational arrangements for graduate extension instruction in terms of graduate centers and evening classes, and willingness of the deans and directors to cooperate in making the survey.

Reasons for Using the Questionnaire Method

Because of the great number of individuals to be contacted over such a large geographic area and because of the limitations of time and expense, the questionnaire was adopted as the only feasible method to use in making this study.

While the questionnaire method is criticized by many and though it has its weaknesses, it is nevertheless considered an important and satisfactory means of research. Koos calls attention to the importance of the questionnaire in the following way (20, pp.144-145):

It should mean something for the legitimation of questionnaire investigation that the proportion of educational literature taking rise in it is so large—roughly a fourth of all published articles or of space occupied by them. It should be significant, also, that the proportions are approximately equal in educational periodicals and in research series published by higher institutions; not only do reports of questionnaire studies pass muster with the editors of periodicals, but they are approved in about the same proportions by those who render judgment on the typically more substantial investigations submitted as doctors' dissertations or are otherwise published in monograph form.

Good, Barr, and Scates state (11, p.325):

The questionnaire is an important instrument in normative-survey research, being used to gather information from widely scattered sources.

Authorities agree that, if the questionnaire is to produce valid results, great care must be taken in its construction, validation, and administration. It is further agreed that the data obtained must be given correct tabulation and interpretation (11, p.325).

As a background for constructing and perfecting the four questionnaires, the following steps were taken:

1. The proceedings of all the annual meetings of the National University Extension Association from 1915 (when it was founded) to the present were examined. The annual proceedings of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities were studied, as well as the institutional catalogs of the participating institutions.
2. One hundred thirty-six personal letters from graduate school deans and directors of extension were carefully read and analyzed, and all of the extension division and graduate school literature forwarded by the deans and directors was examined (about 105 pamphlets and bulletins).
3. The General Extension Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education approved the study and the head administrative officers conferred with the writer many times and examined the questionnaires. Excellent suggestions for additional items, revisions, and deletions were made.
4. The questionnaires were submitted to a jury of experts for their suggestions. These men were selected members of the graduate faculty at Oregon State College. Altogether, seven men in this group gave assistance, considerable time being spent with each. The questionnaires were examined item by item, which in effect constituted a trial run.

Administering the Questionnaire

A package of questionnaires was mailed to the extension directors of each of the fourteen selected institutions. Each package contained

200 questionnaires for graduate students, twenty-five for graduate school faculty members, and one for the graduate school dean. An individually-typed letter accompanied the package. Six weeks later questionnaires were mailed to the fourteen extension directors. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were attached to all questionnaires.

Because of the time needed to get the material distributed to the various classes and centers throughout each state, a month and a half were to pass before the first follow-up letter was sent to each extension director, giving him a report of the returns from his institution.

Since this was a sampling study, and since the questionnaires to the faculty and students did not require signatures, there was no way to send individual follow-up letters. To guarantee a sufficient sampling, a total of 2,800 students were handed questionnaires (200 in each division). It was decided that a 50 per cent return would be considered a sufficient sampling of students. Likewise, twenty-five graduate school faculty members were contacted at each division with the idea that, while the return might be higher, a 50 per cent sampling would be sufficient. It was hoped that all of the graduate school deans and directors of extension would reply.

The study was based on a return of 1,475, or 53 per cent, of the questionnaires from graduate students in extension; 211, or 60 per cent, of the questionnaires from graduate school faculty members; 14, or 93 per cent, of the questionnaires from the graduate school deans; and 13, or 93 per cent, of the questionnaires from the extension directors.

Treatment of the Data

The data obtained from the graduate students were entered on Hollerith cards which made it possible to do the tabulations mechanically on International Business Machines equipment. Explanations and comments were scrutinized carefully and summarized without mechanical assistance.

The questionnaires of faculty, deans, and directors were tabulated manually so that all explanations and comments could be read and become a part of the study. Since the total number of questionnaires in each of these three categories is considerably less than for the students, no particular problems were presented by manually tabulating them.

The data were carefully studied for possible relationships and implications, and only that information which seemed significant was used. It was on this basis that the report of the study was made.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The University Extension Movement

Early Beginnings of University Extension

"The idea of bringing people to the university is American. The idea of taking the university to the people is English. The term, 'University Extension', had its origin in England, and until 1887, University Extension was little known in this country [United States]." (47, p.130).

After a Cambridge University fellow had been experimenting with a series of lectures for six years, that institution officially established an extension program in 1873. The fellow also developed the technique of making use of the printed syllabus and of examinations (13, pp.10-11). By the year 1877, Oxford had initiated a first traveling library and had experimented with lectures (6, p.34). The following year an official program of extension was organized (13, p.38). These first beginnings at Cambridge and Oxford were quickly accepted by other English universities and by 1890 there were over 200 extension programs in operation (25, p.417).

The concept of the right of all men to learning is an old one, and it is said by some to be the basic foundation of the university extension movement in the United States (17, p.51). Before the middle of the nineteenth century, the universities were serving a very few only, and if

more were to be served, revolutionary changes were indicated. In the meantime, other methods were being used to educate the masses.

Among the early methods of adult education were the New England town meetings, which were the forerunners of our present-day community forums. One, too, should not overlook the "lecture activities" of our founding fathers, who were just as much men of thought as they were men of action (47, p.129). Greese (6, p.36), referring to such "lecture activities", mentioned the contribution of the mechanics' institutes of the early nineteenth hundreds in England and America; and others (47, p.129) mentioned the competition among the mercantile libraries, historical societies, mechanics' institutes, and philosophical societies for lectures on technical subjects.

The American lyceum used such techniques as debate and group discussion which later were to become so popular in extension. Josiah Holbrook of Derby, Connecticut, is credited with originating the first lyceum in America in 1826. The idea became so well accepted that by 1834 there were 3,000 branches over the country. Each branch had a weekly program consisting of essays, debates, lectures, and discussions, all of which helped spread the idea of popular education in our country (14, pp.VII-XII).

Present-day evidences of the influence of the lyceum movement are the programs of the Lowell Institute of Boston, the Peabody Institute of Baltimore, and the Brooklyn Institute and Cooper Union. The present-day men's and women's service clubs are considered direct descendants of the lyceum (47, p.129).

The chautauqua was more significant than the lyceum as far as university extension was concerned. It grew out of a two-weeks' summer camp meeting of Sunday school teachers in 1874 and mushroomed into a folk university almost overnight. It was given a university charter by the State of New York in 1883.

The activities of the chautauqua included lectures, classes in college subjects, teachers' institutes, discussion groups and seminars, directed home reading and correspondence courses, concerts, exhibitions, and entertainments (47, p.130). As the times moved toward the nineteen hundreds, the programs of chautauqua became more formally organized into summer sessions, correspondence courses, and courses for college credit (13, p.13). It is understandable, then, that by 1900, it was necessary that chautauqua surrender its charter to the universities, to which belonged, properly, the credit-granting and degree-granting functions.

The lyceum movement before the Civil War and the chautauqua movement after the Civil War met the needs of the people who were ready to learn and who were not being served by the universities. It has been noted that the "extension of education" to the off-campus public became strongest in countries of democratic traditions where enlightenment and literacy for all was emphasized. Bittner said (25, p.417):

Historically, university extension is best understood as a part of the rising interest in adult education in countries where political democracy and rapid industrialization put a premium on literacy, knowledge, and skill in the interest of social utility.

In 1887, at a meeting of the American Library Association, Herbert B. Adams, Professor of History at Johns Hopkins University, advocated university extension for America (47, p.130). The same year, immediate results were evident with the establishment of extension activities at Buffalo, Chicago, and St. Louis, under the auspices of the public libraries (13, p.13).

By 1890, the Philadelphia Society for the Extension of University Teaching was organized, and its first secretary was soon to visit England to study methods used there (13, p.14). A similar organization was founded in Chicago the next year and a national convention was held in December to encourage university extension teaching (6, p.14). Reber (30, p.2) points out that good reports were made at the convention and that great expansion seemed just ahead. Action was taken at the meeting to establish a seminary for extension workers to meet the following year (17, p.359).

Although university professors and others closely associated with higher education participated fully in the activities described above, and while the term, "university extension", was used, there was as yet no official connection with any institution of higher learning (7, p.13).

Early Extension Divisions

The University of Wisconsin and the University of Chicago are credited with establishing the first official institutional extension activities. Wisconsin's legislature provided, in 1885, \$10,000 yearly for the purpose of distributing the results of its research activities to the people through farmers' institutes. Over sixty institutes were held each year

(17, p.313). The same year the Dean of Agriculture at Wisconsin developed the "short course" idea (43, p.702). Wisconsin's program remained chiefly one for agriculture until 1906, when a reorganization took place.

The Chicago program was revolutionary and it is frequently cited as the first extension effort, because, for the first time in America, university extension appeared as a formal, permanent division of a university (47, p.130). William Raney Harper, the University of Chicago's first president, founded the extension division in 1889. Harper, a former chautauqua man, named as his extension director, Professor Richard G. Moulton, who had been trained in the British system. The first annual register of the University of Chicago announces a comprehensive extension division and lists as extension departments those of lecture, classwork, correspondence teaching, library, and training. By 1915, however, only a correspondence department remained (47, pp.130-131).

Chicago's plan is considered a major advance in the promotion of the extension movement in the United States. Three features of the movement are mentioned by Creese (6, pp.44-45):

First, it established extension as a formal, permanent division of the university; second, the details of a thoroughgoing adjustment to other universities were set forth in what we, in this day, would call an integrated plan; and third, along with the English type, there appeared at Chicago an extension program such as chautauqua had had, offering in the classroom and by mail, college courses for college credit.

By this time the chautauqua was surrendering some of its responsibilities to the universities and it would appear that much was in

store for university extension, but, instead, the so-called "lean years" came. From 1891 until 1906 extension education reached its lowest ebb. The chautauqua had surrendered the title of "university", had surrendered the right to award university degrees, had given up most of its correspondence study, and had "resigned extension lecturing to the universities" (6, pp.48-49). The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching reported that, of 22,974 persons who attended extension activities in 1899-1900, only 380 wrote papers and only twenty-nine qualified for certificates (6, p.49). It is a matter of record that President Harper seemed to become discouraged to the point of giving very little attention to his own program and that only twelve additional divisions were organized during the fifteen years (6, p.49).

Baldwin M. Woods and Helen V. Hammarberg suggested the following possible reasons for the failure of extension work to grow between 1891 and 1906 (47, p.131):

Perhaps the fundamental reason was that the initial enthusiasm was not accompanied by the thorough planning which experience has proved is necessary to initiate and carry on any Extension programme. There was also probably too much dependence on inspirational lectures. The other reasons given might apply today; inflexibility of much university organization; unwillingness to adapt university methods to the needs and training of adults; insistence that programmes adhere to strict university academic standards; lack of financial support; lack of suitable university extension lecturers; inability of university faculty members to carry the extra burden of travel and teaching; greater claims of academic service on college campuses; and development of less expensive forms of popular education.

In Reber's study of 1913, lack of confidence in the quality of work given is mentioned as a cause of decline. Some institutions seemed to be afraid of loss of prestige if they participated in extension education.

There was also jealousy among staff members concerning the sizes of classes, the fees to be charged, and the wages to be received (30, p.8).

Creese mentioned lack of financial support, overloading of staff members, and greater claims for campus work (6, p.49) and Hall-Quest stated the main reason for failure to be one of management, that is, a failure to re-adapt to the off-campus adult situation (13, p.17).

The year, 1906, has become known as the "revival year". President Charles R. van Hise of the University of Wisconsin employed Dean Louis E. Reber of Pennsylvania State College to come and direct his extension program. Dean Reber came with very definite ideas--ideas which were to establish the "Wisconsin tradition" and finally to become the "tradition" of university extension today.

Dean Reber moved away from the purely academic and cultural concept of extension education to the all-embracing concept of education and service. He added agricultural, industrial, political, social, and moral concepts to the academic and the cultural. When President van Hise was speaking about Wisconsin's reorganization eleven years later at the first meeting of the National University Extension Association, he said (47, p.131):

If a university is to have as its ideal service on the broadest basis, it cannot escape taking on the function of carrying knowledge to the people. This is but another phraseology for University Extension, if this be defined as extension of knowledge to the masses rather than extension of the scope of the university along traditional lines.

The above quotation does not imply that the university was the only service agency which brought education to the people, but it does imply, it seems, that knowledge had been advancing too rapidly to be assimilated

in the short period of formal schooling provided for those who could attend. It does seem to imply, too, that the university was considered the best agency to carry on extension work.

While state-supported institutions have adopted the Wisconsin idea, the privately endowed schools seem to have followed the University of Chicago pattern. These schools seem committed to the serving of selected clientele at the highest levels of academic and cultural study and to experimentation in leadership training and improvement of teaching materials and techniques (47, p.132).

The National University Extension Association

The Wisconsin idea received a great deal of attention from other states between 1906 and 1915, and representatives from many of the other institutions visited the Madison campus to learn. So complete was the provision for all the people that President van Hise made the following statement in 1913 (43, p.706):

It is now literally true that there is not a man, or woman, boy or girl, of the two and a half million people in Wisconsin whom the University is not prepared to teach anything he or she wishes to know. Probably this record is unmatched in all the other institutions of the world. There is something inspiring in this thought of a university with the whole state for its campus and the whole population for its student body

By 1913, twenty-one institutions had reorganized their programs and twenty-eight others had newly organized divisions (30, p.6). In most instances, the divisions had established departments with specifically designated functions. Some legislatures had made appropriations, but most of the financial support came from fees collected and from other funds which could be diverted for the purpose (30, p.6).

The National University Extension Association was founded in 1915, and its first annual meeting was held at Madison, Wisconsin. The membership consisted of twenty-two institutions of various types and locations (6, p.55). Through this national organization, member divisions have been able to exchange ideas and inspirations and to make studies cooperatively at the national level. The findings of such studies have been made available to all member institutions and have added to the background of useful information.

One need but study the proceedings of the annual meeting of 1925 to discover the wide range of activities at the end of the first ten years. Among the committee reports listed are those on travel courses, workers' education, cooperation between libraries and extension divisions, high school achievement contests, and radio broadcasting. In addition, the subjects listed for discussion were visual instruction, field organization, short courses, package libraries, university credit for correspondence courses, and broadcasting university extension courses (26, p.4).

Since 1925 the list of activities in university extension has increased considerably. In addition to those mentioned in the 1925 proceedings, there may be added such activities as the production of motion picture films, television, touring theater groups, and consultative aids for community theater groups (4, pp.2-74), centers for continuation study (29, pp.1-8), overseas extension centers for servicemen (33, pp.86-87), institutes for labor and industrial relations (18, p.46), and correspondence courses correlated with radio (48, p.302).

At the present time, there are many organizational patterns among the various extension divisions and great variation in the methods and

adequacy of financing and, while there may not be uniformity of philosophy among the National University Extension Association membership (25, p.37), it may well be that the vision of university extension as expressed in 1890 by George Francis James, General Secretary of The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, still applies (17, p.55):

This, then, is University Extension. It is the bringing of the university to the people when, under our social and economic relations, the people can no longer go to the university. The privileges of knowledge shall be no longer only for those who are able to satisfy the conditions of academic residence, no longer for those alone who can go through years of careful preparation and devote additional years to the sole occupation of study. Once more, the university was founded for the people, and the aim of this movement is to have the people share as largely as may be its benefits.

The Literature and Studies Related to the Problem

A considerable amount of material has been written in the broad general field of adult education, of which university extension education is but a part. The literature which is pertinent to extension education, as such, is quite limited and research in the field is extremely inadequate. The chairman of the Research Committee of the National University Extension Association made the following statement at the annual meeting of the Association in 1951 (12, p.21):

This Committee on Research was organized because of our Association's realization that there is a woeful lack of research in the field of extension and adult education

Literature dealing with graduate extension study is virtually non-existent, except for that which is found in the Proceedings of the National University Extension Association from 1915 to the present. Much of the literature and all of the studies related to the problem, which are known to the writer, are summarized in the following pages.

Number of Institutions Offering Graduate Extension Work

Studies which reveal the number of institutions offering graduate extension work are reported below. The material is arranged in chronological order, tracing the graduate extension movement from 1919 to the present. Robertson's 1919 study was reported four years after the founding of the National University Extension Association and is the first study of its kind known to the writer.

Robertson (32, pp.51-52), in 1919, reported that sixteen of the universities holding membership in the National University Extension Association were offering academic credit for extension work and that eight of them were offering graduate credit toward the master's degree. These eight institutions were Columbia University, Pittsburg University, and the state universities of Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Wisconsin, Oregon, and South Dakota. Although Robertson did not name them, he reported that three of the above named institutions were offering work beyond the master's degree.

A committee of the National University Extension Association reported, in 1924, (15, pp.115-120) that of the forty-one institutions contacted, eighteen were accepting graduate extension credit toward advanced degrees, and three of them (Chicago University, Columbia University, and Yale

University) were accepting credit toward the doctor's degree. Such acceptance was conditioned upon the approval of the graduate schools of the particular institutions.

Powers' study (28, pp.167-176) found that twenty-nine of the forty-one institutions holding membership in the National University Extension Association had enrolled 2,564 graduate extension students during the academic year 1928-1929. He reported that when the work was done during the evenings on campus or in absentia, the work was "respected". He pointed out also that the alumni associations of some of the institutions were exerting pressure for graduate extension work.

In 1936 Shelby (36, pp.95-103) reported to the National University Extension Association on "Practices of Member Institutions with Respect to Graduate Credit for Extension Classes". He stated that, of the forty-two institutions replying to the questionnaire, thirty offered graduate credit for extension work. Twenty-eight of the institutions reported offering work toward the master's degree, twelve offered work toward the doctor's degree, and two failed to indicate the degree. Graduate work through extension was reported by Shelby to be on the increase.

Bittner, in 1936, (34, pp.279-308) wrote on "University and College Extension Work", but did not discuss graduate study as such. He did list, however, 108 colleges and universities having extension programs, and described each program individually. Thirty-two of the institutions in Bittner's list were reported to be offering graduate extension programs of study.

A National University Extension Association committee (37, pp.88-90) on "Extension Teaching Credit Courses" surveyed forty-seven institutions, in 1943, and found that thirty of them offered graduate credit through evening classes and that three of them offered graduate credit through correspondence study. Almost all of the subject matter fields were represented in the master's degree extension work, while the work toward the doctor's degree, as provided in twelve institutions, was somewhat more limited.

This above committee reported again in 1945 (38, p.66) of fifty institutions surveyed, that thirty-eight were offering graduate work through extension. This was an increase of eight institutions over the number in the 1943 report.

Lowry (21, pp.48-51), in 1950, reported on a study of "Evaluation of Graduate Work Offered by Land-Grant Institutions Through Off-Campus Study Arrangements". An inquiry was sent to fifty-four deans of graduate schools, of whom forty-five replied. Lowry found that twenty-nine institutions offered graduate extension work through evening classes outside of permanent centers, fourteen had established off-campus graduate centers, and 50 per cent conducted off-campus workshops for which graduate credit was given.

Rees (31, p.8) reported to the November 15, 1952, annual meeting of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities that forty-eight of the fifty-one member institutions offered evening and Saturday classes to students not in full residence. Forty of these reported holding the classes both on and off campus while seven stated "on campus only" and one stated "off campus only". Thirty-two of the institutions

reported conducting graduate classes more than seventy-five miles from the campuses.

Acceptance of the Idea of Graduate Extension Study

Patrick (27, pp.146-147), in 1928, forwarded letters to extension directors of institutions belonging to the National University Extension Association, asking them, "May extension work be counted toward the master's degree and for the doctorate degree?" He summarized his findings as an answer to the question (27, pp.146-147):

In a few instances, yes, and there is a possible tendency to make provisions more and more for the recognition of a small amount of graduate work to be done through extension, although the tendency is not general, indicating that there is still some difficulty to be solved before recognizing such work as being of graduate level.

In his recommendations Patrick (27, p.149) stated, "Where facilities can be provided, extension work might well be offered toward higher degrees."

Powers (28, pp.167-176) made a study, in 1929, of graduate work in extension in the forty-one institutions of the National University Extension Association. His survey included deans of schools of architecture, business administration, journalism; directors of university extension; and deans of graduate schools. His study revealed that the directors of extension tended to avoid the "headache" of graduate extension courses, and that many of the directors were concerned about the prestige and the economic value of academic degrees. Powers made certain observations and suggestions as a result of the study (28, pp.173-174).

The writer has summarized Powers' observations and suggestions as follow:

- a. Higher fees should be charged for graduate extension work.
- b. Extension directors should assume greater responsibility for the quality of graduate extension work than for the undergraduate work.
- c. Frills should be discarded in favor of good instruction.
- d. If extension does not serve the public educationally, private enterprise will.
- e. Extension must not be forced to discriminate against graduate adults.

Seig (35, pp.57-64), in 1934, contended that prejudice and tradition have linked the college with the high school and the activities of youth, and he asked whether it is not also linked with the activities of adults. He criticized the college for so much "course bookkeeping" and suggested more "intellectual stocktaking" to establish the graduate student's status. The comprehensive examination was recommended as a basis for establishing the student's status. What the individual knows is more important than knowing where he learned it! Seig stated (35, p.58):

In putting our numerous candidates through comprehensive examinations, we have not been able to find any distinction whatever between those who have pursued their courses through extension and those who have come to the campus.

While full-time study is preferable to part-time study, should extension students be denied the opportunity to study? Rather than to over-criticize extension, perhaps it should be complimented more for doing so well. Much extension work can be superior to campus work. On-the-job in-service education of teachers is an example. Graduate

work planned in cooperation with industry has been sometimes quite successful. The University of Pittsburg has an excellent arrangement with the Westinghouse Corporation. Academic remoteness is eliminated by holding classes in laboratories of the corporation (35, p.60).

Lowry (21, p.101), in his report to the National University Extension Association in May, 1938, on "The Situation in the South", stated that a committee of deans of southern graduate schools was appointed in 1931 by the Southern Association of Graduate Deans to study the problem of graduate extension study and to report its findings. The committee report, made in 1932, recommended that, "No credits toward graduate degrees may be obtained by correspondence study or extension study." The recommendation was adopted in 1935, reconsidered in 1936, and then re-adopted. Lowry reported he could find no record that this recommendation was ever adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, which is the recognized accrediting agency for the South. He pointed out, however, that common consent resulted among the southern deans and that most of the institutions in the South had limited their graduate extension programs to six semester hours of graduate work. Lowry states (21, p.103), "Frankly, I think we need fear no enforceable regulation against extension work, properly taken, for the master's degree. I have no comment to make respecting correspondence work." He then expressed the conviction that "graduate study through extension is an institutional matter Indeed, I believe that, with proper safeguards and with provision of satisfactory plans for its evaluation, this type of work will continue to grow."

At the 1942 annual convention of the National University Extension Association, it was pointed out by Dixon (8, p.184) that teachers needed in-service work at the graduate level and that difficulty had been experienced in the South because of the limitations which were being imposed by the Southern Association of Graduate Deans. Lowry observed that although the Southern Association of Graduate Deans voted in 1935 and 1936 to abolish all extension work for graduate credit, most of them by 1942 were still conducting graduate extension programs.

Tidwell's report (46, pp.174-175) concerning an Association of American Universities meeting in 1945 expressed some doubt about the wholehearted acceptance of graduate extension work among the committee chairmen of the Association with whom he worked. Concerning two chairmen in particular, he wrote (46, p.174):

It seems appropriate to say, however, based on the comments made by these two chairmen, there is serious doubt in their minds as to the possibility or desirability of carrying on standard work through extension teaching at the graduate level. Even graver misgivings were expressed in regard to the matter of doing any work beyond the requirements for the master's degree.

Tidwell called attention to the fact that twelve of the thirty-five member institutions of the Association of American Universities were already offering graduate work and of those holding joint membership in the Association of American Universities and the National University Extension Association, only five did not offer graduate work.

According to Lowry (21, p.51), in 1950, graduate school deans of land-grant institutions believed that (a) good programs were hard to arrange off campus, (b) there was some doubt about the quality of off-

campus graduate work, and (c) there was no objection to off-campus work of good quality. The problem was to find ways to provide it.

Beals and Brody (1, pp.337-338) in their book, "The Literature of Adult Education", (1941), stated that college faculties had never looked with too much favor on extension teaching, and had insisted on the same performance, standards, and achievements for the adults as for the campus day students. While identity of instruction and performance were demanded, the universities had failed to provide identical facilities. Pay was too low, budgetary support was virtually non-existent, and library and laboratory facilities were usually inferior. This situation need not exist.

These authors also noted that the rapid growth of the high schools had relieved the universities of the responsibility of secondary education and that other agencies were rapidly taking over "the borderland of serious entertainment and light education "

Beals and Brody wrote (1, p.338):

It seems reasonable to suppose, therefore, that universities will husband their resources for education that comes within the meaning of the term, 'higher'. And if this is done, there is no good reason why anything that a university is willing to offer at all should not carry credit if students wish it.

Houle, in 1952 (47, p.13), speaking of the insistent demand of the literate adult population for additional formal instruction through extension, made the following observation concerning the attitudes of some university leaders:

It is not surprising that so insistent a demand, coupled as it is with such other pressures upon the university as expanded full-time enrollment

and the demands of society for practical research, has led many sincere and dedicated university leaders to regard adult education with easy suspicion. They dread the possibility that the hordes of new claimants on their time and service may finally destroy the university itself. The university, such observers fear, may grow to be like the lumbering behemoths of prehistoric times, whose bodies grew too large for their brains to integrate and who thereby failed in the struggle for survival. This fear of size is paralleled by a fear of cheapness and vulgarization.

Houle did not accept the above point-of-view, however. He contended that the universities had gone too far to turn back. They had failed to take advantage of the social opportunity inherent in the eagerness of mature citizens to improve themselves and society. He admitted (47, p.15) that "triviality of thought and mammoth size of program may come as a consequence of adult education", but believed that "there is nothing inherent in the age of a student which makes such a result necessary." Houle suggested that some of the work being offered in our universities to our young people of today may "be the most conspicuous examples of folly and triviality".

Types of Programs

Snell (42, pp.104-108), in 1923, reported the success of postgraduate medical instruction in North Carolina. It was begun in 1915 at the request of medical men, was interrupted by World War I and was revived again in 1922. His questionnaire survey included the class memberships of 1916 and 1922 and the following evaluation of the program was obtained: (a) the lectures were rated as excellent, the clinics as good, and the time and money were stated to have been well spent; (b) the doctors recommended the addition of therapeutics and surgery

to the program of internal medicine already established. No degree credit was requested. In summary, Snell quoted from an article written for a national medical journal by a physician who had enrolled in one of the courses (42, p.108):

Let me make it clear that I am in no way decrying the usual method of going away to a great school for postgraduate medical instruction, that has been, is, and will always be, invaluable, and in a class apart by itself, for those able to avail themselves of it, but I do believe this university extension work is one of the most valuable things that has been done in the history of medical teaching, from the standpoint of widespread benefit to the medical profession and to the public.

Kibler (19, p.127), in 1928, described postgraduate medical work in Oklahoma which was based on the "North Carolina Plan". "Circuit courses" and "short courses" were offered in thirty-two centers the first year. Pediatrics was chosen for the first year to fill in the gap since graduation and, in the meantime, other courses in obstetrics, pathology, anatomy, dissection, and urology were being planned. Each session averaged from fifty to sixty doctors in attendance. Approximately 900 attended the circuit courses and 250 attended the short courses. Although the cost was very high, there was an insistent demand from the profession for more courses.

Thesis writing was permitted in absentia in twenty-seven of the thirty-six member institutions of the National University Extension Association, according to a survey made by Shelby in 1936 (36, p.102). The most popular fields were education, psychology, art of teaching, history of education, and health and physical education.

Shelby concluded (36, p.102):

It is the writer's candid conviction that we as extension workers in this organization need to press definitely into the field of graduate credit work, especially in Education.

Marberry (23, p.200) reported, in 1941, on "Thesis Writing Off-Campus for the Master's Degree", as conducted by the University of Texas. He emphasized the following features of the plan:

- a. The student first completes one term of thesis writing on campus the previous summer.
- b. By continuing through extension for the remainder of the year, the problem of three isolated summer sessions is eliminated.
- c. The work consists of on-the-job studies in Education.
- d. A thesis director visits each center monthly carrying with him a twenty-volume thesis library, about thirty theses, a complete set of Education Index, Education Abstracts, and other reference materials.
- e. While the director is "on location" students may confer with him as much and as often as is desired.
- f. Students check out reference materials and books to be used for the next month.
- g. Great demand for the service is the most difficult problem to solve. At the time of the report, 221 were enrolled. The director must continue working with the student until the thesis is accepted.
- h. The program affords relief to the summer session staff.
- i. Thesis writing through extension may well be done in fields other than education.

Dixon, in leading a discussion, in 1942, on "In-Service Training of Teachers" (8, pp.179-180), emphasized that the demand for on-the-job improvement of teaching was unprecedented. Many teachers had degrees

but wished to do advanced in-service work for credit. The classroom laboratory could be a setting superior to that of a given campus situation. The "gentlemen's agreement" of the Southern Association of Graduate Deans, limiting graduate extension credit to six semester hours toward a master's degree, was criticized as being detrimental to conducting good in-service programs, and the hope was expressed that in-service extension education would soon so impress the graduate school councils of some institutions that they might give up some of their "cloistered notions" regarding graduate credit (8, p.180).

In 1947, Maurice E. Chaffee (5, p.21), then president of the National University Extension Association, gave an address at the annual meeting on "The Challenge of Adult Education to University Extension". He urged that the science graduate in the field be given opportunity through extension classes to study at the graduate level so that he might cope with the technological advancement resulting from the war. Scientists cannot be spared to return to the campuses in any great numbers, even if space and faculty were available. Extension education is the answer. Chaffee contended that the services of university extension are very meager indeed. To most bachelor's degree people, the doors of the university are closed! "Is it any wonder that the majority close their textbooks for the remainder of their lives?", he asks. The period of formal education is ended and we provide nowhere for the graduate to turn for further organized learning. Chaffee (5, p.22) further states:

The responsibility rests with university extension to give far greater opportunity for our graduates

to continue studying after they leave our campuses. This opportunity should not be confined to those interested in technology, but it should extend to those interested in advanced study in the fields of business, professional education, and in fact, all branches of learning.

Meder (24, p.88), in 1948, further emphasized the need to serve industry, through university extension. It was his contention that (a) graduate personnel in industry need opportunity to continue studying at the graduate level, and that (b) informal programs, although helpful, were inadequate. Meder believed his own institution, Rutgers, was meeting the need through such arrangements as had been made with the United States Signal Corps at Ft. Monmouth located thirty-two miles from the campus, where a master of science degree is offered in electrical engineering. He called such a program a beginning and stated (24, p.88), "We know that much can and should be done to extend graduate programs of study to those engaged in industry."

Lowry (21, pp.49-50) reported, in 1950, that the meaning of "off-campus workshop" was not clear. He called it a " comparative recent practice which applies particularly to public school teachers' in-service professional study". Twenty-four, of the forty-five institutions surveyed, reported using in-service training workshops for educational personnel, eleven institutions reported using the workshops for on-the-job training of technical and industrial personnel, and five institutions reported conducting research not possible on the campuses. Lowry reported that a lack of firm budgetary arrangements was a principal handicap.

Tandy's 1950 study (44, p.98) of the extent to which graduate level correspondence courses were offered showed that only twelve of the fifty-three member institutions of the National University Extension Association had such courses. It was reported that correspondence work was considered by these institutions as another kind of service, regardless of level. It was not considered in competition with the campuses or the evening classes offered through extension. Tandy stated (44, p.98):

I believe that it is the graduate student who derives the most benefit through correspondence study and that he should be allowed to do a large part of his graduate study by this method.

The study indicated that some extension directors whose institutions did not permit graduate level correspondence work looked with favor upon it. Points-of-view expressed by some of the directors were that (a) graduate schools may be overlooking one of their best opportunities, (b) very profitable research may be done this way, (c) correspondence work might be especially well-suited to high caliber students, and (d) the mature advanced student is better able to do correspondence study.

Controls and Limitations

Powers (29, p.167) found, in 1929, that geographic location had a definite limiting effect on the amount of graduate extension study which might be offered in a given situation. Isolation caused classes to be too small and limited library facilities; great distances discouraged many graduate instructors. The proximity of sister institutions in other parts of the state sometimes caused competition which was too difficult to meet.

Seig (35, pp.60-64), in 1934, decried the limitation of the amount of graduate extension credit on the basis of its alleged inferiority. He contended that an inferior offering should not be permitted. Although he did not indicate the amount, he recommended that the graduate student should do part of his work on the campus, not because the work there is superior, but because the student should have the campus experience. He admitted that enrichment comes from the greater variety of courses and instructors, and from the many associations with fellow students. Greater opportunity should be provided, nevertheless, for off-campus graduate work (35, p.64).

The report of the National University Extension Association Committee on Extension Teaching Policies (40, p.144) made to the Association in 1936, included the suggestion that extreme care should be exercised to keep the quality of the work at or above that of the campus. This is best done through proper staffing. Supervision must be the responsibility of the department or school being represented by the course and, when properly approved and supervised, full credit should be given for the work taken.

Lowry (21, pp.48-51), in 1950, reported that, among forty-five land-grant institutions surveyed, the graduate deans and resident faculty were responsible for the instructional staff approvals for their graduate extension courses.

Rees (31, p.8) reported, in 1952, general agreement among graduate school deans on the following limitations:

- a. That the number of courses in which these students may enroll in a given semester should be limited;

- b. that students be fully screened;
- c. that instructors be carefully selected;
- d. that courses be restricted to those for which laboratory and library facilities can be adequately provided.

While most of the deans favored graduate extension study and believed the problem should be investigated, there were a few who expressed concern about graduate study of this kind. These deans mentioned lack of study time, the absence of opportunity for inter-communication with other students and faculty, and the "hit and miss" quality of instruction which might result.

Shelby found, in 1936, (40, p.101) that sixteen of the thirty-two reporting institutions used the seminar type of instruction. Generally the institutions reported using the same methods of instruction in extension as were used on the respective campuses.

Shelby (37, pp.88-90), chairman of the 1943 committee of the National University Extension Association on "Extension Teaching Credit Courses", reported that of forty-seven leading private, denominational, and state institutions, almost without exception, the graduate office was wholly or at least partially responsible for administering catalog provisions for the graduate credit earned through extension. Others sharing responsibilities were the directors of extension and the various department heads. The graduate schools also determined the conditions under which graduate classes were to be offered off campus.

Shelby also reported the same year (37, p.96) that the rules regulating the amount of graduate extension credit were unique to the various institutions. The range was from four semester hours of credit

in some institutions to the entire master's degree program at the downtown center of the University of Chicago. The mode for the group studied was eight semester hours. Shelby discovered there were twelve institutions offering extension work which could be applied toward the doctor's degree. They were Chicago University, Columbia University, and Pittsburgh University; the state colleges of Iowa and Louisiana; and the state universities of Arizona, Indiana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Kansas, New Jersey (Rutgers), and Texas. Columbia University and the University of Indiana permitted thirty semester hours of extension credit (Indiana permitted up to forty-five in education), and the University of Pittsburgh allowed twenty-four hours above the master's degree. The remaining eight institutions reported policies of flexibility to accommodate student-needs, but stated no rules governing the amount of credit allowable.

Quality of Graduate Extension Study

Robertson (32, p.52) reported, in 1919, that the graduate schools were giving rigid inspection to course content, to the abilities of the instructors, and to the powers of the graduate students. He reported the need for adequate salaries to insure high quality instruction for graduate level work.

Seig (35, p.64), in 1934, advocated that only fully approved staff members who believe in adult education should instruct graduate extension courses. Adults at this level require instruction which is scholarly and superior. Junior grade staff members should not be assigned graduate work. Organizers must curb their desires for "big programs" in favor of "good programs".

Shelby reported, in 1936, (36, p.103) that nineteen institutions used only their own graduate staffs to instruct their classes but that twelve others used outside specialists as well.

Lowry made the following statement, in 1950, regarding the activities of graduate school deans toward the quality of graduate extension study (22, p.49):

An undertone of misgiving or reservation regarding the quality of graduate study offered through extension courses was discernible in institutional replies, ranging from expressions of mild misgivings to total rejection of the proposition that a satisfactory quality of graduate study could be offered through extension courses.

Brady (3, p.22), speaking on "The University and Statewide Adult Education", made the following observations, in 1950, concerning the quality of graduate extension work:

- a. High quality graduate work demands study and research which is centered in the respective departments.
- b. Adult education divorced from the departments often deteriorates to sub-college levels.
- c. College instructors are preferable. The kind of life an instructor leads distinguishes him.

Brady cautioned (3, p.22):

There is grave danger that extension and adult education work, if it continues to become more popular, will be taken over too largely by institutions and agencies that have become channels for public funds, but which, not being centers of research, will become only educational treadmills where trained people will go through the same motions over and over again.

Rees (31, p.9) found, in 1952, that almost no evaluation studies had been undertaken by institutions to discover the effectiveness of

their graduate extension instruction. Past experience had been the principal basis upon which future programs were planned. The most acceptable graduate extension programs were those in education, library science, history, political science, mathematics, chemistry, and chemical engineering. Great care has been exercised in selecting the staff, controlling the facilities, and screening the students to safeguard the quality of the work. Generally courses requiring elaborate laboratories or exceptional library facilities were discouraged, unless at or near a campus or a permanent center, Rees reported (31, p.9).

Physical Considerations

Robertson (32, p.52), in 1919, stated that the meeting place of a class had very little to do with the quality of instruction or the achievements of students, provided the library facilities were adequate. He reported that more satisfactory library and classroom facilities were available in metropolitan centers.

According to Powers, in 1929, (28, pp.167-176), many graduate school deans were of the opinion that libraries would be found inadequate in off-campus locations.

Seig (35, pp.57-64), speaking before the general assembly of the annual meeting of the National University Extension Association, in 1934, opened his address, "Graduate Study by Extension", with the following assumption: "If the usual setting is provided for a graduate class, it is as good as any other class with a corresponding setting."

The fact of on-campus or off-campus is, perhaps, incidental. He stated, in addition (35, pp.57-58):

Stately halls, bursting libraries, and up-to-the-minute laboratories are not the really vital things in education. Given the student with brains and a will to learn, and a teacher who has some point of conception that this learning is something to be won by the student, not to be pumped into him, you have the proper setting for a graduate class.

Nine out of ten of the objections usually offered by those who lack enthusiasm for graduate extension work are about physical arrangements and not about the real things, Seig observed. He stressed the need for good libraries and suggested that good instructors and extension directors would see to their distribution and circulation. Courses which are not adaptable to extension should not be planned for off-campus offering (35, p.63).

Populous areas, Seig stated, are usually best suited to graduate extension work. General culture courses are recommended for heterogeneous groups (35, p.54).

Shelby's committee, in 1936, (40, p.144) on "Extension Teaching Policies" reported that it was the duty and the responsibility of the extension division, in the final analysis, to provide an adequate library for each course and that the clock-hour provision for class time should not be less than that on the campus for the same work.

According to Shelby's 1936 study (40, p.103), fourteen institutions, of the forty-two replying, reported providing special libraries for each class and fifteen reported that "center" libraries and local public libraries met the needs of the graduate extension classes. In

some instances, extension directors have certified the adequacy of the library facilities to the graduate school deans. It was believed generally that the library provisions for isolated classes were as yet deemed inadequate.

Lowry's study (22, pp.48-51), reported in 1950, showed that there was a wide geographic distribution of graduate extension courses among land-grant institutions. These programs were quite often found near industrial, governmental, and military installations. The deans of the graduate schools favored courses in these situations as a satisfactory means of offering off-campus graduate study more than they favored workshops or evening extension classes. Institutional, extension, and local libraries should guarantee adequate facilities for extension classes, Lowry reported (22, p.51).

Rees (31, p.10), in 1952, reported that classes far removed from the campuses of land-grant colleges and universities had been organized only when adequate library and laboratory facilities had been provided. Local libraries or permanent center libraries usually had met the needs. When they had not done so, portable package libraries had been used. Laboratory type courses usually had not been organized. In some instances, courses requiring laboratory facilities had met on alternate weeks on the campuses and in other instances subordinate centers had been found to have suitable laboratories.

Trends

Shipley (41, p.179), in a discussion of fundamental studies and investigations which needed to be made (1930), observed that the

enormous increase in the number of college graduates who were doing work in extension presented a real challenge to extension leaders. Speaking of his own institution, Washington University, Shipley said (41, p.179):

This year the increase in our institution was 58 per cent college graduates. And we are offering these college graduates no inducement whatever in the way of graduate credit. That is an amazing thing.

He warned against going "credit crazy", however, and spoke of the necessity of keeping instruction standards high.

At the Extension Directors' Roundtable (45, p.24) held during the National University Extension Association annual meeting in 1945, it was reported there was a trend toward an increase in latitude in granting extension credit, including graduate credit. Residence departments were beginning to see that the graduate extension students were a reservoir of resident degree candidates.

The National University Extension Association committee on "Education Trends" reported the following trends in 1948 (9, p.188):

Expansion of post-graduate offerings in medicine, dentistry, engineering, and education; planning cooperative undertakings with public agencies, such as State Department of Education, California Youth Authority, State Board of Health, and related agencies; the expansion of institutes, workshops, and other short-term offerings, especially with labor groups, industrial management, teachers and community agencies; development of a program of community music extension; planning and development of large scale undertaking in intensive language instruction to meet the needs of such groups as Foreign Mission Boards, Department of State, and armed forces.

The same committee, two years later (1950), went on record as reporting "more demands being made for college credit at the graduate level" (10, p.177).

The Contemporary Situation

The literature on graduate extension work and the studies related to it, which have been reviewed, give important information about the graduate extension movement from 1919 to the present. To bring the present into focus, the writer wrote letters to the graduate school deans and the directors of extension of the seventy-six institutions holding membership in the National University Extension Association, asking them to respond to certain specific questions. The information to be gained was to serve two purposes: (a) to provide up-to-date information about graduate extension work nationally, and (b) to provide information basic to planning study on "The Status of Graduate Work Through Extension".

While the letters invited replies to certain specific questions, they were not intended to be treated as questionnaires. No check lists were provided and the comments and explanations made by the deans and directors were voluntary and more or less informal. The responses to the letters were most gratifying. Of the seventy-six institutions contacted (Appendix A), only two failed to return a reply. The seventy-four replying represent an approximate 97 per cent return. TABLE I shows a summary of the replies received from the graduate school deans and the directors of extension of the seventy-six institutions contacted.

TABLE I

NUMBERS OF REPLIES RECEIVED FROM THE GRADUATE DEANS AND
EXTENSION DIRECTORS OF SEVENTY-SIX INSTITUTIONS IN REPLY
TO A PRELIMINARY INQUIRY LETTER

Replies	Number	Per cent
Graduate school deans contacted	76	100
Graduate school deans replying	69	91
Extension directors contacted	76	100
Extension directors replying	67	88
Institutions responding through either dean or director or both	74	97
Institutions not responding	2	3
Institutions responding through graduate school deans only	6	8
Institutions responding through extension directors only	6	8

One can see from this table that all but two institutions were represented by either or both persons contacted. Because six of the replying institutions were represented by graduate school deans only and six of the replying institutions were represented by directors of extension only, the summaries of replies from each group will be given separately.

The Graduate School Deans' Replies

Letters were sent to seventy-six deans of graduate schools and replies were received from sixty-nine, or 91 per cent of them. In the

letters the deans were asked to answer four main questions (Appendix B). Each question is given below, followed by a summary of the important information gained from studying and analyzing the replies received.

1. Does your office authorize and approve graduate work?

To this question there were fifty-seven "yes" replies and eleven "no" replies; one did not reply. Almost without exception, the graduate school deans pointed out that approval was dependent upon following certain graduate school requirements. Such comments as (a) limited to certain fields or schools, (b) number of hours to be earned are limited, (c) if approved by graduate school, (d) if on campus or at permanent center, (e) if supervised by department concerned, (f) if part of student's approved program, and (g) an obligation to graduate alumni, most frequently supported the "yes" answers.

Comments accompanying the "no" answers were: (a) the graduate council feels its present policy is sound, (b) "a rich experience in living the graduate life" is not possible in extension, (c) libraries are inadequate, (d) do not believe in offering graduate or undergraduate work for academic credit.

The next question gave the deans opportunity to comment in greater detail on some of the limitations and controls mentioned above.

2. If such work is approved, what are the governing rules and regulations? (Include reference to staff, time and place, quantity and quality of work, methods of giving approval, kinds of programs.)

Institutional graduate staff members were reported as the only source of graduate extension instruction by twenty of the deans replying

while another thirty stated they used an "approved staff" which might include non-institutional specialists approved by the graduate office. The remaining seven who reported that they offer graduate work did not mention how they provide the staff.

The place of meeting was reported by thirty-five graduate deans to be "where approved". This could be interpreted to be on campus, at permanent off-campus centers, or at off-campus independent locations according to need. The campus as a meeting place was specifically mentioned by four deans, and graduate extension centers were mentioned by ten deans. Two deans reported "other campuses" as centers for their graduate extension programs. The remaining six institutions which offer graduate extension work did not refer to the place of meetings.

The time of meetings was reported unanimously as being during evening hours and on Saturdays. Several mentioned permanent center classes in the daytime, but referred to these as off-campus residence classes. Almost without exception, graduate extension classes meet once a week.

Every graduate dean whose extension division offered graduate extension work stated he believed its quality and quantity to be equal to that of graduate work on the campus. The consensus was that if the work were not of comparable quality with the campus work, it would not be approved. Those who answered "no", on the other hand, doubted whether high standards could be maintained in extension classes, and they were not authorizing the work because of this doubt.

The graduate schools or their representatives usually give approval for the offering of graduate extension courses. In many instances the

presidents, the department heads, the directors of extension, the students' advisers, the professional schools, or a combination of these, work in cooperation with the graduate office to accomplish this.

In describing the kinds of programs offered as graduate work through extension, twenty-seven deans stated they offered any course which was appropriate for off-campus study. Apparently there was some difference of opinion concerning appropriateness because one dean reported that chemistry could not be offered off campus while four others stated that their institutions offered it by extension. The difference of opinion might just as well apply to other subjects.

Courses in education were mentioned by twenty-seven deans, engineering by four, and several other subjects were mentioned by one dean each. These were political science, psychology, history, English, sociology, and business administration. All of the above subject fields were described as "strongest fields" by the institutions reporting them, and it is quite likely that the institutions mentioning them offered a representative number of extension classes in the respective subject fields. It is apparent that graduate extension work in education is the largest single program being conducted currently.

3. Does your graduate school accept any credits earned through extension? If so, on what basis and for what purpose?

To this question there were fifty-seven affirmative replies and ten negative replies. Nine deans did not reply. Of those replying in the affirmative, twenty deans reported that they accept up to six semester hours of graduate extension credit, twenty-one said they accept up to

twelve semester hours, twelve reported accepting more than twelve semester hours, and four did not mention how many graduate extension credits they accept.

Some of the affirmative replies were given with qualifications. While many institutions, particularly in the South, maintained a flat rule of accepting no more than six semester hours by extension, some institutions in other parts of the country varied in the number of hours allowable according to the academic degree sought or according to the particular problems inherent in the student's approved program. Several institutions permitted more graduate extension credit on professional degrees than could be used toward liberal arts degrees.

Ten deans reported their institutions would accept the graduate extension work of other institutions when they knew the standards maintained by the sister institutions to be high. One other provision for accepting another institution's graduate extension credits was that the sister institutions must be willing to accept the same kind of credits in return.

The graduate school deans of the fifty-seven institutions offering graduate study through extension all reported offering such work to be applied toward the master's degree or toward advanced degrees. The replies were rather vague concerning degrees above the master's. Five deans signified advanced degrees, six others said doctor's degrees, and four did not state the degree or degrees being offered.

4. What do you believe about the offering of graduate work through correspondence study?

Five deans reported they favored correspondence work for graduate students, and they made comments such as: (a) accept our own work, (b) may take graduate work by correspondence if the students are in residence at the time, (c) may take correspondence courses when these have received approval from the graduate council, (d) permit a very limited amount of graduate work by correspondence—it is on a trial basis here, (e) permit correspondence work at the graduate level toward both the master's and the doctor's degrees as approved for the individual student.

Except for these five deans who favored correspondence work, there was no question regarding the attitudes of these graduate school deans toward the advisability of offering graduate extension work through correspondence study. At least thirty-one of them went on record as being definitely opposed to correspondence work at the graduate level or at least not favoring it. Such other comments as (a) close supervision is impossible, (b) adequate library usually not available, (c) graduate work requires personal contacts, (d) is neither offered nor accepted, and (e) is suited only to non-credit work, were typical of replies of many deans.

The Extension Directors' Replies

Of the seventy-six extension directors contacted, sixty-seven, or 88 per cent returned replies. The responses of the directors were based on five questions asked of them. In addition, they were asked to forward any official publications, bulletins, or announcements, which had any bearing on their graduate extension work (Appendix C).

This material was sent in good volume, and proved very helpful in checking many items. Many directors referred the writer to marked pages in their publications.

A review of the responses which extension directors gave to the five questions follows.

1. Do you offer such work? Give your reasons whether "yes" or "no".

Fifty-six of the sixty-seven directors replying to this question answered in the affirmative and eleven of them answered in the negative. Several of the directors who answered "yes" believed that their graduate schools should allow more graduate extension credit toward the advanced degrees, and several who answered "no" stated that they favored graduate extension work but could not offer it because it was not approved by their graduate schools. Most of the replies of the extension directors indicated excellent working relationships with the graduate schools, however.

The comments and explanations which were given by the extension directors with reference to the above question have been classified by the writer into four categories as (a) those conditions of approval more or less common to all graduate extension programs, (b) limitations affecting the graduate extension programs, (c) those comments referring to special programs of graduate study through extension, and (d) expressions of points-of-view rather than of fact. Each of these categories is discussed in the following paragraphs.

There was unanimous agreement among the extension directors that graduate extension work should be permitted only when there was an

approved instructor and when adequate library facilities were available. All staff members should be regular members of the institutional graduate faculty or qualified specialists who had been approved by the graduate school for a particular service, they stated. Altogether, twenty-one directors referred to staff adequacy and of these, nine said their own graduate school staff, only, were permitted to instruct graduate extension classes.

There was general agreement among the directors that the graduate student's program should be approved before registration in extension classes, that the course offerings should be approved both by the campus department or school concerned and by the graduate school, and that courses should be approved only when graduate school standards can be maintained.

It would seem that such requirements as are described above should be acceptable and desirable for all graduate extension programs. Institutional catalogs, extension division publications, and graduate school bulletins all support this observation. The other studies related to graduate work through extension, which were reviewed in an earlier part of this chapter, also bear out the fact that a qualified graduate staff, adequate library facilities, and the maintenance of high standards are requisites to a successful graduate program whether it is conducted on the campus or through extension.

Limitations affecting the graduate extension programs are reported to be those of location, of meeting residence requirements, of amount of credit applicable toward advanced degrees, and of maintaining high standards. Five of the directors reported that their graduate extension work

was limited to permanently established extension centers only. The problems of meeting residence requirements, of keeping standards high, and of the graduate student's being limited to a maximum of six semester hours were mentioned three times each. The three directors who referred to the six semester hour limitation stated that the rule had been imposed by the Southern Association of Graduate Deans as a "gentlemen's agreement" among the various graduate schools in the South. The directors expressed the belief that such matters as limitation of credit should be decided internally rather than by a regional association. Other limitations mentioned by less than three deans each were (a) to correspondence work only, (b) to off-campus work only, (c) by the amount of "course credit" allowable, and (d) by a policy not to encourage graduate work through extension. It would seem that the necessity to meet "residence requirements" and to keep "high standards" would apply more or less to all extension divisions, while the other limitations which were mentioned by the directors might apply, in each instance, to a few extension divisions only.

Extension directors whose institutions were conducting special programs spoke of the need to keep our out-of-school professional people up to date in their respective fields of specialization. Fifteen directors stated they believed higher education had a special responsibility to public education. They emphasized the great number of programs being conducted by their extension divisions for on-the-job training of public school personnel and gave strong support to the idea that the "classroom laboratory" was the proper place to do much graduate work in education. Six institutions reported carrying on specially

planned programs at government installations and at industrial sites. They spoke of the services of extension education in the defense effort and of the need to keep the leaders in industry and technology abreast of the times.

The following comments of the extension directors may be considered as expressions of points-of-view rather than as statements of fact. Eight directors wrote that graduate extension work should be offered wherever and whenever it is feasible; four expressed the ideal of service to graduate alumni; three commented in favor of correspondence work for graduate students; two believed graduate study by extension should be a matter of arrangement between the student and the adviser; and one advocated an easing of limitations and a greater trust in the graduate instructors to keep standards high.

The points-of-view expressed above are those which hold that the responsibility of the institution does not end at the time the graduate student leaves the institution but that the college graduate should have available to him during his work-a-day life graduate instruction through extension classes and perhaps by correspondence, which will meet his needs and perhaps those of his employer and his community.

2. Do you believe graduate work should be offered through extension? (Please give your reasons if your answer is different from your reply to question 1.)

Sixty-three extension directors answered "yes" to this question yet, in answer to question numbered 1, only fifty-nine reported offering such work. It appears there are four divisions not offering graduate extension work whose directors believe it should be offered. These

four directors pointed out that they were not in agreement with the established policies of their graduate schools on this problem. Two of the directors expressed the hope that it would not be long before the respective graduate school policies would be changed. One stated that at his institution the possibility of offering graduate study through extension seemed hopeless. Two extension directors stated they did not offer graduate study through extension, and two others failed to answer this question.

Almost all of the directors replying in the affirmative made supporting statements. Some of the directors gave strong support to the idea of graduate extension programs. Thirty-five of these directors believed that some graduate work is best done off campus in work situations, that higher education has an obligation to its employed graduate alumni, and that the present-day needs of our society demand on-the-job training of our college graduate citizens. Thirty-two directors observed that graduate extension work was in its infancy and that there was a great demand for it. They believed it should be provided where the need was evident and that it could be justified just as well as undergraduate work could. This group stated that there was no evidence that the quality of such work was below that of the same work given on the campuses.

Another group of directors of extension spoke of certain restrictions which they had imposed upon themselves or which had been imposed upon them. Nine directors expressed their desire for close association with the campus and the graduate school. They emphasized the importance of maintaining campus standards and of the graduate student's need to

spend time in residence. Five directors referred to the limitations of six semester hours of graduate extension credit imposed by the Southern Association of Graduate Deans, and expressed the view that the attitudes of the "Association" should be liberalized. One director observed that correspondence study seemed best suited to graduate study; another said he did not have the full support of his entire faculty, although the graduate school was in accord; and still another said he sometimes doubted the quality of graduate extension work.

3. If you offer graduate work through extension, what kinds of programs are organized? Which are the most successful?

Almost without exception the replies of the directors of extension stated that judgment of the success of a program was based on (a) enrollment and (b) the conditions under which the program was established. Special and consistent mention was made of the contribution to public education through the in-service programs for the public school teachers and of the special arrangements for on-the-job training of government and industrial employees.

Generally, all of the institutions operating permanent extension centers offer quite a variety of graduate courses. The independently organized non-center evening and Saturday classes are mostly in the field of education, with occasional other courses to meet local desires as requested. Following, in descending order, are listed the most successful graduate extension course offerings, as reported by the extension directors.

<u>Course</u>	<u>Frequency of mention</u>
Education	35
Engineering	24
Business administration	7
Social work	5
Chemistry	4
Political science	4
Physics	4
Arts	4
Agriculture	3
Mathematics	3
History	3
Physical education	2
Psychology	2
Natural resources	2
Music	2
Sciences	2
Applied statistics	1
Law	1
Humanities	1
Home economics	1
Vocational agriculture	1
Commerce	1
Personnel service	1
English	1
Public administration	1
Community workshops	1

4. What was your total enrollment in extension classwork
for the academic year, 1951-1952?

Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____
Fall term, 1952?
 _____ Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____

According to the report of the "Committee on Reports and Business Practices" of the National University Extension Association for the academic year, 1951-1952 (4, pp.6-10), a total of 337,483 persons was registered for extension classwork and 89,307 in correspondence study among the seventy-five member institutions. An additional 306,104 persons participated in short courses, institutes, etc. Unfortunately,

the report did not indicate what part of these were graduate students. It seemed desirable, therefore, to ask the extension directors of the seventy-six member divisions to report their undergraduate and graduate enrollments for that year and for the fall term, 1952-1953.

Forty-eight of the directors of extension reported enrollments totaling 131,123 undergraduates and 53,664 graduates for the academic year 1951-1952. Three more reported an approximate total of 33,280 extension students in both their undergraduate and graduate programs but failed to segregate them. Four others reporting graduate extension programs failed to provide enrollment information. In addition, three other divisions whose extension directors did not answer the inquiry letters were reported by their graduate deans as offering graduate extension credit.

Since the total of 218,067 enrollments reported by the fifty-one directors is far below the number reported for the seventy-five institutions by "Burke's committee", it seems reasonable to assume that the number of graduate extension students greatly exceeds the 53,664 reported.

5. Do you observe any trends? What are they?

Of the fifty-six extension directors whose divisions offer graduate work, only two failed to note any trends. The observations of the fifty-four who reported noticeable trends fall into two categories: (a) trends toward a greater graduate extension program and (b) trends toward a limited or smaller graduate extension program.

Those reporting trends toward a greater emphasis of the graduate extension program reported also that more of the work was being offered

off campus than previously. A great deal of this work has been provided, particularly in education, on an in-service basis, the classes having met at the school locations. Governmental and industrial groups were likewise being given instruction at on-the-job locations.

Other off-campus work is being offered increasingly at extension centers. One division reported a trend toward graduate work in a day-time center program. The "center" programs were becoming more and more stabilized and, in some situations, all of the requirements for a master's degree may be met. Other directors reported an increasing opportunity to work toward the doctor's degree, and one other observed that the engineering degree was becoming an extension degree.

Some of the reporting directors stated that there was a definite trend in their institutions to assign equal status to all credits earned and that the quality of graduate extension work was considered equal to on-campus work. One director noted a trend away from hard-and-fast rules which limit the amount of graduate extension credit, and in their place a trend toward planning the graduate student's program according to his needs. Several directors reported greater acceptance of the graduate extension idea by campus faculty members.

Fourteen directors observed trends toward a limited or smaller graduate extension program. Three of the above reported that there was less demand for graduate extension work than there had been formerly; two others stated the demand was leveling off; and one reported that there was no demand. Two directors reported a trend away from the traditional type of classwork and toward courses designed to meet particular needs, especially in isolated areas. One director expressed his

disappointment in an accrediting agency's tendency to disapprove and limit graduate extension classwork, and expressed the point-of-view that the amount of credit an institution was to accept should be determined internally.

Summary

The concept of the right of all men to learning is an old one and it may be considered to be the basis of university extension in the United States. Until the middle of the nineteenth century the universities were available to provide such learning for those who could come to the campuses but few came. It remained for England to give us in this country the idea of taking the university to the people.

Even though our forefathers were not flocking to the universities, a great program of adult education was under way through the mechanics' institutes, the mercantile libraries, the historical societies, and the philosophical societies of the early nineteenth hundreds. Following these the American lyceum and the chautauqua through weekly programs consisting of essays, debates, lectures, and discussions helped spread the idea of popular education to every part of the nation. The chautauqua was soon to develop more formally organized programs of summer sessions, correspondence courses, and courses for college credit until finally it was literally "extending" the services of higher education beyond the boundaries of the various campuses. The institutions of higher learning soon saw the need to reclaim the responsibility of providing these services to the people, and it became necessary by 1900

that chautauqua surrender its charter to the universities to which belonged properly the credit-granting and degree-granting functions.

The University of Chicago founded university extension in 1889 under the leadership of a former chautauqua man, Richard G. Moulton, who had received his extension training in Great Britain. This Chicago plan provided formalized courses in academic and cultural subjects. About the same time the University of Wisconsin was developing a program of state-wide services in agriculture, and later by 1906 it was reorganized to encompass the industrial, political, social, and the moral aspects of education as well as the academic and cultural. The "Wisconsin idea" was soon to be adopted as the pattern for other state supported institutions, while the "Chicago plan" became the pattern of extension in the privately endowed schools.

Between 1906 and 1915, many representatives of other states visited the University of Wisconsin to learn, and by the time the newly founded National University Extension Association had its first meeting at Madison, Wisconsin in 1915 the membership list included twenty-two institutions of various types and locations. From simple beginnings the membership had grown to seventy-six institutions by the academic year, 1951-1952, and the activities of the member institutions included travel courses, workers' education, high school achievement contests, short courses, package libraries, visual instruction libraries, correspondence study, radio broadcasting, touring theater groups, speakers' bureaus, concert series, motion picture production, evening classes, centers for continuation study, television, and in-service training programs.

The literature on this subject does not show just when graduate work was first available through university extension, but it is recorded that by 1919 eight of the member institutions of the National University Extension Association were offering work which might be applied on the master's degree and that three of these institutions were offering work carrying credit which might be applied beyond the master's degree. The literature and related studies which concern graduate study through university extension also show that there has been a continuing concern among the deans of the graduate schools and the directors of extension about (a) the degree of acceptance of the idea of graduate study through extension, (b) the types of organizational programs through which instruction is given, (c) the controls and limitations which are exercised regarding graduate extension study, (d) the quality of graduate extension study, and (e) the adequacy of the libraries, laboratories, and classrooms which are provided.

By the academic year, 1951-1952, sixty-one of the seventy-six member institutions of the National University Extension Association were making graduate credit work available through their extension divisions. Graduate extension classes are organized and administered by these extension divisions with the approval of the graduate schools and the subject matter departments concerned.

The instructional staff of these graduate extension programs have consisted usually of members of the graduate school faculties of the institutions concerned or of academically qualified specialists who have been approved for graduate level instruction by the graduate schools.

Graduate school deans and extension directors whose institutions permit graduate work through extension believe the quality and the quantity of the work to be equal to that of similar work done on the campuses. They believe that the maintenance of high academic standards is insured through the use of campus graduate school staff members, who in turn not only know how to instruct at the graduate level but who expect the student to achieve at the same level.

Both graduate school deans and directors of extension believe that permanently established extension centers with approved libraries are more suited to graduate work than are the independently organized off-campus classes. They admit, however, that in certain types of in-service on-the-job situations, such as in the public schools, excellent graduate work may be accomplished. Correspondence study, radio, conferences, and short courses are not popular as means of providing instruction at this level.

The amount of credit graduate extension students have been permitted to earn is generally limited to one or two semesters of work. In some institutions, particularly in the South, six semester hours of credit are the maximum permitted, while through some other programs an entire degree may be earned off campus.

All graduate school deans and directors of extension emphasized the importance of adequate library and laboratory facilities in their extension programs. In some instances graduate classes were not scheduled away from the library locations, and in other instances the required books and equipment were transported to the class locations.

These deans and directors believed, generally, that it was the obligation of their institutions to carry graduate level instruction off campus to the adult citizens of their communities and states. The majority believed there were trends toward more graduate extension work, toward more stabilized off-campus permanent centers, and toward full acceptance of graduate credit earned through their extension programs.

CHAPTER III

THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY GRADUATE SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS

The information obtained from questionnaires sent to members of the graduate faculties of fourteen selected institutions is presented in this chapter. These institutions were selected on the basis of geographical locations, graduate extension enrollments, organizational arrangements for providing graduate extension instruction, and expressed willingness to cooperate in the study.

The fourteen selected institutions are quite equally distributed throughout the geographic areas of the United States known as the West, the Middle-west, the South, and the North. All of them had graduate extension enrollments in excess of 500 students during the academic year 1951-1952, except one; and all of them are conducting extension center programs as well as the more traditional independently organized evening and Saturday classes.

The extension director at each institution was asked to distribute twenty-five questionnaires among the graduate school instructional staff members to be returned by them directly to the writer in self-addressed stamped envelopes which were provided. The returned questionnaires were identifiable by numbers assigned to the cooperating institutions but were unsigned by the faculty members participating. Because the names of the faculty members were not known, no personal follow-up could be

made. A follow-up letter was written, however, to the extension directors, asking them to urge faculty members to respond. The colleges and universities to which questionnaires were sent and the returns from each of them are shown in TABLE II.

TABLE II

RETURNS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO 350 GRADUATE
SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS OF FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Institution	Sent	Ret'd	Per cent
University of Arizona	25	18	72
University of Arkansas	25	4	16
University of Colorado	25	22	88
University of Connecticut	25	15	60
University of Florida	25	17	68
University of Illinois	25	20	80
University of Michigan	25	16	64
Syracuse University	25	3	12
University of Oklahoma	25	23	92
Oklahoma A and M College	25	7	28
Oregon State System of Higher Education	25	25	100
University of South Carolina	25	17	68
State College of Washington	25	21	84
University of Wisconsin	25	3	12
Total:	350	211	60

Of the 350 questionnaires placed in the hands of the participating faculty members, 211 replies, representing 60 per cent of the total, were returned.

The graduate faculty members responding to the questionnaires all instruct in graduate extension courses. The three sections into which this information is divided are: (a) the graduate extension instructor,

(b) achievement in graduate extension work, and (c) the organizational and physical provisions for graduate extension work.

The material concerning the graduate extension instructors includes a study of their sex and age, academic status, experience in higher education, academic load, reasons for instructing graduate extension classes, and the influence of compensation arrangements.

The information about achievement in graduate extension work includes consideration of quality of instruction, student achievement, and class membership.

The third part of the information is the material reported by the graduate faculty members on organizational patterns and physical facilities used for graduate extension teaching. Consideration is given to organizational patterns in terms of time and place, instructional plans, and administrative arrangements; library provisions; and the physical environment provided for the classes.

The Graduate Extension Instructor

The sexes of the graduate extension instructors are shown in TABLE III.

TABLE III

THE SEX DISTRIBUTION OF 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS

Sex	Replies	Per cent
Male	180	86
Female	30	14
No reply	1	-

Of the 211 faculty members returning questionnaires, 180, or 86 per cent, were male; and thirty, or 14 per cent, were female. Only one, representing less than 1 per cent, failed to indicate the sex.

There is a wide range of ages among the instructors in graduate extension work. Five different age groups are listed in TABLE IV.

TABLE IV

THE AGE DISTRIBUTION OF 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS

Age	Replies	Per cent
20 to 30	9	4
30 to 40	83	39
40 to 50	66	31
50 to 60	33	16
Above 60	10	5
No reply	10	5

Nine instructors of the 211 reporting, or 4 per cent, were found to be under thirty years of age. These might be considered beginning teachers of graduate level work. The greatest majority of these instructors were in the "30 to 40" and the "40 to 50" age groups. In the "30 to 40" group, there were eighty-three instructors, or 39 per cent; and in the "40 to 50" age group there were sixty instructors, or 31 per cent of the number reporting. Thirty-three, or 16 per cent, were in the "50 to 60" year group; and only ten, representing 5 per cent, were above sixty years of age. Ten others, or the remaining 5 per cent, did not reply to this question.

The time between thirty and fifty years of age may be considered man's most vigorous years when productivity is high and when fatigue is a less important factor. Families are being raised during these years, too, and any increase in income is usually welcome. It was in this age range of thirty to fifty years that 70 per cent of these graduate instructors were found. Older instructors have, no doubt, achieved higher salaries and higher academic rank and feel less inclined to accept the challenge and the burden of extension teaching. One instructor observed that the real problem seemed to be how to "man" the more advanced courses. He observed that the "elder statesmen" on the campuses disliked to travel and work overtime and that they felt their on-campus work was affected by so doing.

As shown in TABLE V, the typical graduate extension instructor in this study had a college degree, was a member of the regular graduate faculty of the institution, and held academic rank.

TABLE V

ACADEMIC STATUS OF 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS

Status	Replies	Per cent
Hold college degree	211	100
Have academic rank in institution	179	85
Member of regular campus graduate faculty	162	77
Non-staff specialists and others	32	15

Two hundred eleven, or 100 per cent, of these instructors held college degrees, and 179 instructors, representing 85 per cent, had academic rank in their institutions. Since 162 of them, or 77 per cent, were members of a campus graduate faculty, it appears that some staff members not of graduate faculty status were teaching some graduate extension courses. The remaining thirty-two, or 15 per cent, were classified as non-staff specialists who were selected because of their special qualifications to teach particular courses, even though they were not regular members of graduate school staffs. Among these instructors were public school administrators, practicing psychologists, mathematicians, research specialists, extension specialists, and audio-visual aids experts. These experts performed the greatest amount of service in the large number of in-service teacher education programs and at particular government installations where nuclear studies were under way. All of these specialists in this study held academic degrees.

One instructor said that many times the non-staff specialists were better suited to the teaching of adults than some members of the university staffs. He suggested that only the institutional staff members who are well suited to extension teaching should be assigned the work. Another instructor spoke of the splendid graduate extension program being conducted in their city center and credited its success largely to close affiliation with the campus graduate school. He said that extension center instructors needed campus staff status.

The academic degrees held by graduate extension instructors are shown in TABLE VI.

TABLE VI

HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREES HELD BY 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS

Degrees	Replies	Per cent
Doctor's	134	64
Master's	72	34
Bachelor's	4	2
Other	1	-

One hundred thirty-four of these instructors, or 64 per cent, held the doctor's degree, and seventy-two, representing 34 per cent, held the master's degree. Four of these graduate extension instructors, or 2 per cent, held the bachelor's degree, and only one person, or less than 1 per cent, reported holding some other degree.

The fact that 64 per cent of the graduate extension instructors held the doctor's degree is consistent with the point-of-view that the more highly specialized instructors should be teaching at the graduate level.

While, according to TABLE VI, 98 per cent of the graduate extension instructors held either the master's or the doctor's degrees, TABLE VII shows that these same instructors had a wide distribution of academic ranks.

TABLE VII

ACADEMIC RANKS OF 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS

Rank held	Replies	Per cent
Full professor	49	23
Associate professor	46	22
Assistant professor	63	30
Instructor	21	10
Other	32	15

Twenty-one, or 10 per cent, held the rank of instructor; sixty-three, or 30 per cent, were assistant professors; forty-six, or 22 per cent, were associate professors; and forty-nine, representing 23 per cent, were full professors. Thirty-two others, or 15 per cent, are listed as "other" in the table and are composed mainly of non-staff specialists who had been employed to instruct certain classes because of special competence.

The fact that over half (52 per cent) of the graduate extension instructors were either assistant or associate professors bears out the observation that the younger staff members are more active in extension work than the older ones.

TABLE VIII gives an idea of the background of the graduate instructor's experience in higher education.

TABLE VIII

EXPERIENCE OF 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Experience	Less than 10 years		More than 10 years		No	
	Replies	%	Replies	%	replies	%
Years of all experience in higher education	122	58	84	40	5	2
Years which included some teaching	119	57	66	31	26	12
Years major assignment was teaching	106	50	39	19	66	31
Years in present institution	163	77	42	20	6	3
Years in present position	174	83	28	13	9	4

In each of the five items of experience listed, the majority of those replying have had less than ten years' experience. One hundred twenty-two instructors, or 58 per cent, reported their total experience in higher education to be less than ten years, while eighty-four, or 40 per cent, reported more than ten years of experience. Only five, representing 2 per cent, did not reply.

The second item in the table shows the number of years in which some teaching was a part of the instructor's assignment. In this category 119, or 57 per cent, with less than ten years' experience had taught at least some. Sixty-six, representing 31 per cent, had taught as a part of their assignment for more than ten years and twenty-five,

or 13 per cent, did not reply. The number of instructors whose teaching loads had been at least half of their assignments is considerably less than the number of those who reported having done some teaching. Of this latter group 106, or 50 per cent, had taught at least half time for less than ten years while thirty-nine, or 19 per cent, had taught for more than ten years. Sixty-six, representing 33 per cent, did not reply. One hundred sixty-three instructors, or 77 per cent, had been in their present institutions less than ten years and 174, or 83 per cent, had held their present positions in their institutions less than ten years. Those who had been in their present institutions over ten years totaled forty-two, representing 20 per cent, and those in their present positions more than ten years were twenty-eight, or 13 per cent. No replies were received from six instructors, or 3 per cent, concerning the length of time in their present institutions; and nine instructors, or 4 per cent, did not reply concerning the total years in their present positions.

It seems obvious that graduate extension instructors are relatively young, not only in experience, but in their present institutions and in their present positions as well. The evidence is not overwhelming, however, since there is a good representation from among the older instructors both in total experience in higher education (40 per cent) and in teaching experience (31 per cent).

To obtain an idea of the various academic and other fields represented by the graduate extension faculties of the fourteen cooperating extension divisions, the faculty members were asked to answer the question, "What is your present position?" The replies have been classified both

according to ranks and to fields indicated. These classifications, together with the totals and percentages for each field, are presented in TABLE IX.

TABLE IX

POSITIONS HELD BY 211 GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTORS

ACCORDING TO FIELDS AND RANKS REPRESENTED

Field	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Instr.	Other	Total	Total per cent
Education	24	21	28	7	3	83	39
Engineering	4	4	5	1	1	15	7
Psychology	4	2	4	1	3	14	7
Business adm.	4	-	5	2	1	12	6
Audio-visual	-	-	2	1	3	6	3
Extension	-	-	1	2	3	6	3
Guidance	-	4	-	-	2	6	3
Health and P. E.	3	1	1	-	-	5	2.5
Mathematics	-	-	-	2	3	5	2.5
History	1	2	-	1	-	4	2
Physics	-	-	-	3	1	4	2
Public schools	-	-	-	-	3	3	1
Research	1	-	-	-	2	3	1
Social work	-	-	2	-	1	3	1
Sociology	-	2	1	-	-	3	1
Ind. and voc. ed.	-	-	1	-	1	2	1
Music	1	1	-	-	-	2	1
Political science	-	1	1	-	-	1	.5
Agriculture	1	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Anthropology	-	-	1	-	-	1	.5
College president	1	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Dean of extension	-	-	-	-	1	1	.5
Economics	-	-	1	-	-	1	.5
English	-	1	-	-	-	1	.5
French	1	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Geography	-	-	1	-	-	1	.5
Geology	1	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Library science	1	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Philosophy	1	-	-	-	-	1	.5
Pharmaceutical adm.	-	1	-	-	-	1	.5
Speech	-	1	-	-	-	1	.5
Not indicated	1	4	9	3	4	21	10
Total:	49	46	63	21	32	211	100

Thirty-nine per cent of all graduate instructors returning questionnaires reported their field to be education. These eighty-three instructors held many kinds of positions in the field. Among those most frequently listed were supervision of teacher training, school administration, and educational research. Altogether, forty-three instructors in education mentioned administrative, supervisory, or other responsibilities in addition to the teaching of education courses, while the remaining forty reported teaching in education as their present assignment.

Other active graduate extension fields were engineering (7 per cent), psychology (7 per cent), and business administration (6 per cent). Twenty-seven other fields each were represented by 3 per cent or less among these 211 graduate staff members. Twenty-one, or 10 per cent, failed to reply to this question.

Some graduate schools insist that staff members should instruct graduate extension classes as part of their regular load, while others feel that staff members should be permitted to elect to instruct extension classes in addition to the regularly assigned work. TABLE X gives the relationship of extension teaching to the regular assignment.

TABLE X
RELATIONSHIP OF EXTENSION TEACHING TO THE REGULAR ASSIGNMENT
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Relationship	Replies	Per cent
In addition to regular assignment	100	48
Part of regular assignment	97	46
No reply	14	6

TABLE I shows that about the same number of graduate staff members (100 or 48 per cent) stated that graduate extension teaching was in addition to their regular assignments as there were (ninety-seven, or 46 per cent) who reported extension teaching to be a part of their regular teaching loads. It is evident that among the fourteen extension divisions studied there is no predominant tendency toward one plan or the other.

Those who favor the inclusion of extension teaching as part of the regular load believe that overload may be avoided and that teaching effectiveness is thereby increased. This group also contends that lower salaried instructors tend to ask for extension teaching when it is in addition to the regular assignment because additional compensation is usually given for extension overload.

One instructor, who advocated extension teaching as a part of the regular load, said he believed "gift grading" was the result of the need to build large classes so that fee income would be sufficient to pay wages.

It should be pointed out, on the other hand, that extension schedules cannot always be planned in advance and that instructor load is sometimes impossible to determine at the time of making yearly assignments. If flexibility of scheduling classes were not permitted, many extension classes could not be offered.

TABLE XI shows a comparison of the time factor and the class size of graduate extension and graduate campus classes

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF AMOUNT OF PREPARATION, SIZE OF CLASS, AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT WITH GRADUATE STUDENTS IN EXTENSION AND IN CAMPUS SITUATIONS AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Comparison	Same as campus		More than campus		Less than campus	
	Replies	%	Replies	%	Replies	%
Preparation time	133	63	38	18	15	7
Class size	70	33	53	25	54	26
Time with individual students	61	29	13	6	110	52

The table shows that 133, or 63 per cent, of the 211 instructors, reported using the same preparation time for graduate extension classes as for graduate campus classes and that 18 per cent spent more time. Only 15 per cent spent less time. Class size was reported to be the same by seventy, or 33 per cent, of the instructors, while about an equal number each reported classes to be larger (25 per cent) or smaller (26 per cent). One instructor expressed the opinion that if the classes were too small in some subject fields, student interest was lessened and the quality of instruction was lowered.

More time was reported as being spent with individual graduate students on the campuses than in the extension classes. One hundred

ten, representing 52 per cent of the instructors, stated this to be true, while sixty-one, or 29 per cent, thought the amount of time spent with the individual students to be the same. Most of those who did not reply to the part of the questionnaire reported in TABLE XI pointed out that they were specialists who were not teaching on the campuses and that therefore they had no bases for comparison.

In general, it would seem that the instructor spends the same amount of time in the preparation of instructional materials for extension classes and that the graduate students on the campuses receive more individual attention than those enrolled through extension.

The reasons given by instructors for instructing graduate extension courses are shown in TABLE XII.

TABLE XII

REASONS FOR INSTRUCTING GRADUATE EXTENSION COURSES
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Reason	<u>First*</u>		<u>Second</u>		<u>Third</u>	
	Replies	%	Replies	%	Replies	%
Expected of staff	61	29	14	6	7	3
Desire to become better known out in state	5	2	24	11	12	6
To enlarge institutional influence	33	16	23	11	17	8
Prefer to teach adults	18	9	10	5	4	2
Need extra money	30	14	14	6	16	8
To attract graduate students through extension to campus	11	5	23	11	18	9
Other	53	25	19	10	5	2
No reply	-	-	84	40	132	62

*Arranged according to first, second, and third importance as reported by the instructors.

The three outstanding reasons given by 124 instructors, or 59 per cent, for instructing graduate extension classes were (a) expected of staff, (b) to enlarge institutional influence, and (c) need extra money. Sixty-one, or 29 per cent, of the 211 instructors stated that it was

expected of the staff, while thirty-three, or 16 per cent, and thirty, or 14 per cent, gave the other two reasons respectively. Fifty-three, representing 25 per cent of the instructors, gave reasons other than those shown in TABLE XII.

These instructors were invited, if they wished to give more than one reason, to do so in "1, 2, 3" order according to the importance of these reasons to them. One hundred twenty-seven gave second reasons. No second choice reasons seemed to stand out above the others as being especially important. Desire to become better known in the state was mentioned by twenty-four, or 11 per cent of the instructors; while two other groups of twenty-three, representing 11 per cent each, mentioned (a) to enlarge institutional influence, and (b) to attract graduate students through extension to the campus.

One hundred thirty-two, or 62 per cent of the 211 instructors, did not give a third reason. Of the reasons that were mentioned, none was mentioned by more than 9 per cent of the instructors.

The reasons for instructing graduate extension classes listed as "other" in TABLE XII are given below. Because they are first choice for 25 per cent of the instructors reporting, considerable importance is attached to them.

Among the other reasons stated ten times or more were (a) to contribute to the in-service education of teachers, (b) to meet the needs of off-campus graduate students, (c) to promote the special field through off-campus contacts, and (d) because it is a pleasure to teach. Other reasons mentioned less frequently were (a) to comply with the institution's policy of service to the state, (b) to meet professional

responsibility to off-campus people, (c) is full-time assignment, and (d) to gain experience. Reasons mentioned only once each were (a) to keep up teaching record, (b) to teach upper-division courses, (c) was asked to, (d) to teach those who want to learn, and (e) enjoy independence of action possible in extension classes.

It appears that extension instructors have their own reasons for instructing graduate extension classes and that these reasons vary according to the personalities and the needs of the individuals and according to the respective policies of the institutions they serve. Nearly one-third of the instructors reported as their first reason for teaching graduate extension classes that it was expected of them.

TABLE XIII shows whether graduate extension instructors are obligated to teach extension classes without extra compensation or whether they may accept extra pay. It also shows a comparison of the compensation received for extension teaching with that on the campus and indicates whether the rate of compensation affects the availability of instructors for graduate extension teaching.

TABLE XIII
ARRANGEMENTS FOR COMPENSATION AND INFLUENCE
ON AVAILABILITY OF 211 INSTRUCTORS

Arrangement	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	
	Replies %		Replies %	
Obligated to teach extension classes without additional compensation	53	25	142	67
May accept extra compensation	133	63	58	28
Extension compensation compares favorably with campus	72	34	75	36
Rate of compensation affects instructor's availability to teach extension classes	45	21	124	59

Fifty-three instructors, or 25 per cent, reported they were obligated by contract to teach extension classes without extra pay; and 133, or 63 per cent, stated they were permitted to accept extra compensation.

It is entirely possible that some of the instructors who did not reply belonged in a third category, namely, those who are not obligated to teach extension classes but who, if they do, may not receive additional compensation. Seventy-two instructors, or 34 per cent, reported that extension compensation compared favorably with that on the campus; while seventy-five, or 36 per cent, said it did not. Sixty-four, representing 30 per cent, did not reply. Although it appears that rates of pay vary among the cooperating institutions and that a substantial group (34 per cent) received less pay than when teaching on campus, 154 instructors, or 59 per cent, reported the rate of compensation did not affect their

availability to teach extension classes. Some of the instructors making comments referred to "professional loyalty" and to "the desire to serve" as being motivating influences, indicating that the amount of pay was of less importance when it was in addition to the regular salary. Forty-five others, representing 21 per cent, stated that the rate of compensation did affect their availability. These persons emphasized that "you get what you pay for". They indicated that the lower rates of pay for extension instruction in some situations were indexes of the "level of respectability" the campuses had assigned extension work. Forty-two, or 20 per cent, did not reply. In general, extension instructors may receive extra compensation and are willing to accept extension assignments, regardless of how the rates of pay compare with those on the campuses.

Three of the instructors said that extension work drained more time and energy than regular campus work and that the rate of pay was inadequate. One of these three instructors expressed the belief that graduate extension education would grow as more recognition is given to staff members. Two instructors spoke of the evils of the "fee system of support". If fees were too high, the class enrollments were limited, and if the fees were needed to pay salaries, the students were not "screened" properly. One instructor believed more liberal travel expense policies would tend to attract some of the more competent instructors.

Achievement in Graduate Extension Work

TABLE XIV deals with the ratings of the quality of graduate extension instruction.

TABLE XIV

QUALITY OF GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTION

AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Comment	Replies				No	
	Yes	%	No	%	reply	%
In general, the quality of extension instruction is as high as that on the campus	132	63	59	28	20	9
The instructor's own personal extension instruction is as high as that on the campus	137	65	51	24	23	11
Extension instruction requires as much time as that on the campus	185	88	10	5	16	7
Salary influences quality of instruction	20	9	158	75	33	16
The time of meeting affects the quality of instruction	81	38	120	57	10	5
The place of meeting affects the quality of instruction	84	40	110	52	17	8
Travel distance affects the quality of instruction	54	26	133	63	24	11

Of the 211 graduate extension instructors returning questionnaires, 63 per cent reported that graduate extension instruction, generally, was as high in quality as graduate instruction on the campus, whereas 28 per

cent stated the quality was not as high, and 9 per cent did not reply. Referring to the quality of their own extension instruction in particular, as compared with their own campus instruction, the instructors reported "yes" 65 per cent, "no" 24 per cent, and "no reply" 11 per cent.

Comments of the graduate extension instructors on the quality and importance of graduate extension instruction have been arranged into two groups by the writer. They are (a) comments which are critical of graduate extension work and (b) comments which express enthusiasm for the work.

One instructor said that graduate extension work in education was considered a farce in his state. He called it a plan to "pile up credits". "The instructors are many times public school administrators who do not know the subject and the instruction is as poor as can be obtained," he said.

Three instructors referred to the non-credit students in their classes who sometimes lacked the ability or interest to do graduate level work and mentioned the difficulty of keeping the instruction at the graduate level in these situations. "Non-credit students," one said, "want the instruction tailored."

Two instructors spoke of the high quality of graduate extension work being provided for technical professional personnel and of the enthusiasm of these students for the work. Seven of the instructors believed that the in-service work being provided for teachers on the job was superior to the on-campus in-service classes. They said the in-service work offered through extension for teachers should not be planned to duplicate campus work, but it should instead be adjusted to

the particular situation. One said, "Flexibility of method is a must! Extension provides a unique opportunity to use local resources, to make teaching meaningful, and to apply methods and techniques long advocated but seldom used."

One hundred eighty-five, or 88 per cent of the 211 instructors, reported that extension instruction requires as much time as campus instruction. These figures correspond very closely with the preparation time reported in TABLE XI where it is shown that 171 instructors, or 81 per cent, reported that preparation for extension teaching required as much or more time as for the same work on the campus. It may be that the higher percentage reported in TABLE XIV includes consideration of other factors such as travel and after-class consultations with persons who are seen less often than students who are on the campus.

According to TABLE XIV, salary does not influence the quality of instruction. While 158 instructors, representing 75 per cent, reported that it did not, only twenty, or 9 per cent, stated it did. To this question thirty-three, or 16 per cent, did not reply. Those not replying reported they had not answered the question because it did not apply to their situations. Extension teaching, they pointed out, was part of their regular assignment, anyway.

The time of meeting does not affect the quality of instruction, according to 120, or 57 per cent, of these instructors. A strong minority of 81, representing 38 per cent, contended that it did. They referred to the fatigue of the instructors who may have traveled long distances and of the wearing effect of the longer class periods usually found in extension classes. Again the majority (110, or 52 per cent)

reported that the place of meeting had no effect on the quality of instruction, and again a strong minority (40 per cent) stated that it did. The minority group referred to poor seating and lighting, lack of heat, and lack of maps and books as being closely associated with the place of meeting. Travel distances do not affect the quality of instruction, according to 133, or 63 per cent, of the instructors. They emphasized the need for allowing travel time and meal time before meeting extension classes. Twenty-six per cent believed travel does affect the quality of instruction, and 11 per cent did not reply.

The distances traveled by graduate extension instructors are shown in TABLE IV.

TABLE IV

DISTANCES TRAVELED TO TEACH GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Distance	<u>Extension</u>		<u>Campus</u>	
	Replies %		Replies %	
Below 20 miles	39	19	154	73
20 to 40 miles	32	15	3	1
Above 40 miles	112	53	2	1
No reply	28	13	52	25

It is noted that 112, or 53 per cent, of the 211 instructors, reported traveling more than forty miles to their extension classes. Many of these instructors reported traveling to metropolitan centers some distances from the campus towns. Instructors traveling more than forty miles are not as likely to return home the same evening and there

may, therefore, be a limitation of their services on the campus. One instructor reported that his institution provided airplanes for the transportation of staff members to and from extension classes. Instructors were not fatigued by long distance ground travel and much time and money were saved for the state.

The next three tables have to do with student achievement in campus and in extension classes. In TABLE XVI graduate extension students are compared with campus graduate students on the basis of "same", "above", or "below" in achievement.

TABLE XVI

COMPARISON OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF
GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS WITH CAMPUS GRADUATE STUDENTS
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Achievement	Replies	Per cent
Same	102	48
Above	28	13
Below	61	29
No reply	20	10

One hundred two, or 48 per cent, of the instructors reported the achievement of both groups to be the same; whereas twenty-eight, or 13 per cent, said extension students achieve more, and sixty-one, or 29 per cent, reported their achievements to be below those of campus graduate students.

One instructor stated that graduate extension students had great enthusiasm for their classes and the result was high achievement. He believed the extension students were more avid generally for the knowledge that would help them do a better job and that, while they placed less emphasis on intellectual accomplishment, they placed more emphasis on the feeling aspects of the knowledge imparted. Two others believed achievement was high in graduate extension classes because of the demand for competence on the job which was made by industry and specialized groups.

Those answering the questionnaires were asked to give the grade distribution on an A, B, C, D, F grading scale for their last graduate extension class and for the same course the last time it was taught to a graduate campus class. Sixty-seven instructors gave grade distributions which are shown in TABLE XVII, and the remaining 144 reported they did not have the records available or failed to give a reason.

TABLE XVII

COMPARISON OF GRADE DISTRIBUTIONS IN IDENTICAL GRADUATE CLASSES TAUGHT
THROUGH EXTENSION WITH DAYTIME ON-CAMPUS CLASSES
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Grades	<u>Extension</u> Per cent	<u>Campus</u> Per cent
A	27	26
B	49	51
C	15	18
D	3	2
F	2	1
Other	4	2

The distributions of grades for graduate students are almost identical, both in extension and in the campus classes. Approximately three-fourths of all the grades issued are in the A and B groups. About twice as many B's are issued as are A's. The remaining one-fourth of the grades are distributed among the C's, D's, F's, withdrawals, and incompletes, with a large proportion falling into the "C" category.

Grade distribution may not be an index of the performance of students, one instructor observed, because all classes whether on or off campus are conducted under different circumstances with different students. Another instructor believed that grade distributions for his campus classes and his extension classes reflected a double set of standards. One instructor thought that the courses which have scholarly accomplishments as objectives should best be offered on the campuses. Still another instructor stated it was the instructor's responsibility to grade students in extension exactly the same as if they were campus students. He did not indicate how this should be done, however.

Instructors were also requested to compare graduate extension students with campus students on the basis of certain performances associated with their course work. These comparisons appear in TABLE XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE OF GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS
WITH GRADUATE CAMPUS STUDENTS AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Performance	R e p l i e s						No	
	Same	%	Above	%	Below	%	reply	%
Test scores	90	43	13	6	46	22	62	29
Oral reporting	67	32	64	30	24	11	56	27
Written papers	83	39	23	11	49	23	56	27
Informal class discussions	40	19	104	49	17	8	50	24
Promptness to do assignments	89	42	25	12	49	23	48	23
Amount of outside reading	41	19	18	9	103	49	49	23
Reading of class text	108	51	39	19	13	6	51	24

The evidence presented in TABLE XVIII indicates that the test scores of graduate extension students are slightly below those of graduate campus students. Only thirteen instructors, or 6 per cent, reported them to be above campus students, while forty-six, or 22 per cent, said test scores were below those of campus students and ninety, or 43 per cent, stated them to be the same.

The oral reporting of extension students seems to be the same or above that of campus students, according to 131, or 62 per cent, of the instructors replying. Only twenty-four, or 11 per cent, stated the oral reporting of extension students to be below that of the campus students.

Performance on written papers was reported to be slightly in favor of the extension students, with eighty-three of the instructors, or 39 per cent, reporting "same" and twenty-three, or 11 per cent, reporting "above".

Informal class discussions were considered by 104, or 49 per cent, of the instructors to be superior among the graduate extension students. Those who reported the informal class discussions to be the same or to be below those of the campus students were definitely in the minority.

Eighty-nine, or 42 per cent, of the graduate instructors stated that graduate extension students and campus graduate students were equally prompt in doing assignments. Another forty-nine, representing 23 per cent, reported extension students to be below campus students in this respect. Only 12 per cent thought extension students were more prompt than campus students. In this trait, the evidence is in favor of the campus group.

There is extensive belief as shown in the above table that campus students do more outside reading than do the extension students. One hundred three, or 49 per cent, of the graduate instructors reported this to be true. Of those who reported otherwise, there were more who thought the amount of outside reading was the same (19 per cent) than there were who thought it to be above (9 per cent) campus students.

This information tends to substantiate the often-repeated criticism of the lack of suitable library facilities for extension students.

Fifty-one per cent (108) of the instructors stated that both groups of students did the same amount of reading of the class text, while 19 per cent (thirty-nine) reported extension students to be above campus students in text reading. Only 6 per cent said extension students read the text less.

The percentages of "no" replies on the seven items of performance in TABLE XVIII range from 23 per cent to 29 per cent, showing that approximately one-fourth of the instructors did not contribute to the information given in the table. It may be concluded from studying the material provided in the table that graduate students in extension compared favorably with campus graduate students in oral reporting, written papers, and reading of the text, and that they were superior in informal class discussions. Campus students achieved somewhat better test scores, were somewhat more prompt in doing assignments, and were superior in the amounts of outside reading which they did.

One instructor commented that extension students were tired and that their motivation must be exceptionally high to be able to do creditable work, and another instructor expressed the opinion that extension students are better motivated than are the campus students. A third instructor believed that the limited extension course offerings usually found in the average community caused the students to tend to take "anything" they could get, regardless of need.

Because graduate extension classes generally are more heterogeneous in their ages and in their backgrounds of experience, the graduate instructors were asked to compare certain characteristics of their graduate extension class students with those of the same level on the campuses and to give age and sex information concerning the members of their extension classes. TABLES XIX, XX, and XXI include data on these topics.

TABLE XIX shows age groupings of graduate extension class members as reported by 201 of the 211 graduate extension instructors.

TABLE XIX

AGE SPREAD OF STUDENTS ATTENDING GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Spread of ages	Replies	Per cent
Up to 10 years	20	10
Up to 20 years	100	47
More than 20 years	81	38
No reply	10	5

Twenty instructors, or 10 per cent, reported their students as having an age spread of less than ten years, while 100, representing 47 per cent, stated the spread of ages to be up to twenty years, and eighty-one, or 38 per cent, reported over twenty years. No replies were received from ten, or 5 per cent, of the instructors. It is apparent that there was a wide range of student ages in graduate extension classes.

Such a wide range of ages implies a wide range of interests and experiences among graduate extension students. According to TABLE IX, instructors were somewhat divided concerning whether there is a wider range of abilities and test scores among graduate extension students or among graduate students on the campus.

TABLE IX

CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASS MEMBERSHIP
IN TERMS OF SPREAD OF ABILITIES, TEST SCORES, AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION
COMPARED WITH CAMPUS GRADUATE CLASSES AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Characteristic	R e p l i e s				No	
	Yes	%	No	%	reply	%
Wider spread of abilities than on campus	100	47	76	36	35	17
Wider spread of test scores than on campus	65	30	88	42	57	28
Wider distribution of final grades than on campus	41	19	112	53	57	28

One hundred, or 47 per cent, of the instructors said there was a wider range of abilities among graduate extension students; seventy-six, or 36 per cent, said there was a narrower range; and thirty-five, or 17 per cent, failed to reply to the question. Even though 47 per cent of the instructors believed there was a wider spread of abilities among the extension students, eighty-eight, or 42 per cent, said there was not a wider spread of test scores than on the campus, and only sixty-five, representing 30 per cent, stated there was.

One hundred twelve, or 53 per cent, of the instructors answered "no" to the question, "Is there a wider distribution of final grades earned in your graduate extension classes than in your graduate campus classes?" Only 19 per cent answered "yes", and 28 per cent failed to reply. The majority answer to this question is in agreement with TABLE XVII which shows the grade distribution to be approximately the same in graduate extension as in campus graduate work.

One instructor stated he taught only graduate courses on the campus and that in terms of abilities, some of the very best and some of the very worst students came from extension. Much depended on their personal circumstances. "Time and energy make the difference," he observed. "Many students are thirty-five to fifty years old and are busy people." Another instructor said the graduate extension students, because of their backgrounds and experiences, had an abundance of material available, so that when a concept was introduced they could accept or reject it on the basis of experience. A third instructor observed, "The boundaries of our university are those of our state. It is a pleasure to work with experienced, serious, dedicated people. They improve 'our' teaching."

The sex distribution in graduate extension classes is reported in percentages in the following table.

TABLE XXI

SEX DISTRIBUTION IN GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Sex	Per cent
Male	54
Female	46

The 211 instructors have reported that 54 per cent of the graduate extension students are males and 46 per cent are females.

Organizational and Physical Arrangements for Graduate Extension Classes

This section of Chapter III presents the material on the organization of graduate extension classes in terms of time, instruction methods, and administrative arrangements; library provisions for the classes; and classroom facilities provided.

Extension classes usually meet less frequently than do the campus classes and the result usually is longer class sessions. The instructors participating in this study were asked to indicate the frequency and duration of the class meetings of their graduate extension classes. The information these instructors provided is given in TABLE XXII.

TABLE XXII

FREQUENCY AND DURATION OF MEETINGS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION COURSES
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Minutes per week	Monthly	Bi- weekly	Weekly	Semi- weekly	Total	Per cent
Less than 75	1	2	1	-	4	2
75 to 125	1	1	56	-	58	27
125 to 175	-	-	106	9	115	55
175 to 225	-	-	22	1	23	11
Above 225	-	-	-	3	3	1
No reply	-	-	8	-	8	4
Total:	2	3	193	13	211	100

Fifty-eight instructors, or 27 per cent, reported their class sessions to be in the "75 to 125" minute-per-week range. This range includes the time provisions for the regular two-hour class which normally meets approximately 100 minutes a week, whether on campus or off campus. It may be noted that all but two of the classes in this group were reported as meeting once a week. One hundred fifteen, or 55 per cent, of the graduate extension instructors reported that their classes met for three hours a week (125 to 175 minutes). Of these, 106 met weekly and nine met semi-weekly. This group of 115 includes the regular three-hour classes which usually meet for 150 minutes both on and off campus. The other variations shown in the table are influenced by the amounts of credit the respective courses carry and

the types of activity being conducted. In some instances, in-service work with teachers calls for a great deal of committee and laboratory work between class sessions, which are held less frequently than weekly.

It appears that the same amount of time is given to graduate extension instruction as is normally given on the campuses for the same courses. The principal difference is that on the campus the week's class time may be distributed over several class periods of one hour each, while in extension work the typical class meets once a week for a two or three-hour session.

One instructor expressed the opinion that more review was required when classes met once a week because of the longer time between learning periods and that less instruction time than on the campus was the result.

TABLE XXIII shows the instructional methods reported by the 211 graduate extension instructors. The tabulation is in terms of frequency of mention, since many of those reporting mentioned more than one method.

TABLE XXIII

CLASS ORGANIZATION IN TERMS OF INSTRUCTION METHODS
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Methods	Frequency of mention	Per cent
Part lecture and part class discussion	181	86
Seminar plan	54	26
Laboratory	27	13
Straight lecture	11	5
Other	25	12

Part lecture and part class discussion were reported by 181, or 86 per cent, of the instructors as the methods used. The second most often used method, the seminar plan, was reported by fifty-four, or 26 per cent. The laboratory method (13 per cent) and the lecture method (5 per cent) were also used. The 12 per cent reporting "other" methods gave varying combinations of the methods shown in the table or mentioned other plans such as the field trip, reading and conference, and thesis writing. The most popular instruction methods used are those which permit a great deal of student participation.

There are many administrative arrangements for providing instruction to extension students. Those which are shown in TABLE XXIV are typical of some of the more popular plans. The arrangements listed in the table are shown in first, second, and third order according to preferences of the instructors.

TABLE XXIV

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR MEETING STUDENTS

AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Arrangement	First		Second		Third	
	Replies	%	Replies	%	Replies	%
Daytime center	38	18	11	5	9	4
Evening center	102	48	32	15	3	2
Independent evening class	37	18	21	10	13	6
Short course	6	3	15	7	12	6
Conference	4	2	13	6	13	6
Correspondence study	1	1	3	2	2	1
Thesis writing	2	1	7	3	6	3
Other	7	3	3	2	5	2
No reply	14	6	106	50	148	70

The evening center was preferred by many graduate extension instructors, there being 102, or 48 per cent, who gave it as their first choice. The daytime center was preferred by thirty-eight, or 18 per cent, of the instructors, and the independent evening class by another 18 per cent of those replying to the questionnaire. Several instructors indicated only one preference, stating that they had no other extension work experience.

Altogether 177, or 84 per cent, of the instructors gave first choice to the first three types of arrangement listed in the table. These three are those which lend themselves to more traditional class organization. Short courses, conferences, correspondence study, and thesis writing have less certain status in terms of preference than the first three, none of them being mentioned by more than 7 per cent in any of the three preference ranks.

The matter of adequate library provisions for graduate extension classes has been one of great concern to graduate deans, extension directors, and to extension graduate faculty alike. It is the point-of-view of staff members and deans that adequate library provisions must exist before effective graduate work is possible. Those who oppose graduate work off campus insist that the library facilities for extension students cannot equal those provided for the on-campus graduate students.

TABLE XIV includes information on the library provisions for graduate extension classes.

TABLE XIV

LIBRARY PROVISIONS FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Provision	Yes		No	
	Replies	%	Replies	%
Campus library available	106	50	96	45
Local public library available	103	49	85	40
Special class library provided by extension division	138	65	61	29
Extension graduate center library	82	39	96	45
Instructor provides library	91	43	101	48
Student provides own library	29	14	151	71
Other library provisions	31	14	50	24
Facilities as adequate as for campus students	67	32	126	60
Extension students use library facilities as much as campus students do	56	26	118	56

Fifty per cent, or 106, of the 211 graduate extension instructors reported that a campus library was available and 49 per cent, or 103 instructors, reported the availability of a local public library. The provision of a special extension division class library was reported by the largest number of instructors (138, or 65 per cent). Another provision of some extension divisions was the extension graduate center library reported available to 39 per cent. The least used method of

providing graduate library facilities was to request the student to provide his own, yet 14 per cent reported doing this.

According to 126 instructors, or 60 per cent of this group, the graduate extension students were not provided with library facilities which were as adequate as the library facilities provided for graduate students on the campuses and, according to 118, or 56 per cent of these instructors, graduate extension students did not use the library facilities as much as the campus students did.

Among the reasons given by the instructors for failure of extension students to use library facilities were the following: (a) they are too busy with community, job, and family responsibilities (listed by forty-four instructors); (b) libraries are not readily available (listed by eighteen instructors); (c) facilities are inadequate (listed by four instructors); and (d) extension students are in a hurry to go home (mentioned by one instructor).

Some instructors defended the belief that extension students did not compare favorably with campus students in library use. Nine instructors pointed out that the reading done by graduate extension students is selective purposeful reading and that the students are "resource-conscious". Three or fewer instructors offered each of the following statements: (a) extension courses are planned to produce practical rather than theoretical results, so that some types of reading may be of less importance than reading which may be required on the campus; (b) extension students take more books home and buy more books than do campus students; (c) many good school libraries are better suited to teacher in-service work than are the campus libraries;

(d) multiple texts and individual projects are more suited to in-service courses than library reading in some instances; (e) company libraries provided by industry are quite adequate but specialized; and (f) reading may not be so important for advanced on-the-job students.

Thirty-one, or 14 per cent of the 211 instructors, reported other library provisions than those listed in TABLE XIV. In the order of frequency of mention they were: public school library (13), state library (7), instructor's personal books (6), government library (4), and company library (1).

Extension classes are often scheduled in public libraries, public school classrooms, and in industrial laboratories. It is possible that such meeting places are not always suitable for the work to be accomplished. TABLE XXVI is concerned with the adequacy of classrooms for graduate extension classes.

TABLE XXVI

ADEQUACY OF CLASSROOMS FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES
AS REPORTED BY 211 INSTRUCTORS

Facility	Yes		No	
	Replies %		Replies %	
Size is adequate	199	94	7	3
Lighted adequately	175	83	28	13
Heated adequately	196	93	7	3
Located conveniently	191	91	13	6
Classroom equipped adequately	154	73	50	24
Classroom located on campus	37	17	160	76

Size, lighting, heating, and location were reported to be adequate by more than 80 per cent of the 211 instructors. A lesser number, 154, or 73 per cent, reported the equipment of the classroom to be adequate. Since 160, or 76 per cent, reported the classrooms to be off campus, it is understandable that the equipment in some classrooms might be inadequate. It may be noted, however, that according to these findings, the graduate extension classrooms seem quite adequate in most instances.

Summary

According to the survey findings reported in this chapter, the typical instructor of graduate extension classes was a man between the ages of thirty and fifty years, who held a college degree, usually a doctor's, and who has been employed by his present institution for less than ten years. The graduate extension instructor has taught mainly in the fields of education, engineering, psychology, and business administration. In about one-half of the institutions he was expected to teach extension classes as part of his regular assignment, while in the other institutions he might choose to teach "in addition" to his regular load and receive extra compensation. He spent about the same amount of time in the preparation for his extension teaching as he did for his campus teaching, and he found more time to help campus students than he did to help extension students. He usually has taught extension classes because it was expected of him, or because he needed the money, or as a professional service to his institution. Although the rate of pay was less for this work than he received for his regular campus work, he was glad to accept the assignment.

The instructors of graduate extension classes believed that the quality of their extension teaching was equal to that of their teaching on the campuses and that the time and place of class meetings did not influence materially the quality of the work they did. The majority of the extension instructors traveled more than forty miles each way to and from their extension classes.

Forty-eight per cent of the instructors have said that the achievement of graduate extension students was equal to that of the campus graduate students, while smaller percentages said it was "above" or "below" that of campus students. Grade distributions were virtually identical among both student groups, and their achievement was very much the same in oral reporting, written papers, promptness, reading of the text, and test scores. The instructors have rated the extension students slightly superior to the campus students in class discussion and have rated the campus students superior to the extension students in the amounts of outside reading they accomplish.

The ages of graduate extension students varied considerably as did their general scholastic abilities.

The typical extension class met once a week for two or three class hours each session. These classes were usually scheduled in permanently established graduate centers located in or near thickly populated areas. A good many of the classes were also found in non-center locations where sufficient enrollments and adequate facilities were provided.

Campus libraries, local public libraries, special class libraries, and extension center libraries provided the books for graduate extension students. A fair majority (60 per cent) of the instructors reported

that these library services were not as well used by the extension students as they were by the campus students and that many of these facilities were quite inadequate. The classrooms provided for extension classes were found to be adequate in most situations, however 24 per cent of the instructors said the equipment was inadequate and 13 per cent said that the lighting was poor.

CHAPTER IV

THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY DEANS OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

The success of the graduate extension program of any extension division, it seems to the writer, is dependent to a very great extent upon the controls and requirements exercised by the graduate school concerned. In an effort to discover such controls and requirements as are exercised in the fourteen institutions cooperating in this study, questionnaires were mailed to the deans of the respective graduate schools. Although the reply of one dean was not returned in time to be included in the report, fourteen replies were received because two deans replied for the Oregon State System of Higher Education. While the two cooperating institutions in Oregon are both served by a single extension division, the reports of both deans are included because the graduate schools they represent are independent of each other and their policies are not identical. Listed below are the institutions whose graduate school deans returned questionnaires:

University of Arizona	Oklahoma A. and M. College
University of Arkansas	University of Oregon
University of Colorado	Oregon State College
University of Florida	University of South Carolina
University of Illinois	Syracuse University
University of Michigan	State College of Washington
University of Oklahoma	University of Wisconsin

The information obtained from the questionnaires is presented in the following five sections of this chapter: (a) staff requirements,

(b) course requirements and approvals, (c) the status of graduate extension credit, (d) organizational and physical provisions, and (e) planning the student's program.

The writer does not necessarily assume that the controls exercised over graduate extension study by the graduate schools of the reporting institutions are those which are typical of graduate schools everywhere. The material is intended, rather, to provide the reader with specific information about the fourteen cooperating institutions in this study. Since these cooperating institutions are among those with the largest enrollments of graduate extension students in the nation, the information provided by their graduate school deans should be of interest and value to many other deans of graduate schools and directors of extension.

Staff Requirements

These staff members may be selected from among the full-time institutional staff; they may be staff members from sister institutions which are located conveniently near or in extension centers; they may be non-institutional specialists or full-time extension division personnel. The fourteen graduate school deans were asked to indicate on what bases they approved instructors for teaching their graduate extension classes. The responses they gave are shown in TABLE XXVII.

TABLE XXVII

STATUS OF STAFF MEMBERS APPROVED IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS
WHO INSTRUCT GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

Instructors	Replies	Per cent
Institutional faculty, but must be approved by the graduate office to instruct a given course	9	64
Approved faculty members of other institutions	7	50
Non-institutional persons who are specialists in their fields, when approved	7	50
Full-time extension division personnel of graduate faculty standing	6	43
Members of the regular daytime graduate faculty only	4	29
Others	1	7

Nine, or 64 per cent, of the fourteen deans reported that all of the institutional staff members who are approved by the graduate office might instruct graduate extension classes. A smaller group of four, or 29 per cent, said that only members of their regular daytime graduate faculty might teach these classes; and the remaining dean said that approval for graduate extension teaching came from the college or department concerned.

Seven, or 50 per cent, of the deans who reported approving other than regular graduate campus staff members also reported approving staff members of sister institutions, and another 50 per cent of the

deans said they approved non-institutional staff specialists who were especially qualified in their fields. Six, or 43 per cent, of the fourteen deans stated that they also used full-time extension division personnel to instruct graduate courses through extension.

The information given by these fourteen graduate school deans concerning the minimum academic degree requirements for teaching graduate extension courses is shown in TABLE XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII

MINIMUM ACADEMIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS OF FOURTEEN GRADUATE SCHOOLS
FOR INSTRUCTING GRADUATE EXTENSION COURSES

Requirements	Replies	Per cent
Bachelor's degree	1	7
Master's degree	7	50
Doctor's degree	1	7
No degree stated	5	36

While 50 per cent of the fourteen deans stated the master's degree was required, only one, or 7 per cent, required the doctor's degree. Thirty-six per cent said there was no specific degree requirement. It was the consensus of this group that expertness and competence were more important than academic degrees.

Almost all of the deans agreed that, although advanced degrees were not required, the majority of the graduate faculty members had them. Three deans stated that the non-staff specialists were usually as well educated as the campus faculty members.

These fourteen deans of the graduate schools had a similar attitude about academic rank requirements as they had about academic degree requirements, namely, that rank was not as important as was competence. Minimum academic rank requirements, as reported by these deans, are shown in TABLE XXIX.

TABLE XXIX

MINIMUM ACADEMIC RANK REQUIREMENTS AT FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS
FOR INSTRUCTING GRADUATE EXTENSION COURSES

Ranks	Replies	Per cent
Instructor	2	14
Assistant professor	5	36
Associate professor	-	-
Full professor	-	-
Other	7	50

Fifty per cent of the deans in this study stated there was no academic rank requirement for instructing graduate extension classes in their institutions. They said that competence was the basic requirement for election to the graduate faculty. Thirty-six per cent of the deans named the rank of assistant professor to be the minimum rank permitted, but 14 per cent answered that the rank of instructor was the minimum.

Course Requirements and Approvals

Critics of graduate extension work sometimes hint that staff members instructing the courses through extension are prone to require

less work of their students and of themselves than they would require for the same courses on the campuses. TABLE XXI contains the replies of these fourteen deans on course requirements.

TABLE XXI

COURSE REQUIREMENTS IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION WORK

Requirements	R e p l i e s				No	
	Yes	%	No	%	reply	%
Courses are identical to campus	12	86	2	14	-	-
Instructor must submit own syllabus or course outline	4	29	10	71	-	-
Special papers and course projects are required of students	2	14	11	79	1	7
Time requirement is the same as on the campus	14	100	-	-	-	-
Classes have specific minimum library requirements	7	50	7	50	-	-
Individual counseling of students is required	4	29	9	64	1	7

Eighty-six per cent of these fourteen deans reported that graduate extension courses were identical in content with the graduate courses offered on the various campuses.

The deans who stated that their courses were identical with those on the campuses made the following qualifying statements: (a) except in the case of education workshops, (b) except for special courses, (c) except in certain field studies, and (d) courses must be equivalent if not identical.

The above table also shows that there was 100 per cent agreement among the deans that the time requirement in class hours must be the same for graduate extension classes as for the same work on the campuses. One dean emphasized the need for keeping the time requirement the same as on the campuses by saying, "Yes, positively, to avoid criticism!"

Seventy-one per cent of the deans reported that the graduate extension instructor is not required to submit a course syllabus for each course he proposes to teach. These deans said that the courses had already been approved at the time they were established on the campuses and that faculty members should be trusted to provide appropriate instruction without being required to present course outlines simply because the classes were scheduled off campus. Approximately the same per cent of the deans (79 per cent) stated that instructors were not required to assign special course papers and course projects to graduate extension students. They said that campus departmental policy applied the same for extension classes as for the on-campus classes and that there was considerable variation among the departments, both on and off campus.

The answers of these graduate school deans returning the questionnaires were equally divided on the question of specific library requirements for extension classes. The seven deans who had minimum library requirements for extension classes took the stand that library facilities were usually poor, at best, for these off-campus classes and that minimum requirements assured a semblance of a library for the students. One stated that the departments concerned checked to see that library facilities were adequate; another dean stated, "We send the books"; and still

another observed that the library requirements varied with the campus departments. The seven who answered they had no minimum library requirements for extension classes explained that the instructor, the department concerned, and the extension division cooperate to provide adequate library facilities for all courses, but that they were not expected to make a specific report that a minimum requirement had been met.

Sixty-four per cent of the graduate school deans reported that there was no specific requirement regarding student-staff individual conferences. They said, however, that the instructors were usually available and that they were willing to give the necessary time to the individual students. One dean said his institution allowed additional travel expense money so that its instructors could "stay over" if necessary to counsel their students, but that the instructors were not required to do so. Twenty-nine per cent required conferences, and one of the four in this group reported that his institution also required an on-campus conference with the major adviser. One other dean stated that the counsel requirements of his institution varied with the departments concerned.

TABLE XXXI shows who has final authority in approving graduate extension work at the fourteen institutions.

TABLE XXXI
APPROVING AUTHORITIES IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS
FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION WORK

Approving authorities	Replies	Per cent
Graduate council or committee	8	57
Graduate school dean	2	14
President	1	7
Extension division director	-	-
Departmental head or dean of school	-	-
Departmental committee	-	-
Other	3	21

In 71 per cent of the institutions the graduate councils or the graduate school deans gave final approval for the offering of graduate extension work. Three deans gave answers other than those shown in the table and one dean named the president as the approving authority. The three "other" replies were: (a) same as for campus, (b) special graduate extension committee, (c) graduate faculty. It is quite apparent from the replies tabulated in the table that most often the approval of graduate extension courses is the responsibility of the graduate school through its authorized representatives.

Many of the fourteen institutions participating in this study organize extension graduate classes throughout their entire states, and requests for the classes are channeled through the extension divisions and the campus departments to the graduate schools for approval.

TABLE XXXII indicates the sources of these requests.

TABLE XXXII

SOURCES OF REQUESTS FOR PERMISSION TO ORGANIZE
GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Sources of requests	Replies	Per cent
Extension director or his representative	9	64
Graduate school faculty member	1	7
Outside sponsor of course	-	-
Other	4	29

TABLE XXXII shows that the extension director or his representative makes the request of the approving authority to establish graduate extension classes in nine, or 64 per cent, of the institutions. In four other institutions, or 29 per cent, it was reported that the department or college concerned presented the request for graduate extension work.

The Status of Graduate Extension Credit

The study of the literature on graduate extension study and of the letters from the extension directors and graduate school deans of the seventy-four institutions reported in this thesis show that there has been considerable concern about the status of graduate extension credit. TABLE XXXIII, which follows, shows the replies of these fourteen deans about the acceptance and use of graduate extension credits at their respective institutions.

TABLE XXXIII

ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CREDITS
IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Acceptance and use	R e p l i e s			
	Yes	%	No	%
Applied toward an advanced degree	14	100	-	-
Accepted from another institution within state	7	50	7	50
Accepted from out-of-state institution	5	36	9	64
Entire degree may be earned through extension	1	7	13	93
Extension credit is disallowed by some schools or departments	5	36	9	64
Distinguished between extension and campus credit on permanent record	14	100	-	-
Graduate extension credit is discounted	-	-	14	100
Registrar distinguishes between "course" and "residence" credit in extension	6	43	8	57

All of the institutions represented in this study, or 100 per cent, were reported by the deans of their graduate schools as accepting graduate extension work toward an advanced degree. Seven deans said that they accepted graduate extension credit from institutions within the state, but seven stated that they did not accept such credit.

Five deans reported that they accepted a limited amount of extension credit from out-of-state institutions, and nine answered they did not.

The deans who reported accepting credit from other in-state institutions made the following comments: (a) accept only for the master of arts degree in general studies, (b) accept only in individual cases, (c) have reciprocal arrangements with certain other institutions for six semester hours only, (d) accept eight semester hours, and (e) accept six semester hours on master's from accredited institutions--perhaps more on doctor's. Those who answered "no" made no comments.

A great many comments accompanied the responses to the question about accepting out-of-state extension credit. Among these comments were: (a) in individual cases, (b) eight semester hours on master's or doctor's degrees, (c) six semester hours on master's degree, and perhaps more on doctor's degree, (d) six semester hours maximum, and (e) if they are willing to accept our extension credits at the state university in their state.

One dean said his institution offered the entire master of arts degree in general studies through extension.

Graduate extension credit is acceptable toward advanced degrees in all of the various schools and departments on nine, or 64 per cent, of the campuses. The deans representing these institutions stated that (a) some departments themselves did not offer graduate credit, however, and (b) that certain laboratory courses were not acceptable as graduate credit if taken in extension classes. Five deans, representing 36 per cent, stated some of their departments and schools

did not accept graduate extension credit, but they failed to name departments. All of the fourteen, or 100 per cent of the deans in the survey, distinguish between extension and campus credit on the student's permanent record, but, almost without exception, the deans reported that this had no effect on the value of the credit. They said, however, that the credit was not accepted if the total amount taken exceeded the maximum number of credits permitted by the institution toward the advanced degree. It was reported that, in some institutions, certain extension credits earned in established extension centers were applied as "residence credits" while extension credits earned in non-center classes were designated as "course credits" and were limited in amount applicable toward graduation. All of the institutions represented by these deans allowed full credit for extension work, if it was accepted at all.

Six, or 43 per cent, of these institutions distinguish between "course" and "residence" extension credit. The principal difference in the two kinds of credit, as reported by some of these deans, was that "course" credit was applied as non-residence credit and could not reduce the residence requirements. One dean said that the "course" credit did not apply toward a degree. The larger number of institutions (57 per cent), however, did not separate extension credit into "course" credit and "residence" credit.

The academic degrees toward which graduate extension credits may be applied in these fourteen cooperating institutions and the amount of credits allowed for each degree are shown in TABLE XXXIV.

TABLE XXXIV

SEMESTER HOURS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CREDIT
APPLICABLE TOWARD VARIOUS ACADEMIC DEGREES IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Degrees	I n s t i t u t i o n s													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Masters	-	-	8	8	-	6	-	-	-	16	-	-	V*	-
Master of arts	24	24	-	-	6	-	7	-	-	-	6	10	-	10
Master of arts in general studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	32
Master of science	24	24	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	6	10	-	10
Master of science in general studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Master of education	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	8	-	9	22	-	22
Master of political science	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Doctor of education	-	V	V	8	V	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	V	-
Doctor of philosophy	-	V	V	-	V	-	-	12	-	-	-	V	V	-

*Varies with individual student to meet need as approved by faculty members.

By viewing the table vertically, the reader may determine the amounts of credit each institution allows toward certain degrees. The amounts vary from six semester hours toward the "master's" in the case of institution numbered 6 to the thirty-two semester hours toward the master of arts in general studies degree in institution numbered 14. Institutions allowing the most extension credit toward advanced degrees are located in the northern part of the nation, while there are only

two institutions located south of the Mason-Dixon line which allow more than eight semester credits toward an advanced degree. Institution numbered 8 accepts twelve credits toward both the master of education degree and the doctor of education degree, but six of the twelve credits must be earned in a field laboratory study. Institution numbered 11 allows nine semester hour credits toward the master of education degree. Two southern institutions, numbered 4 and 8, permit extension credit to be applied toward the doctor of education degree, but none of them permit any credit to be applied toward the doctor of philosophy degree.

By viewing the table horizontally, the reader may see the number of institutions permitting extension credit to be applied on various degrees. At the doctoral level, it appears that the institutions prefer to vary the amounts of credit applicable according to individual student's needs. Comments such as (a) by petition only, (b) to meet student's needs, (c) usually limited, and (d) as recommended by doctoral committee, were given as responses to the question about the number of credits permitted at this level. In the case of institution numbered 13, this same practice prevails at the master's level.

It was necessary to indicate one space in the table as "master's" because four of the institutions failed to show the type of master's degree or degrees toward which they permitted extension credit to be applied. It is assumed by the writer that these degrees may be either the master of arts, master of science, master of education, or more than one of these as was reported by the other institutions.

Two graduate school deans stated that their institutions allowed considerable credit toward the master of arts in general studies degree

and one institution allowed twenty-four semester hours toward the master of political science degree. In the case of institution numbered 14, the entire master of arts degree in general studies may be completed at an extension center. The graduate school dean of institution numbered 10 reported that sixteen semester hours could be earned toward the master's degree at their permanent center, but that only eight semester hours could be earned in non-center classes.

Organizational and Physical Provisions for Graduate Extension Classes

There is a variety of organizational arrangements under which graduate extension work is offered. These range from fully organized daytime centers with faculty, classrooms, equipment, and libraries similar to those found on the campuses to programs of independent study, such as thesis writing and correspondence study.

TABLE XXV shows the organizational plans approved for graduate extension study in the fourteen institutions included in this study.

TABLE XXV

ORGANIZATIONAL PLANS THROUGH WHICH GRADUATE EXTENSION WORK IS OFFERED BY FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Organizational plans	Replies	Per cent
Evening centers	13	93
Independent evening and Saturday classes	9	64
Daytime centers	8	57
Short courses	2	14
Conferences	2	14
Correspondence study	2	14
Thesis writing	4	29
Other	-	-

The three most frequently used organizational plans for the offering of graduate work by these fourteen institutions are evening centers (93 per cent), independent evening and Saturday classes (64 per cent), and daytime centers (57 per cent). No evidence was presented to indicate that the evening centers are preferable to the other two plans mentioned above. It is the observation of the writer that the independent class is the one which has a longer history in extension education, while the permanently established evening and daytime centers are more recent developments. One dean expressed the belief that there would be an increase in the number of "centers" and a gradual decrease in the number of independently organized classes which might offer graduate work. Another dean, however, said he believed graduate work in all three types of situations would increase as controls became more standardized among the graduate schools.

Thesis writing was permitted in four, or 29 per cent, of the institutions, while short courses, correspondence study, and conferences were used by two, or 14 per cent, each.

The deans did not seem as much concerned about the places in which graduate extension courses were offered or under what administrative arrangements, as they were concerned about the adequacy of the library or laboratory in each instance. For the purposes of this thesis, the writer asked graduate students and graduate school faculty members to report on the adequacy of the libraries and laboratory facilities they have used in graduate extension work, and their replies are reported in TABLES XXV and XLIX on pages 103 and 149 respectively.

The deans of the graduate schools were also asked to report on the provisions for these facilities. TABLE XXXVI gives the library provisions for graduate extension classes as reported by these deans.

TABLE XXXVI

LIBRARY PROVISIONS FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION
CLASSES IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Provisions	Replies				No	
	Yes	%	No	%	reply	%
Instructor submits bibliography to graduate office for approval	1	7	13	93	-	-
Instructor has entire responsibility for library adequacy	7	50	7	50	-	-
Graduate center provides own library	11	79	3	21	-	-
Public libraries serve isolated evening classes	13	93	1	7	-	-
Instructor transports class library	5	36	7	50	2	14
Student provides own library	4	29	8	57	2	14

In thirteen, or 93 per cent, of the fourteen institutions included in this part of the study, the instructor was not required to submit a bibliography to the graduate office for approval. Four of the deans stated they held the particular department responsible for an adequate book list which should be provided each extension class.

The answers of the deans were evenly divided concerning the responsibility of the instructor to provide an adequate library for his extension class. Some of the 50 per cent who held the instructor responsible

accompanied their replies with the following comments: (a) bibliography is sent to the campus librarian and the responsibility is shared, and (b) responsibility is assumed for the bibliography when the class is approved. Two of those deans who did not hold the instructor responsible commented that: (a) the extension division is responsible and (b) the instructor must check to be certain the library will be provided before the class is scheduled.

In all but three of the institutions, the deans stated that their permanent centers provided their own libraries.

One dean stated that the extension division provided all of the library facilities necessary for graduate work in their "centers"; one said that other college campuses were considered their centers and that adequate libraries were available; and two others reported that their campus libraries and the public libraries supplemented the center libraries for certain types of courses. No statement was made concerning the adequacy of these libraries.

Books were provided by 93 per cent of the institutions for the isolated non-center evening and Saturday classes. One dean remarked that reserve shelves were occasionally established for these courses, and another said his institution used the public libraries in some cases. He noted that some local libraries were inadequate and that the library hours were sometimes limited. In five of the institutions, the instructor transported the class library or saw to it that it was transported to his extension class. These traveling libraries were: (a) provided by the extension division or (b) "packaged" at the campus library as requested by the instructor. The seven institutions which

did not expect instructors to transport class libraries said they were: (a) shipped by truck, (b) the responsibility of the extension division, or (c) shipped by the campus library to the proper designation. In one institution, the instructors mailed bibliographies to the state library which, in turn, shipped the books to the local public library. Under this plan, the books never became the responsibility of the instructors and books which were lost were not charged to them.

Four of the graduate school deans of these fourteen institutions reported they required graduate extension students to provide their own libraries. This requirement applied especially in cases of special research of an individual nature or when the student needed material over an extended period of time.

Laboratory type work is quite often provided through extension classes at industrial sites and at governmental installations. In some instances, the laboratories thus provided are considered superior to any which might be found on the campuses. Public school classrooms, too, often become the laboratories for teachers doing in-service work under institutional supervision. TABLE XXXVII and the comments which follow provide information concerning the laboratories provided for graduate extension classes in the fourteen institutions.

TABLE XXXVII

CONCERNING LABORATORIES PROVIDED FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION
CLASSES IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Statements	Replies		No		reply	
	Yes	%	No	%	reply	%
Approve off-campus laboratory classes	5	36	9	64	-	-
Some off-campus laboratories are superior to on-campus laboratories	4	29	7	50	3	21
Inspect off-campus laboratory facilities	4	29	5	36	5	36
Instructor may "alter" a course to "fit" available laboratory and equipment	7	50	4	29	3	21

Thirty-six per cent of the fourteen graduate school deans said they approved off-campus laboratory classes, and nine (64 per cent) said they did not. The five deans reporting in the affirmative commented as follows: (a) where the field situation is the laboratory, (b) in engineering, and (c) in industrial plants. Four deans believed some off-campus laboratories to be superior to campus laboratories. They gave the following qualifications to their answers: (a) but rarely, as in a medical school, (b) at an atomic energy plant, (c) in the case of state highway equipment, (d) in oil companies, and (e) at chemical plants. Seven of the deans, representing 50 per cent of the total, believed campus laboratories to be superior to those found off campus; and three, or 21 per cent, did not reply. Only four institutions, according to the table, inspected their off-campus laboratory facilities.

Fifty per cent of these institutions permitted some alteration of courses to fit available laboratory facilities. One dean suggested that it was more a matter of flexibility than of alteration. Other comments were: (a) for field work, (b) for research, and (c) after securing the permission of the department concerned. Twenty-nine per cent did not permit alteration and 21 per cent did not reply to the question.

The deans of the graduate schools of the fourteen institutions included in this study were unanimous in their beliefs that graduate study should not be offered through correspondence study.

TABLE XXXVIII

CONCERNING GRADUATE WORK THROUGH CORRESPONDENCE STUDY
IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Statements	Replies		No	
	Yes	%	No	%
Graduate students are more qualified to do correspondence study than undergraduates are	4	29	4	29
Graduate work is offered through correspondence study	2	14	12	86
Graduate credits by correspondence study are limited	12	86	-	-

The two deans who stated their institutions offered graduate study through correspondence lessons qualified their replies as follow:
(a) only to remove deficiencies but not to be applied as credit toward advanced degrees, and (b) plan to discontinue it soon.

While four deans believed that graduate students were more qualified to study by correspondence than were the undergraduates, four others said they were not. The largest number, six, representing 43 per cent, stated they had no basis for judgment because they had never offered graduate level correspondence work. One dean commented that he thought graduate students should be more capable of doing independent research. He questioned whether, regardless of level or difficulty, correspondence study was suited to the serious business of graduate study.

It is obvious that all of the institutions, with the exception of the two offering some graduate level correspondence work, would not accept correspondence study credit. One of the two deans whose institutions accept some correspondence work stated that very little was permitted and the other dean stated that the only work accepted was that offered through the United States Armed Forces Institute.

Planning the Student's Program

The graduate student registered in extension classes may not always find sufficient counseling services available to enable him to secure all of the information and guidance he needs in planning his program of studies. In densely populated areas, the classes which are offered through the extension division of an institution are likely to begin during the same weeks that classes are beginning on the campus and during these times campus counselors may not be available to travel to extension centers to assist the students there. The graduate extension student finds it necessary, therefore, to register anyway, hoping to seek counsel as soon thereafter as is possible. Graduate school deans

have been reluctant to penalize students who have been unable to avail themselves of campus counseling facilities, while others have adhered more or less strictly to campus regulations for these students. TABLE XXXIX gives the responses of fourteen graduate school deans concerning some of the problems connected with planning the students' programs.

TABLE XXXIX

PLANNING THE GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS' PROGRAMS
IN FOURTEEN INSTITUTIONS

Procedures for planning	Replies				No reply %	
	Yes	%	No	%		
Students are required to secure permission in advance to take extension work	8	57	6	43	-	-
Counselors are assigned to students in advance of registration	6	43	7	50	1	7
Students usually take some work before seeking counsel	8	57	5	36	1	7
Students may take extension work before being admitted to graduate standing	9	64	5	36	-	-
Extension staff advises students about their programs	9	64	5	36	-	-

In eight, or 57 per cent, of the institutions studied the graduate extension students are required to secure permission in advance of taking graduate extension work. One dean said his institution accomplishes this at the first class meeting; another requires students to sign

statements acknowledging the possibility of losing the credit when they have registered before being counseled; and three others do not permit registration for credit until the student has established his graduate standing. Six, or 43 per cent, of the graduate school deans stated that counselors were assigned to students in advance of registration; and seven, or 50 per cent, stated they were not. It was reported that in eight, or 57 per cent, of the institutions students usually took some graduate extension work before counseling. Comments from the deans were: (a) at their own risk, (b) unfortunately, (c) more so in permanent centers, (d) frequently, but not usually, and (e) are counseled soon after. In nine, or 64 per cent, of the institutions extension students could take graduate work before being admitted to graduate standing. Some of these deans qualified their responses with such statements as: (a) but not officially, (b) up to six hours which may or may not be accepted, and (c) this is difficult to control. Five deans, or 36 per cent, answered that students could not enroll in graduate extension classes before being admitted to graduate standing, and one dean did not reply. One dean said "never" would his institution permit any student to take graduate extension work before being admitted to graduate standing.

Extension division staff members may counsel graduate students in nine, or 64 per cent, of the institutions. Two deans specified that the extension staff members must be members of the graduate teaching faculty of the institutions and have academic rank in the campus department or school for which they give counsel.

Summary

The quality and the status of graduate extension study are dependent to a great extent upon the controls and requirements exercised over them by the graduate schools. Some of these controls and limitations are summarized in the following paragraphs.

The instructors in graduate extension courses were usually full-time campus staff members and non-institutional specialists who had been approved by the graduate schools of the respective institutions. There were no specific minimum academic degree or academic rank requirements in most of the institutions studied, but the majority of the instructors possessed advanced degrees and ranks above that of instructor. Competence was considered to be of primary importance in the selection of graduate extension instructors.

A large majority of the deans of the graduate schools believed that the course content of graduate extension courses was identical with that of the same courses when taught in the regular campus programs, and said that the time requirement was the same. No special requirements were made of the instructors or students which were different from those that applied on the campuses.

In almost all of the institutions the graduate school deans were the approving authorities for the scheduling of graduate extension classes and the requests for such work were usually channeled through the offices of the extension divisions to these deans.

Graduate extension credit, although accepted toward advanced degrees by all of the institutions in this study, was accepted in varying amounts

and under varying conditions. Some institutions accepted graduate extension credit from sister institutions on a reciprocal basis. The amounts of credit for graduate work through extension ranged from six semester hours in some institutions to meeting all of the requirements for a master's degree in others. Extension credit toward the doctor's degree was permitted in seven of the fourteen institutions.

Almost all of the graduate extension work was reported to be offered in daytime centers, evening centers, and independent evening classes. A small amount of thesis writing was permitted in some institutions and some work was done in short courses and conferences. Correspondence study was not considered appropriate for graduate study.

Various arrangements have been devised to insure adequate library facilities for extension classes. Quite often the instructor assumed the responsibility for library adequacy, and he arranged through one or more sources to get the necessary books. Sometimes the extension divisions have provided portable libraries for the classes.

Laboratories at some industrial and governmental locations were considered superior to those on some of the campuses. In-service training of teachers was considered by several deans to be more successful when conducted in the laboratory settings of the public school classrooms.

Many students have not always found counseling services available when registering for extension classes, and many others have not used the services at hand. Some deans reported that students were not permitted to take any graduate extension work without permission, and

others said students registered at their own risk. In most instances, only those staff members who had status in the department concerned could counsel for it.

CHAPTER V

THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

A study of the status of graduate work through extension would not be complete, it seems to the writer, without determining: (a) who takes graduate extension work and why, (b) the evaluation by the extension student of the instruction and facilities provided for him, and (c) the services he is using to obtain his instruction and the extent to which the student has planned his program.

To obtain this information, questionnaires were distributed by the extension directors of the fourteen cooperating institutions to 2,800 students enrolled in graduate extension courses during the fall of 1952. Replies were returned by 1,475 of these students, representing 53 per cent of those who were contacted. Because of the fact that the questionnaires were unsigned, no follow-up cards or letters could be mailed as reminders to those whose questionnaires had not been returned.

The Graduate Extension Student

The persons registered for graduate extension work are usually part-time students whose full-time occupations are those of carrying on the normal adult activities in their homes and communities. This section of this chapter describes these students in terms of their sex, marital status, number of children, ages, and employment. It also

reports on their academic status, their scholastic ambitions, and their reasons for taking graduate extension work.

TABLE XL shows the sex of the graduate extension students.

TABLE XL

THE SEX DISTRIBUTION OF 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Sex	Replies	Per cent
Male	757	51
Female	712	48
No reply	6	-

According to the above table, the sex of the 1,475 students enrolled in the fourteen graduate extension programs was very evenly divided. There were 757, or 51 per cent, males and 712, or 48 per cent, females. Only six, or less than 1 per cent, failed to reply.

Since a great deal of extension work is in the field of education, one might assume that there would be a predominance of females enrolled in extension courses, and in the opinion of the writer this is probably true at the undergraduate level. According to the above table, there is a balance of the sexes at the graduate level. It is likely that a smaller per cent of women classroom teachers are working for advanced degrees than are the male teachers and the male administrators.

TABLE XII gives the marital status of these graduate extension students.

TABLE XII

THE MARITAL STATUS OF 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Status	Replies	Per cent
Married	976	66
Single	381	26
Widowed	61	4
Divorced	45	3
Separated	4	-
No reply	8	1

Nine hundred and seventy-six, or 66 per cent of the 1,475 graduate students in this study were married and 381, or 26 per cent were single. These two groups account for 92 per cent of the total. The remaining 8 per cent were divided among the separated, the divorced, the widowed, and those who did not reply.

The number of children of the 1,475 graduate extension students are reported in TABLE XLII.

TABLE XLII

NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Number of children	Replies	Per cent
0	741	50
1	297	20
2	268	18
3	113	8
4	39	3
5 and above	17	1

Fifty per cent of the students (741) said they had no children; 20 per cent (297) had one child each, and 18 per cent (268) had two children each. The remaining 12 per cent ranged from three children each (8 per cent) to five or above (1 per cent).

The ages of graduate extension students, as reported in this study, are shown in groupings in TABLE XLIII.

TABLE XLIII

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Age distribution	Replies	Per cent
20 to 30	447	30
30 to 40	368	25
40 to 50	338	23
50 to 60	94	6
Over 60	17	1
No reply	211	15

Thirty per cent, or 447 of the students represented in this table, were in the age group of "20 to 30"; 25 per cent were in the age group of "30 to 40"; and 23 per cent were in the age group of "40 to 50". Of the remaining students, 6 per cent were between the ages of "50 to 60"; 1 per cent were over 60 years of age; and 211, or 15 per cent, did not reply.

The above table shows that a greater number of young adults are enrolled for graduate extension work than are the older ones. It is likely that these younger persons feel the need for promotion and personal development yet to be achieved, so that they may secure improved economic and social positions.

TABLE XLIV shows the employment status of the 1,475 graduate extension students in this study.

TABLE XLIV

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Status	Replies	Per cent
Full time	1,367	93
Part time	29	2
Not employed	44	3
No reply	35	2

Students employed full time numbered 1,367, or 93 per cent of the total. Only twenty-nine students, or 2 per cent, were working part time and forty-four, or 3 per cent, said they were not working. TABLES XLIII and XLIV seem to indicate that graduate extension classes

serve, more than any others, employed persons who are married and who may not be able to resign from their positions of work or leave their homes and children to become full time campus students. The above table also shows that unemployed persons do not usually take graduate extension courses.

Many of these graduate extension students expressed appreciation for extension classes. They said that study beyond their bachelor's degrees would otherwise be almost impossible since they were fully employed. Their incentive to study at the graduate level was strong, they said, because of the opportunities for advancement with additional training.

The highest academic degrees held by graduate extension students are indicated in TABLE XLV.

TABLE XLV

HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREES HELD BY 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Degrees	Replies	Per cent
Bachelor's	1,216	83
Master's	208	14
Doctor's	4	-
No reply	47	3

The highest degree held by 1,216, or 83 per cent, of the 1,475 students in this study, was the bachelor's degree, since the possession of this degree is usually a prerequisite to graduate standing. Two hundred eight, or 14 per cent of these students, possessed the master's

degree and four, representing less than 1 per cent, already had a doctor's degree. It may be assumed that those already holding the doctor's degrees were more interested in professional growth than in working toward another degree.

The next table, number XLVI, shows the degrees for which the graduate extension students are studying.

TABLE XLVI

DEGREES FOR WHICH 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS ARE STUDYING

Degrees	Replies	Per cent
Master's	971	66
Doctor's	87	6
None	350	23
No reply	67	5

The largest number, 971 or 66 per cent of the 1,475 students, were working toward the master's degree, while eighty-seven, or 6 per cent, were working toward the doctor's degree. Three hundred fifty of the students reported working toward no degree. It is likely that many of this latter group were teachers working for in-service credit which would apply toward salary increases and others who were working toward promotion on the job.

Recognising the fact that the students might have more than one reason for taking graduate extension work, the writer asked the students to give, if they wished, their second and third reasons according to importance. The reasons given are shown in TABLE XLVII.

TABLE XLVII

REASONS OF 1,475 STUDENTS FOR TAKING GRADUATE EXTENSION WORK

Reasons	First Replies %		Second Replies %		Third Replies %	
Work in daytime	518	35	168	11	101	7
To apply credit toward an advanced degree	462	31	351	24	138	9
Work applies toward promotion in present position	219	15	224	15	98	7
Personal enjoyment	79	5	104	7	116	8
No college nearby	52	4	83	4	33	2
Cannot afford college	25	2	23	2	26	2
Not as good as campus instruction, but best I can do	6	-	9	1	24	2
Better than campus daytime instruction	2	-	15	1	15	1
Other	104	7	71	5	50	3
No reply	8	1	427	29	874	59

The three most frequently stated "first" reasons given by the extension students for taking graduate extension work were: (a) "work in the daytime" mentioned by 518, or 35 per cent, (b) "to apply credit toward an advanced degree" listed by 462, or 31 per cent, and (c) "work applies toward promotion in present position" mentioned by 219, or 15 per cent. Such reasons as "for personal enjoyment", "no college nearby", "cannot afford college", "instruction is better in extension", or "there is no other choice" were mentioned as "first" reasons by too few students

to be considered important in this study. The same three "first" reasons listed above were the "second" reasons mentioned most frequently, the percentages being 11 per cent, 24 per cent, and 15 per cent respectively. "Work in the daytime" and "to apply credit toward an advanced degree" were also among the first three "third" reasons given along with "personal enjoyment".

Many of the school systems, represented by the school teachers in this study, and the state departments of education of the various states have imposed certain requirements which, when fulfilled, are to the professional and economic advantage of those concerned. Many of these persons gave reasons other than those appearing in the table such as: (a) to meet certification requirements, (b) to meet school district increment requirements, (c) to work toward promotion on the job, and (d) to improve my teaching.

Student Evaluation of Instruction and Facilities

The literature and related studies reviewed in Chapter II of this thesis give considerable attention to the problems of the quality and evaluation of graduate extension work. It seemed desirable to the writer, that students who had studied at the graduate level both on the campus and through extension should be asked to compare the two. Referring to the six items listed in TABLE XLVIII, these students were asked, "How does each of the following in your graduate extension work compare with the graduate campus work you have taken?" It is assumed by the writer that the 1,149 students who answered the question

by checking the items listed, were qualified to do so. The remaining 326 students who did not reply apparently had not studied at the graduate level in both situations. Many of these students stated they had not taken graduate work on the campus and therefore had no basis for comparison.

TABLE XLVIII

1,149 STUDENTS COMPARE GRADUATE EXTENSION WORK WITH SIMILAR CAMPUS WORK

Items compared	Same Replies %		Above Replies %		Below Replies %		No Reply %	
Quality	810	70	249	22	90	8	-	-
Quantity	729	64	137	12	241	21	42	3
Difficulty	822	71	138	12	131	12	58	5
Instructor's ability	753	66	338	29	48	4	10	1
Instructor's preparation	768	68	287	25	68	5	27	2
Grades earned	777	68	114	10	51	5	207	17

Eight hundred ten students, representing 70 per cent, stated the quality of extension work was the same as that of similar work on the campus. Of the remaining 30 per cent, 22 per cent rated graduate extension work above the same work on the campus and 8 per cent rated it below that of the campus.

One student made the statement that many times the quality of extension work was higher than that offered by the campus because

extension made more use of teaching talent "in the field", thereby providing practical rather than theoretical instruction.

The fact that these students considered extension class members to be more mature and experienced than those of the campus classes caused them to feel that extension class participation was stimulating and helpful.

Many students believed the value of extension work to be higher than that of the campus because they could apply immediately the principles to teaching in their classrooms.

More than half of the students, 729, or 64 per cent, stated that the quantity of graduate extension instruction was the same as that given on the campus. Twelve per cent reported the quantity of work in extension to be above that of the campus and 21 per cent said it was below that of the campus. These percentages seem to indicate that the amount of work covered in graduate extension courses is the same or less than for campus classes at the same level. Three per cent of the students did not reply to the question.

A majority of the graduate extension students, 822 or 71 per cent, believed the difficulty of graduate extension work to be the same as comparable work offered on the campus. Twelve per cent rated extension work above campus work in difficulty and 12 per cent rated it below. Five per cent did not reply.

Many students felt that, because of their full-time jobs during the day, it was very difficult for them to do the caliber of work required in graduate study. One student believed the extension division

of his state had a very wise policy of not allowing persons employed full time to register for more than six term hours.

Seven hundred fifty-three graduate extension students, representing 66 per cent of the 1,149 students answering this part of the questionnaire, rated the extension instructor's ability to be the same as that of campus instructors, while 29 per cent rated it above those of the campus and 4 per cent said it was below. Only 1 per cent gave no reply. Since 95 per cent of the students rated the instructor's ability as same or above and 33 per cent rated it as same or below, it appears that the ability of extension instructors is rated slightly higher in the minds of these students than it is for the campus instructors.

The extension instructor's preparation to teach the subject matter of the course is rated by the graduate extension students in this study to be slightly above that of the campus instructors. Seven hundred sixty-eight, or 68 per cent, said it was same and 287, or 25 per cent, said it was above. Only 5 per cent rated the preparation of extension instructors below that of the campus instructors and 2 per cent did not give replies to the question.

The grades earned in graduate extension courses, according to 777, or 68 per cent of the students in the study, were the same as grades earned on the campuses for similar work. Ten per cent said they earned higher grades in extension and 5 per cent said they received lower grades in extension than they did in campus classes. Seventeen per cent did not reply. Many of the students who did not reply to this question commented that because this was their first graduate extension class, they had earned no grades to use for comparison.

Graduate school deans and faculty members often express concern over the possible inadequacy of library and laboratory facilities which may be available to extension students. TABLE XLIX gives the responses of graduate students to questions concerning facilities they use.

TABLE XLIX

LIBRARY AND LABORATORY FACILITIES PROVIDED
FOR 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Item	Yes		No		No	
	Replies	%	Replies	%	reply	%
1. Have access to an adequate library	1,089	74	293	20	93	6
2. Use campus library	471	32	849	58	155	10
3. Use an adequate off-campus library	769	52	489	33	217	15
4. Use special class library	613	42	667	45	195	13
5. Provide own personal library	111	7	1,148	78	216	15
6. Do as much library and reference work as for campus classes	726	49	649	44	100	7
7. Have as many charts, maps, and illustrative materials as for campus classes	597	40	632	43	246	17
8. Visual aids (movies, slides, etc.) used as much as in campus classes	719	49	512	35	244	16
9. Have as much use of laboratory equipment as for campus classes	476	32	530	36	469	32
10. Laboratory equipment is as adequate as for campus classes	532	36	395	27	548	37

One may assume that an adequate library should be available to all students, whether they are on campus or off campus, yet 293, or 20 per cent of the students in the study said they did not have access to an adequate library. Since extension classes are not always organized in campus towns, it is understandable that campus libraries are not always available. In this study 849, or 58 per cent of the students said they did not use a campus library for their graduate extension work. Although 769, or 52 per cent, reported they had access to an adequate off-campus library, 489, or 33 per cent, said they did not. Extension divisions quite often provide special traveling libraries for their classes and, according to the above table, this was done for the 613, or 42 per cent, who answered "yes" to the fourth question in the list. Seventy-eight per cent (1,142) of the students stated they were not required to provide their own personal libraries, while 7 per cent (111) said they were required to do so.

Items 6 through 9 in the table having to do with charts, maps, and similar teaching aids are concerned with the use these students have made of the facilities which are provided. Ideally, it seems to this writer, all replies should have been 100 per cent "yes". According to the table, however, 44 per cent did not do as much library and reference work as they did for comparable classes on the campus; 43 per cent did not make as much use of maps, charts, and other illustrative materials; 35 per cent did not have as much use of visual aids (movies, film slides, and glass slides) as for the same work on the campus; and 36 per cent did not make as much use of laboratory equipment. Finally, 27 per cent

of the students said that the laboratory equipment provided for their use in graduate extension classes was not as adequate as that provided for the same classes on the campuses.

Referring to the laboratory facilities of his graduate extension class, one student stated, "The graduate school of Nuclear Engineering offers the best off-campus graduate work program and facilities that I can imagine," while another student said, "A serious lack of laboratory facilities is my only real objection to the graduate extension course in which I am now enrolled."

Because students in extension classes usually work in the daytime and because instructors cannot leave their daytime schedules, extension classes are usually scheduled during the evening hours. The classes are also scheduled less frequently than are the daytime campus classes and for longer sessions. The frequency of graduate extension class meetings is tabulated in TABLE L.

TABLE L

FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

AS REPORTED BY 1,475 STUDENTS

Frequencies	Replies	Per cent
Once a week	1,387	94
Twice a week	63	4
Three times a week	11	1
Four times a week	4	-
No reply	10	1

The frequency of class meetings was reported by 1,387, or 94 per cent of the 1,475 students, to be once a week. It is possible that those meeting more than once a week were registered in daytime extension centers where classes were scheduled on the same basis as on the campuses.

One student expressed the feeling that it was too difficult to confer with graduate extension instructors outside of class and therefore classes scheduled to meet twice a week might be advantageous to some students.

Many institutional extension divisions are administratively responsible for the evening campus course offerings as well as for those offered off campus. The 1,475 students' replies concerning locations are given in TABLE LI.

TABLE LI

LOCATIONS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES
AS REPORTED BY 1,475 STUDENTS

Locations	Replies	Per cent
Off campus	1,139	77
On campus	297	20
No reply	39	3

It is apparent, according to the above table, that graduate extension classes are usually scheduled off campus, there being 1,139 students, or 77 per cent, reporting this to be so. Only 297, or 20 per cent, of the students said their classes were scheduled on the campus in the

evenings and on Saturdays. According to letters received from extension directors by the writer, many other evening classes are offered on some of the campuses independently of the extension divisions. It is probable, therefore, that a larger on-campus program of adult education exists than is apparent in the above table.

The classrooms for graduate extension classes seem to be quite adequate according to TABLE LII.

TABLE LII

ADEQUACY OF CLASSROOMS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES
AS REPORTED BY 1,475 STUDENTS

Adequacy of	Yes Replies %		No Replies %		No reply %	
Size	1,406	95	53	4	16	1
Heating	1,370	93	86	6	19	1
Furnishings	1,331	90	122	8	22	2
Lighting	1,258	85	200	14	17	1

Ninety per cent or more of the graduate extension students reported the size, heating, and furnishings of the meeting places to be adequate. Eighty-five per cent reported the lighting to be adequate, while 14 per cent said it was not. It is quite possible, in the opinion of the writer, that comparable percentages would result from rating the adequacy of classrooms provided for daytime campus classes, or it may be that evening class students felt, though their classrooms were not ideal, they were good enough.

The Students' Use and Evaluation of Extension Services

Because most extension classes are scheduled off campus and, in many situations, the extension class offerings are definitely limited in number and variety, and because people, especially teachers, are anxious to obtain salary increases, promotions, and teaching certificates, it is quite likely that many of them will register in courses without proper counseling or planning. TABLE LIII gives some evidence of the extent of planning by showing what counseling services have been available and have been used, whether the student has a planned program, whether he has knowledge of how the credit he is earning may be applied, and whether he has been admitted to a graduate school.

TABLE LIII

PLANNING THE PROGRAMS OF 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Evidence of planning	Yes		No		No	
	Replies %		Replies %		reply %	
Graduate school counselor available	1,027	71	331	21	117	8
Extension division representative available	1,012	69	283	19	180	12
Present course part of planned program	1,109	75	250	17	116	8
Present course acceptable at full graduate credit value	1,248	85	120	8	107	7
Used services of counselor already	736	50	635	43	104	7
Applied for and been admitted to graduate school	930	63	427	29	118	8

The above table shows that a graduate school counselor was available to 1,027, or 71 per cent, of the 1,475 students participating in this survey, and that an extension division representative was available to 69 per cent of them. Eleven hundred nine, representing 75 per cent, of the students stated that the present courses they were taking were part of a planned program of studies and 1,248, or 85 per cent, reported that the present courses were acceptable at full graduate credit value. Since only 736, or 50 per cent, of the students said they had already used the services of a counselor, it seems to the writer that some of the above 85 per cent must have had other sources of information concerning the acceptance of their graduate extension credit. It seems apparent, also, that all of the students are not using the counseling services which are available, since 71 per cent reported such services available and 50 per cent reported using them.

A belief that counselor service should be more available was stressed when one student stated, "Due to lack of counseling from the school where I have applied for credit, I don't know if my 'program' is taking me toward a degree or not." Another said that the teachers already know which courses were required for certification and that it was not necessary to seek out a counselor before registering in these courses.

Only 930, or 63 per cent, of the students stated they had been admitted to the graduate school. The requirement of admission to the graduate school before taking graduate extension work varies among the institutions. Some institutions permit extension students to register in graduate extension courses before admission to the graduate school, the same as they do in summer school, with the understanding that the

credit may or may not be accepted later as part of the student's planned program.

TABLE LIV indicates the number of semester hours of graduate extension credit the students in this study believed was applicable toward an advanced degree.

TABLE LIV

SEMESTER HOURS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CREDIT APPLICABLE
TOWARD ADVANCED DEGREES AS REPORTED BY 1,475 STUDENTS

Semester hours	Replies	Per cent
Less than 6	57	4
6 to 12	375	25
12 to 18	228	15
18 to 24	95	7
24 to 30	88	6
30 to 36	72	5
36 to 42	6	-
42 to 48	1	-
48 to 54	-	-
54 or more	4	-
No reply	549	37

The range of credit applicable toward advanced degrees, according to the above table, extends from "less than 6" credits for 4 per cent of the students to "54 or more" credits for fewer than 1 per cent of them. The greatest number of students in any single category was 375, or 25 per cent, who were allowed to apply from six to twelve hours of credit toward advanced degrees. The second largest group of 228, or 15 per cent, said they might apply from twelve to eighteen semester hours

of graduate extension credit in the same way. It is probable that some of the 549 students, representing 37 per cent, did not know whether or not they could apply the credit or else they were not concerned about credit since they gave no reply to the question.

The feeling was expressed by several students that, since the quality of graduate extension work was the same as that of the campus, persons should be privileged to obtain their master's degrees through extension, without having to attend a campus.

While the above table gives an idea, in terms of semester hours of credit, of the potential services available to graduate extension students, TABLE LV which follows gives an idea of the amount of these services already used by the students.

TABLE LV

NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS OF GRADUATE CREDIT

ALREADY EARNED BY 1,475 GRADUATE STUDENTS THROUGH EXTENSION CLASSES

Semester hours	Replies	Per cent
Less than 6	366	25
6 to 12	371	25
12 to 18	189	13
18 to 24	66	4
24 to 30	27	2
30 to 36	18	1
36 to 42	3	-
42 to 48	2	-
48 to 54	6	-
54 or more	6	-
No reply	421	28

Three hundred sixty-six students in this study, representing 25 per cent, have earned less than six semester hours of graduate credit and another 25 per cent have already earned between six and twelve hours. These two groups, together with the third group of 189, or 13 per cent, which has earned twelve to eighteen semester credits, constitute 63 per cent of the 1,475 students. Since a very few students in this study have earned a larger number of semester credits than eighteen, it seems reasonable to the writer to assume that the principal responsibility remains with the graduate schools on the campuses to educate at the graduate level.

The graduate work done by extension students may be provided through specially organized programs of one kind or another or through regularly organized evening classes. It is the purpose of TABLE LVI to show under which plans the graduate study is provided.

TABLE LVI

EXTENSION SERVICES USED BY 1,475 GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS

Services	Replies	Per cent
Graduate center classes	857	58
Non-center evening classes	491	33
Campus evening classes	285	19
Correspondence study	77	5
Conferences	61	4
Short courses	41	3
Television	6	-
Radio	6	-
No reply	15	1

Eight hundred fifty-seven, or 58 per cent, of the graduate students in this study stated they had used graduate center classes for their extension work; 491, or 33 per cent, said they had used non-center evening classes; and 285, or 19 per cent, said they had used campus evening classes. Very little graduate work was done in conferences, short courses, correspondence study, television, and radio, according to the above table. It appears, according to the table, that slightly more than half of the students in this study have used the services of a graduate extension center.

Graduate center classes are usually provided in especially established centers located in or near thickly populated areas. A resident director is usually in charge and center libraries and laboratories are provided. These centers are generally considered more suitable for graduate study than the non-center classes. Non-center evening classes are quite often located in isolated areas and must use whatever classrooms and other facilities which may be provided.

The students who had used more than one of the services listed in TABLE LVII were asked to state which services they considered the most satisfactory and which they considered the least satisfactory for graduate extension work. Twelve hundred fifty-three, or 83 per cent of the 1,475 participating students, had not used more than one service and, as a result, were unable to reply to these questions. Two hundred twenty-nine of the students had used more than one service, and the percentages in TABLE LVII are based on this number. In this table, the services are rated as "most satisfactory" and "least satisfactory".

TABLE LVII

RATINGS OF EXTENSION SERVICES GIVEN BY 229 GRADUATE STUDENTS

Services	Most satisfactory		Least satisfactory	
	Replies %		Replies %	
Graduate center classes	97	42	4	2
Non-center evening classes	59	25	6	3
Campus evening classes	50	22	5	2
Conferences	9	4	13	6
Short courses	9	4	10	4
Correspondence study	4	2	125	55
Television	1	1	15	6
Radio	-	-	34	15
No reply	-	-	17	7

Ninety-seven, or 42 per cent, of the 229 students whose replies are included in this table, reported the graduate center classes to be the most satisfactory means of doing graduate work through extension. The non-center evening classes were rated most satisfactory by 25 per cent and campus evening classes by 22 per cent. The least satisfactory service for offering graduate study was considered to be correspondence study according to 125, or 55 per cent, of the students whose responses are included in the table. According to students' comments, the lack of personal incentive, the lack of opportunity for class discussion, and a lack of contact with the instructor seemed to be the foremost reasons that correspondence study was considered the least satisfactory. Fifteen per cent thought radio would be least satisfactory.

Summary

This study showed that there were approximately the same percentages of male and female students in graduate extension work. A majority of them were married, and about 50 per cent of them had one or two children. About 75 per cent of these students were between the ages of twenty and fifty and nearly all of them were fully employed. All of them held bachelor's degrees and about 14 per cent held the master's degree. Approximately 75 per cent of these graduate extension students were working for an advanced degree. Reasons most often given by graduate extension students for taking graduate extension work were (a) work in daytime, (b) applies toward promotion in present position, and (c) to earn credit toward an advanced degree.

About 65 to 70 per cent of the graduate students in extension classes who, it is assumed, had also studied at the graduate level on a campus, said they believed the quality, the quantity, and the difficulty of the extension work to be about the same or slightly above that of similar work they had taken on the campuses. The students rated their instructor's abilities and preparations as equal to or above that of the campus instructors and they said that they had earned the same grades as they had for similar work on the campuses.

Twenty per cent of the students in this study reported they did not have access to an adequate library, and 44 per cent did not do as much reading and reference work as they did for their on-campus classes. Other learning aids such as maps, charts, movies, and slides were not as available as similar aids were on the campuses, and sometimes the

laboratory equipment in extension classes was considered to be inadequate.

Graduate extension classes usually were scheduled to meet once a week and a large majority of them were scheduled at off-campus locations. The meeting places were considered quite adequate in size, lighting, heating, and furnishings.

About 70 per cent of the graduate extension students had a graduate school counselor available, but only about 50 per cent of the students had used the services of one at the time of this survey. A large majority of these students believed the courses they were now taking were acceptable for advanced degree work at full credit value and said the work was part of a planned graduate program. Sixty-three per cent of these students had already been admitted to a graduate school.

Semester hours of graduate extension credit applicable toward advanced degrees ranged, according to the survey, from "less than 6" to "5 $\frac{1}{4}$ or more". The greatest number of students could apply less than eighteen semester hours of credit toward an advanced degree. Fifty per cent of the students had earned fewer than twelve semester hours of credit at the time of this study, while the rest had earned from twelve to fifty-four credits.

More than 50 per cent of the graduate students in extension were enrolled at graduate centers, although many also attended non-center evening classes and campus evening classes. Conferences, short courses, correspondence study, radio, and television were used very little as means of providing instruction at the graduate level. The students rated the graduate center as being the most satisfactory extension

division plan for providing graduate level instruction and correspondence study as the least satisfactory plan.

Comments made by a great many of the students indicated a genuine appreciation of the opportunity given them by the institutions of higher learning to study off campus.

CHAPTER VI

THE STATUS OF GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION AS REPORTED BY DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION DIVISIONS

The director of university extension is the administrative officer of an institution of higher learning whose responsibility it is to administer many of the off-campus adult level instructional activities which are made available to the citizens of the community and of the state. These activities include largely the administration of evening classes, correspondence study courses, radio education, film libraries, institutes, conferences, and short courses.

This chapter is a report of the information secured by the writer through questionnaires returned by thirteen, or 93 per cent of fourteen directors of extension who were contacted. This information is presented in four chapter sections: (a) the cooperating extension divisions, (b) their extension programs, (c) their problems of administration, and (d) the comments and suggestions of these thirteen directors of extension.

The Cooperating Extension Divisions

The thirteen extension divisions, whose directors returned the questionnaires sent to them by the writer, represent extension programs

which were selected on the basis of certain criteria given on page of this thesis. These extension divisions were those of:

University of Arizona	University of Oklahoma
University of Arkansas	Oregon State System of Higher Education
University of Colorado	University of South Carolina
University of Connecticut	Syracuse University
University of Florida	State College of Washington
University of Michigan	University of Wisconsin
Oklahoma A and M College	

The types of institutions represented by these thirteen extension divisions are listed in TABLE LVIII.

TABLE LVIII

TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED BY THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Types of institutions	Number of institutions	Per cent
State university	6	33
State university and land-grant college	5	28
Land-grant college	3	17
State college of education	3	17
Private university	1	5

Six, or 33 per cent, of these eighteen institutions were state universities. They were the universities of Arkansas, Colorado, Michigan, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Carolina. The five combination state university and land-grant colleges, representing 28 per cent of the total, were the universities of Arizona, Connecticut, Florida, and Wisconsin, and Florida State University. These institutions include under single administrations the entire programs of state universities and land-grant

colleges. Three, or 17 per cent, of the institutions represented by the thirteen extension divisions were land-grant colleges and another three, representing 17 per cent, were state colleges of education. The land-grant colleges were Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Oregon State College, and the State College of Washington. Oregon College of Education, Eastern Oregon College of Education, and Southern Oregon College of Education were the three colleges of education which were represented.

Eleven, or 84 per cent, of the thirteen extension divisions in this study served but one institution each. The other two, 16 per cent, were the general extension divisions of Florida and Oregon, serving all of the state supported institutions in their respective states. One of the two general extension divisions (Florida) represented two institutions and the other one (Oregon) represented five.

TABLES LIX and LX give enrollment comparisons. TABLE LIX compares the campus enrollments of the institutions represented with their thirteen extension division enrollments. These enrollments are the total numbers of individual students enrolled for credit during the 1951-1952 academic year.

TABLE LIX

A COMPARISON OF EXTENSION DIVISION STUDENT ENROLLMENTS
WITH CAMPUS ENROLLMENTS IN THE INSTITUTIONS THEY REPRESENT
FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1951-1952

Extension division	Campus enrollment	Extension enrollment	Percentage extension is of campus
1	8,000	3,845	48
2	13,214	13,795	104
3	5,300	5,021	95
4	8,500	4,262	50
5	16,654	23,497	140
6	3,700	6,000	160
7	5,600	3,999	71
8	16,646	6,049	36
9	8,207	5,946	72
10	13,500	23,843	180
11	3,265	5,709	170
12	5,657	2,725	48
13	9,000	3,588	40
Total:	117,243	108,279	92

The importance and extent of the various university extension programs may both be emphasized by comparing the campus and extension enrollments. Five of the divisions in the above table reported

enrollments in extension which were larger than their campus enrollments; four others had extension enrollments which were between 50 per cent and 100 per cent of those on the campuses; and the remaining four gave extension enrollments which were less than 50 per cent of those on their campuses.

TABLE LX, which follows, gives further data concerning enrollments. In this table, individual graduate extension enrollments are compared with total extension enrollments for the same academic year. The emphasis placed on graduate study through extension might be shown in this tabulation.

TABLE LX

A COMPARISON OF TOTAL STUDENT EXTENSION ENROLLMENTS
WITH GRADUATE EXTENSION ENROLLMENTS IN THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS
FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1951-1952

Extension divisions	Total extension enrollments	Graduate extension enrollments	Percentage graduate extension is of total extension
1	3,845	667	17
2	13,795	2,481	18
3	5,021	270	5
4	4,262	600	14
5	23,497	3,945	17
6	6,000	1,000	19
7	3,999	513	13
8	6,049	2,151	35
9	5,946	1,437	24
10	23,843	1,109	5
11	5,709	2,300	40
12	2,725	545	20
13	3,588	998	27
Total:	108,279	18,016	17

The thirteen extension divisions whose enrollments are tabulated in TABLE LX enrolled a total of 108,279 individuals during the academic year 1951-1952. Of these, 18,016 were graduate students, representing 17 per cent of the total. This 17 per cent means that one extension person in six in these thirteen divisions was a graduate student. Six, or 46 per cent, of these divisions had an above average percentage of graduate students; three, or 23 per cent, were average; and four, or 31 per cent, had a smaller than average per cent of graduate students.

The Graduate Extension Program

The thirteen directors of extension were asked to rank in first, second, and third order the subject-matter fields having the greatest enrollments during the academic year 1951-1952. The data given by these directors indicate the needs of graduate extension students which are being met through their extension programs. This information appears in TABLE LXI.

TABLE LXI

FIELDS HAVING THE LARGEST GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS
DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1951-1952 IN THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Fields	First		Second		Third	
	Replies %		Replies %		Replies %	
Education	11	85	1	8	-	-
Engineering	2	15	3	23	5	38
Business administration	-	-	3	23	2	15
Languages	-	-	-	-	1	8
Liberal arts	-	-	-	-	1	8
Social work	-	-	2	15	1	8
Social sciences	-	-	4	31	3	23

Eleven, or 85 per cent, of these thirteen extension divisions listed education as the subject-matter field having the greatest number of graduate extension enrollments and two, or 15 per cent, listed engineering as having the greatest number.

Four, or 31 per cent, of these divisions reported their second highest enrollments to be in the field of the social sciences, while three groups of 23 per cent each named engineering and business administration as having the second highest enrollment. Social work was listed as second highest in enrollment by two divisions, 15 per cent, and education by one, or 8 per cent.

Subject-matter fields having the third largest enrollments were engineering (38 per cent), the social sciences (23 per cent), business administration (15 per cent), and social work, languages, and liberal arts (1 per cent each).

The following TABLE LXII gives some indication of the reasons why enrollments were high in education, engineering, business administration, the social sciences, and social work. The table shows the specially organized graduate extension programs conducted by the thirteen extension divisions.

TABLE LXII

SPECIALLY ORGANIZED GRADUATE EXTENSION PROGRAMS
CONDUCTED BY THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Special programs	Replies	Per cent
In-service courses and workshops for teachers	12	92
On-the-job training of industrial employees	7	53
On-the-job training of governmental employees	4	31

In-service courses and workshops for teachers were conducted by twelve, or 92 per cent, of the extension divisions replying to the questionnaire. This, no doubt, accounts for the fact that the largest enrollments as shown in TABLE LXI were reported to be in the field of education. The other two specially organized programs of graduate study reported in the questionnaire were: (a) on-the-job training of industrial employees (53 per cent) and (b) on-the-job training of government employees (31 per cent). These two kinds of programs might well cause large enrollments in engineering, business administration, the social sciences, and social work.

The organizational arrangements through which graduate extension instruction is provided are shown in TABLE LXIII. Information is given there about: (a) the number of extension divisions using each arrangement, (b) the number of locations within the state or area being served by the division, (c) the number of extension classes provided under each arrangement, and (d) the graduate student enrollments for each.

TABLE LXIII

THE NUMBER OF LOCATIONS, NUMBER OF CLASSES, AND GRADUATE EXTENSION ENROLLMENTS, ACCORDING TO ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN ELEVEN* EXTENSION DIVISIONS FOR THE FALL TERM, 1952

Arrangements	Number of divisions	%	Loca- tions	Classes	Enroll- ments	Per cent of total enrollment
Permanently established off-campus graduate centers	8	73	16	432	4,163	48
Off-campus independently organized non-center evening and Saturday classes	9	80	164	178	2,141	25
On-campus evening and Saturday classes at parent institution	4	36	5	80	932	11
Campuses of other col- leges and universities	3	27	12	30	857	10
Graduate programs esta- blished at government installations	3	27	4	22	404	5
Graduate programs esta- blished at industrial sites	4	36	4	23	127	1
Total:			205	765	8,624	

*Two divisions did not give sufficient information to be included in the table.

During the fall term of the academic year 1951-1952, eight, or 73 per cent, of these eleven extension divisions were providing graduate

level instruction in sixteen permanently established off-campus graduate centers. The 4,163 student enrollments in these centers represented 48 per cent of the total graduate student enrollment of 8,624 for the 1952 fall term in these eleven extension divisions.

The independently organized off-campus non-center evening and Saturday extension classes enrolled 2,141, or 25 per cent, of the graduate students in the eleven reporting extension divisions shown in the above table. There were 178 such classes organized in 164 locations in nine, or 80 per cent, of the divisions. These classes were usually organized where they were needed, using the libraries and other instructional aids which could be provided by the local communities or those which might be transported to the location by the extension division representatives and the instructors.

Eighty evening and Saturday graduate classes were offered by four extension divisions on five home campuses. The 932 students enrolled in these classes represented 11 per cent of the total.

Three of the extension directors, or 27 per cent, said they had established graduate classes on the campuses of other institutions. These twelve "other" campuses provided meeting places for thirty classes enrolling 857 graduate students, who represented 10 per cent of the total.

While a smaller number (6 per cent) of the students were enrolled at industrial sites and government installations, it is the opinion of the writer that the importance of these special services should not be overlooked. Not only may the institutions of higher learning contribute to the general welfare and national security, but these governmental and

industrial laboratories might serve as practical experience laboratories for the campus instructors, who might possibly lose contact with the practical application of their special fields.

Problems of Administration

There are many factors which tend to limit the scheduling of graduate extension classes. Among these limiting factors are: (a) finding satisfactory meeting places, (b) providing adequate library and laboratory facilities, (c) securing competent and willing instructors, (d) securing approval of the various departments and of the graduate school to schedule classes, (e) supervision of the program, and (f) safeguarding the status of the credits.

The directors of the thirteen participating extension divisions were asked to state which factors limited the extents of their graduate extension programs. Their responses are given in TABLE LXIV.

TABLE LXIV

FACTORS LIMITING THE EXTENT OF THE GRADUATE EXTENSION PROGRAMS
IN THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Limiting factors	Replies	Per cent
Lack of laboratory facilities	9	69
Some distances too great for instructor to travel	9	69
Lack of library facilities	8	62
Graduate school instructors are available, but there are not enough of them to go around	8	62
Lack of desire on the part of instructors to teach graduate extension classes	6	46
Conservative attitude on the part of the graduate school	6	46
Lack of extension field staff to promote the program	6	46
Program is too costly to the extension division	2	15
Lack of meeting places	1	8
Poorly located meeting places	1	8
Conservative attitude on the part of the extension division	1	8
High cost to the student limits the enrollments	1	8
Students are reluctant to enroll because status of the credit is uncertain	-	-
Other	4	31

There were four factors which were reported by more than 60 per cent of the directors as limiting their programs. They were: (a) lack of laboratory facilities (69 per cent), (b) some distances too great for instructors to travel (69 per cent), (c) lack of library facilities (62 per cent), and (d) graduate school instructors were available but there were not enough of them (62 per cent).

Six directors, or 46 per cent, of the thirteen replying, said that (a) lack of desire on the part of instructors to teach extension classes, (b) a conservative attitude on the part of the graduate school, and (c) a lack of extension field staff members to promote the program were limiting factors in their situations.

Such factors as (a) cost to the extension division, (b) lack of meeting places, (c) poorly located meeting places, (d) conservative attitude on the part of the extension division, (e) cost to the student, and (f) uncertain status of the credit were considered relatively less important by the directors.

Four directors made other comments not listed in the table. One of these mentioned a general lack of awareness at his institution of the university's responsibility to the adult population and another said that staff members were willing to take extension class assignments, but that some of their department heads and deans did not permit them to accept these assignments. The fact that some departments did not make graduate work available through extension was mentioned by a third director, and a fourth said some graduate groups were unwilling to pay the real costs above the regular tuition. He observed that the cost of graduate study was high and that without greater support from the

institution, the student must be willing to share the cost by paying higher fees.

The methods of approving the scheduling of graduate extension classes in the thirteen extension divisions are reported in TABLE LXV.

TABLE LXV

METHODS OF APPROVING THE SCHEDULING OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES
IN THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Approval method	Replies	Per cent
Extension division and various departments make arrangements, then secure approval from the graduate school	8	62
Extension division has blanket approval from graduate school	4	31
Extension division submits request to graduate school for each and every class	3	23
Permanent centers get blanket approvals, but individually organized classes get separate approvals	2	15
Graduate school organizes classes, then notifies extension division	-	-
Others	3	23

Eight, representing 62 per cent, of the directors of the thirteen extension divisions reported that their divisions, in cooperation with the various campus departments, made preliminary arrangements for scheduling their graduate extension classes and then they secured

approval from their graduate schools. Other methods included: (a) the blanket approval plan, used by 31 per cent, (b) individual approval from the graduate school for each proposed class, used by 23 per cent, and (c) a combination of the above two methods, used by 15 per cent of the directors. Under the combination method, blanket approval was given for the scheduling of the permanent center classes, but the scheduling of the non-center evening and Saturday classes was approved individually.

Three directors said that they always secured the approvals of the department heads before submitting their requests to the graduate school deans and one stated that the planning was done between an extension committee and the graduate council.

Because many extension classes are scheduled away from the environment of the campuses and because the instructors, in some instances, are non-staff specialists, there are those who are concerned about the amounts and kinds of supervision of graduate extension instruction. TABLE LXVI includes information supplied by the extension directors about the supervision of their graduate extension instructors.

TABLE LXVI

SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTION
IN THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Types of supervision	Replies	Per cent
No supervision	8	62
Must follow a "grading system"	7	53
Professional staff meetings	5	38
Instructor grades as he wishes	3	23
Must use campus syllabus	3	23
Instructor required to prepare outline of course and submit for approval	2	15
Direct supervision by class visitation	-	-

Sixty-two per cent, representing eight, of these extension directors reported that they did not supervise their graduate extension instructors. It was their opinion that their instructors were fully trustworthy and responsible and that they should be permitted to exercise full academic freedom regarding the quality and quantity of instruction. The extension director's responsibility was to provide adequate facilities and to arrange the correct number of class or instruction hours for the amount of credit to be earned. Seven directors, representing 53 per cent, stated their instructors were expected to follow a "grading system". In no division was there direct supervision by class visitation, but professional staff meetings were provided in five, or 38 per cent, of

the divisions. Three directors, or 23 per cent, said the instructors were permitted to grade as they wished. Three other directors, 23 per cent, stated they required their instructors to use a campus syllabus for the courses they were instructing, and two directors, 15 per cent, required their instructors to prepare and submit a course outline to be approved.

One director observed that in his program an instructor who appeared "out-of-line" too much was counseled.

The status of the graduate extension credit earned in the thirteen extension divisions is shown in TABLE LXVIII.

TABLE LXVIII

STATUS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CREDIT IN THIRTEEN EXTENSION DIVISIONS

Status of credit	Replies	Per cent
Number of graduate extension credits are strictly limited	8	62
Non-center credit is "course credit" but not "residence"	6	46
Permanent center is residence--other is not residence	5	38
Amount of graduate extension credit varies with student's approved program	4	31
All extension credit is residence	2	15
Non-center credit is residence when approved in advance	1	8

In eight, or 62 per cent of the divisions, the amount of graduate extension credit was strictly limited, while in four, or 31 per cent, the amount of credit allowable was reported to vary according to the individual student's approved program. One director advocated a policy of flexibility for the graduate student which should apply on or off campus. It was his belief that "needs" rather than "rules" should be the determining factors in planning the programs of advanced students. Forty-six per cent of the directors said their non-center credit was counted as "course" credit. Some of these directors stated that the course credit was treated as non-residence credit in the student's program of studies. Only one director, or 8 per cent of the thirteen, said the non-center extension credit was considered as "residence" credit when approved in advance. In five, or 38 per cent, of the divisions, the credit earned in permanent centers was counted as "residence" but that which was earned in non-center evening and Saturday classes was not. Only two, or 15 per cent, of the thirteen directors of extension reported that all of the credit earned in extension classes was "residence" credit.

Comments and Suggestions of Directors of Extension

In one part of the questionnaire returned by the thirteen directors of extension, space was provided for comments and suggestions which were to be based on the eight questions listed below:

What changes or improvements do you seek or desire in your graduate extension program?

To what extent do you believe extension staff members should be employed to instruct graduate extension classes?

To what extent do you believe non-staff specialists should be employed to instruct graduate extension classes?

What opinion or evidence do you have regarding the inferiority or superiority of graduate extension work as compared with regular graduate work on the campus?

What suggestions do you have for the improvement of the status of graduate work at the local level?

What suggestions do you have for the improvement of the status of graduate work at the national level?

What do you believe to be the outstanding positive characteristics of your graduate extension program?

What other comments which are pertinent to the problem do you wish to make?

In the next several pages the comments and suggestions of the thirteen extension directors are summarized under the appropriate questions.

What changes or improvements do you seek or desire in your graduate extension program?

Twelve, 92 per cent, of the thirteen directors replied to this question and their replies, it seems to the writer, were typical of the problems mentioned so often in the literature and in the annual proceedings of the National University Extension Association from 1919 to the present.

Some of these directors wrote of the limited program in their states and stated that a greater variety of course offerings was needed in addition to the already strong programs in the field of education. Others expressed concern over the fact that they were not serving the

state well outside of their permanent residence centers and expressed the hope of expanding their programs. Two of the directors said they needed more staff members, representing more subject-matter fields, to meet the demand for their graduate extension classes.

Several of the extension directors said they needed permission from the parent institutions to expand their graduate extension programs and expressed the need for greater enthusiasm on the parts of their graduate schools and campus faculty members. Three of the directors spoke of the status of graduate extension credit. All extension credit should be "residence" credit and the idea of "course" credit which a few divisions awarded for non-center classes should be discarded, one believed. Another said the idea of "course" credit was discrimination against the non-center student and the third director advocated less restriction on the exact amount of graduate extension credit allowable and advocated that more attention be given to meeting the individual graduate student's needs. Some students should be able to do considerable work through extension toward advanced degrees, he believed.

Long range planning of the graduate students' programs was needed, according to three directors. It was conceivable, they thought, that some extension work might be required off campus to "round out" the graduate students' preparation in certain fields. Off-campus on-the-job experience at construction projects, in business administration, in school administration, and in industry could be provided easily to graduate students through many of the presently organized extension programs.

This would be an elaboration of the internship idea used in the training of medical students and nurses.

Three directors spoke of the need for improving laboratory and library facilities for extension classes, particularly in key locations throughout their states; and one said there was a need for more graduate centers in his division. Another director believed there should be a constant effort to improve the quality of instruction and instructional aids.

Closer supervision of instruction through class visitation and conferences by the campus departments was advocated by one director of extension, and another thought definite minimum syllabi and course requirements should be established for all classes, whether scheduled on or off campus.

Graduate extension work needed more financial aid, some of these directors felt, so that class enrollments could be kept at a minimum and the salary scale for graduate level instruction should be equal to that for the same kind of work given on the campuses.

One director said his program could be improved if he had a more adequate extension field staff to assist in organizing and administering the program.

To what extent do you believe full-time extension staff members should be employed to instruct graduate extension classes?

All of the thirteen directors answered this question. Five of them were quite positive that they did not want full-time extension staff members employed as instructors. These directors emphasized

that the first attachment of staff members should be to the campus academic departments, and that full-time extension instructors might not have the campus viewpoint. Instructors, they believed, should attend campus staff meetings and live the campus life.

The remaining eight directors were of the opinion that, when possible, campus instructors should be used. They were willing, however, to use full-time extension instructors under varying conditions such as: (a) for far away places, (b) if required to teach some campus classes, (c) if approved as a member of the graduate school faculty, and (d) providing they were given campus connections. One director believed the extension administrators should be full time but not the instructors.

To what extent do you believe non-staff specialists should be employed to instruct graduate classes?

Seven of the thirteen directors answering this question were rather strongly opposed to using non-staff specialists to instruct graduate extension classes. One of the seven said he would use the campus staff only, and the others of this group said the use of other than campus staff members would be an exception to the rule. Remarks which were typical of their comments are: (a) only in extreme emergencies, (b) should be approached with great caution, (c) only if own staff not available, and (d) as a last resort.

The six remaining directors appeared to be in sympathy with the idea of using non-campus specialists when to use them would be to the advantage of the learner or if it was necessary or expedient to use them. Four directors spoke of the desirability of using non-staff

specialists. They said specialists in the field are quite often superior to campus instructors; that, because they are making practical application, they "know" and the students know they "know"; and that, if their training, ability, and experience are superior and they know how to teach, they are preferred.

Three of the six directors said campus staff members should be used when they were available but they had no objection to using others who were qualified, when they were needed. They stipulated that approval must be given by the graduate school and that their qualifications must be the same as those of comparable graduate school staff members.

What opinion or evidence do you have regarding the inferiority or superiority of graduate extension work as compared with regular graduate work on a campus?

It was the consensus of the twelve directors who answered this question that there was really no difference, generally, between campus and extension work at the graduate level. They observed that the differences among the classes in extension among themselves or on campus were far greater per se than between those of campus and extension. Several directors said that if the same courses were offered by the same instructors, the location would have little or no influence on the quality of the work. Some of their comments were: (a) according to our records and according to what our students say, there is no difference, (b) good instructors are good anywhere and poor instructors are poor anywhere, (c) we offer only courses which are appropriate, so quality is safeguarded, (d) our departments are showing a growing interest in graduate extension work, and (e) location is not as important

as motivation, maturity, and purpose. Several of these directors stated that some kinds of graduate work were best conducted off campus. They said that some types of research require an on-the-job situation, in which case, the campus may be "artificial" and "remote". Three directors believed certain types of in-service education work were more beneficial to the students in extension situations. They said these students were consistently as good when they came to the campuses to study; that their motivation in the extension classes was real, not theoretical; that they wanted skills, knowledge, and promotion. One of these directors said that the state bureau of certification in his state had conducted an "opinion study" and had found that the teachers believed they were more benefited by extension classes than by regular classes on campus or summer session classes. Finally, it was stated that certain studies (nuclear, for example) could not be conducted on a campus as successfully as at a government installation site.

There was general agreement among the directors that better facilities for most kinds of research were to be found in the campus libraries and laboratories and that the contacts which the graduate student would make on the campus could be invaluable.

What suggestions do you have for the improvement of the status of graduate work through extension at the local level?

The provision of adequate instruction in the graduate extension program was a problem which seemed to confront seven of the eleven directors who answered this question. They believed the instructors of off-campus classes should be given more time to spend "on location"

to enable them to provide for the individual needs of their students. These directors said more adequate research facilities were needed at the various extension centers. More released time for instructors, more careful selection of instructors, and more pay for instructors, were other improvements suggested. One director felt that all extension instructors should have university staff status and another said his division needed more administrative assistants to provide proper service to his state.

Six directors of extension programs were concerned about keeping the quality of extension instruction high. One director suggested there should be a better screening of students, but did not indicate how this should be done. Another suggested a better screening of courses, while a third expressed a desire for better guidance of the graduate students by faculty members and better all-over planning of the students' graduate programs. Three other directors wrote: (a) they were always concerned with the problem of quality, (b) standards for graduate extension classes should be kept as high as for similar campus classes, and (c) there should be more emphasis on accomplishment and less emphasis on "time serving" in extension classes. Recognition on the part of both student and instructor of the need to do graduate level work was emphasized by this director.

Other directors spoke of: (a) a need for closer cooperation among the degree granting institutions within the state, (b) of the need for better liaison between the various communities and the university, and (c) of the need for better libraries and other tools of learning for their graduate extension classes.

What suggestions do you have for the improvement of the status of graduate work through extension at the national level?

Five of the seven directors who answered this question commented on the need for continuing study of existing practices and conditions. Research at the national level is very important, they thought. One of these directors believed there needed to be a study of ways to measure educational levels. This is just as important on campus as off campus and, when once the educational level can be determined, the problem of inter-institutional acceptance of credit will be partially solved. This director suggested the possibility of a national board of examiners who would evaluate graduate extension work. He spoke of similar boards in medicine, law, and accounting.

Another of these five directors urged full cooperation of extension education groups, such as the National University Extension Association, with such national groups as the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, and the American Council on Education.

Three of the seven directors replying to the question emphasized the need to understand each other's extension programs. As such understanding is increased, standards will become more uniform and greater exchange of credit will result.

What do you believe to be the outstanding positive characteristic of your graduate extension program?

Service to the people of the state and the professional growth of campus staff members who instruct the graduate extension classes were the two positive characteristics most often mentioned by the

eleven directors who replied to the above question. They called attention to the fact that the people of the state look to the extension division to bring instruction to them because they feel the need for it. Some of these on-the-job people are college graduates and many of them, through extension classes, are afforded opportunity to continue toward advanced degrees, especially in engineering, science, technical fields, and education.

Four of the directors believed their divisions were making a distinct contribution to the improvement of teaching and administration in the public schools. Examples of their efforts were: (a) improved curricula, (b) better guidance programs, (c) more democracy in administration, (d) more knowledge and use of research in school administration, and (e) better use of visual and other teaching aids.

Seven of the eleven directors answering this question mentioned the contribution of extension work to campus instruction. One director said it put "picture windows in ivory towers" so that faculty members were able to view the practical operation and application of their specialties. Another director suggested that campus teaching is vitalized by off-campus teaching experience and that the quality of both is increased. Certain types of extension work bring together the best minds of the world in off-campus situations, such as at atomic energy installations, one director observed.

Other comments pertinent to the problem.

Two directors emphasized the importance of the work of the National University Extension Association in acting as a clearing house on

almost all problems of concern to university extension programs.

One of these directors commented on the need for an evaluating procedure to judge the quality of graduate extension work being done in non-member institutions.

Two other directors wrote at some length on the need of the adult population for the services of our institutions of higher learning which were available through university extension. These directors believed that, through some means, university and college people needed to find out that adults were ready for further study. Too many seemed to think that the university had no obligation except to those who could and would afford time and money to devote their full time to study. Too many of these college people have no patience with or sympathy for the part-time student, the directors stated. These directors observed that our changing society demanded that more thought be given to all of our problems and that many of us needed to earn while we learn.

Summary

The thirteen university extension programs described in this chapter represented eighteen state institutions and one private university. All of these thirteen divisions represented at least one institution each, except Florida and Oregon, which represented all of the state institutions in their respective states. Of this group of nineteen institutions, 48 per cent were state universities, 37 per cent were land-grant colleges or universities, 10 per cent were state colleges, and 5 per cent, or one institution, was a private university.

The total number of students enrolled in these extension divisions was 92 per cent of the campus enrollments of the institutions they represented and the graduate students enrolled in extension were 17 per cent of the total extension enrollment. The largest numbers of students were enrolled in education, engineering, the social sciences, and business administration. In addition to regularly organized classes, these extension divisions conducted specially organized programs of in-service and on-the-job training for public school employees, industrial workers, and government employees. About one-half (48 per cent) of the graduate extension students in this study took their work at permanently established off-campus centers, while smaller percentages attended evening and Saturday classes both off campus and on campus. Some of the off-campus classes were located at industrial sites and governmental installations.

Lack of facilities off-campus, travel distances, and a shortage of instructors were factors which limited the graduate extension programs in a majority of the divisions studied. A representative number (46 per cent) of the directors also said that a lack of desire to teach graduate extension classes, the conservatism of the graduate schools, and a lack of field staffs to organize the programs also limited the amounts of service their divisions could render.

Almost all of the graduate level classes in these extension divisions were scheduled only after approval of the graduate school was given although, in the cases of some permanent centers, blanket approval was given in advance.

Graduate extension instructors were usually not supervised nor were they required to submit a course outline or syllabus for their extension classes. In some divisions, professional staff meetings were held to discuss problems common to those who were instructing in extension. Fifty-three per cent of the directors of extension stated that their graduate extension instructors were required to follow a "grading system".

Some graduate extension credit was considered residence credit and some was considered course credit. In a majority of the divisions studied, the amount of graduate extension credit one might take was strictly limited but in 31 per cent of these divisions, the amount of credit was adjusted to the individual student's program.

These directors of extension stated that their extension programs could be improved by making a greater variety of courses available to more people. While the permanently established extension centers were meeting some of the needs of persons living nearby, the people in outlying areas were being neglected. An improved graduate extension program would be possible, they believed, only when graduate school deans and faculty members had a greater enthusiasm for the idea of graduate work off campus. Some directors advocated long range planning of the graduate student's program to include some off-campus experience, closer supervision of the graduate extension program, and full acceptance of all credit earned as being improvements which seemed desirable.

Instructors in extension should be associated with campus faculties and departments, and their first attachment should be to these campus departments, they contended.

Directors of extension were not in agreement regarding the use of non-staff specialists. One group was concerned about the lowering of graduate level standards through the use of non-campus instructors. The other group emphasized the value of studying under the leadership of experts who were close to the practical application of the subject matter in the field.

It was the consensus of the twelve directors that on-campus study and off-campus study were of comparable value to the student. The differences among the classes in either program were greater than the differences between the programs, they observed. The differences in the abilities of the instructors, wherever they taught, influenced quality the most, they stated. Some kinds of work such as nuclear studies were best conducted off campus.

These directors suggested that there be a continuing effort at the national level to standardize graduate extension work so that it might be accorded the same inter-institutional acceptance as the campus work now enjoys. All institutions should cooperate with existing national education groups in conducting studies and research to accomplish better understanding of each other's programs and problems.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

The returns from the four sets of questionnaires sent out to faculty members instructing graduate extension courses, graduate school deans, graduate students enrolled in extension classes, and directors of extension divisions are summarized in this chapter under the following headings: (a) the organization, administration, and supervision of the graduate extension program; (b) the instructional program; (c) the student in the graduate extension program; (d) provision for libraries, laboratories, and classrooms; and (e) the status of graduate extension credit.

The Organization, Administration, and Supervision of the Graduate Extension Program

1. The extension divisions of the institutions included in this study were providing instruction to almost as many adults as there were students enrolled on their combined campuses and of this extension division enrollment, 17 per cent were taking their work for graduate credit.

2. More than three-fourths of these graduate extension students were studying in off-campus extension classes. The largest enrollments were in permanently established extension centers and the students

reported these centers to be the most satisfactory arrangement for doing off-campus work. The independently organized non-center evening classes were given second preference by the students. Generally, students living in or near areas of dense population enjoyed better extension education opportunities than those living in isolated areas.

3. Some of the factors which have most often limited the scheduling of graduate extension classes were a lack of approved library and laboratory facilities, distance, a lack of graduate school approved staff members, a lack of desire of some instructors to teach extension classes, and a conservative attitude on the part of some graduate schools.

4. Requests for the scheduling of graduate extension classes were usually channeled through the administrative offices of the extension division to the graduate school and it was the graduate school council, through the office of the graduate school dean, which approved the scheduling.

5. There were two kinds of approvals which were sometimes required before certain graduate extension classes could be scheduled. They were: (a) approval to offer a course off campus, and (b) approval of the instructor. Most of the graduate school deans followed the practice of permitting the department and the extension division representative concerned to determine the suitability of offering any given course off campus. It was expected that certain established graduate school standards regarding library and laboratory facilities would be met if a class was scheduled. Some deans, however, required a full report on

all physical arrangements before the scheduling of any class outside of the permanently established extension centers.

6. If the staff member who was selected to instruct a graduate extension course was already a member of the graduate school faculty, no staff approval problem presented itself in most institutions. It was common practice, however, to give separate approvals of other staff members and of non-institutional specialists whose services were needed to teach graduate classes through extension.

7. In the majority of the institutions studied, the instructor was not given supervision on the job. Staff members were permitted the same freedom in their extension teaching that they enjoyed on the campuses. In some situations professional staff meetings were held which were found to be beneficial to the program. Instructors usually followed a campus syllabus and the established campus grading system.

8. Almost all of the graduate extension classes were scheduled to meet once a week in class sessions ranging from seventy-five to 175 minutes in length.

The Instructional Program

1. Graduate extension classes were usually taught by men under fifty years of age who were members of the regular campus faculty. Most of these instructors held academic ranks above that of instructor and had a doctor's degree. Half of the graduate schools of the institutions in this study required the master's degree for graduate school faculty membership and about one-third of the remaining schools had no degree requirement. Expertness and competence were considered more important

than either academic degrees or academic ranks. While many teaching fields were represented among the staff members, education was the special field of almost two-fifths of the group. Engineering, psychology, and business administration were also well represented.

2. The majority of these graduate extension instructors were permitted to receive additional compensation for their extension teaching but only about one-third of them stated that the rate of pay compared favorably with that received for campus teaching. Their availability to teach extension courses was not affected by the rate of compensation, however.

3. Many reasons were given by the staff members for instructing graduate extension courses but no particular reason seemed predominate. Among the more important reasons given were: (a) expected of staff, (b) to enlarge institutional influence, and (c) need extra money. The fact that they were obligated to teach extension classes was the reason mentioned by more instructors than any other.

4. Although psychology was named among the first four fields represented by the instructors, the directors of extension stated that their enrollments were highest in education, engineering, business administration, and the social sciences. Specially organized in-service programs for teachers, industrial employees, and government employees, were partially responsible, no doubt, for some of the heavy enrollments in the four fields mentioned above.

5. The instructors in this study spent the same amount of time preparing for their graduate extension classes as they did for their graduate campus classes but they reported spending more time with the

individual campus students. The size of their extension classes was neither more nor less than that of their campus classes.

6. Part lecture and part class discussion was the method used by a large majority of the instructors in their graduate extension classes; the seminar plan was also popular. According to almost all of the graduate school deans these courses were identical to the campus courses and the requirements of time, assignment, and library were the same. The instructors believed the quality of their instruction in extension was as high as the quality of their instruction on the campuses and stated that class meeting time, place, and travel time did not materially affect the quality of their instruction.

7. Students who answered the question comparing the graduate level work they had taken both on the campus and through extension were in agreement with the instructors concerning the caliber of the instruction they had received. These students reported the quality, quantity, and difficulty of graduate extension work to be the equal of that of the same work on the campus; the instructor's ability and his preparation were considered equal in both situations; and the grades earned by the students were comparable.

The Student in the Graduate Extension Program

1. Approximately the same number of men and women were enrolled in graduate extension classes in the extension divisions included in this study. The large majority of these students were under fifty years of age, were married, and half of them had no children. Almost without exception, graduate extension students were fully employed and were

attending evening classes. Many of them were taking extension work to earn credit toward an advanced degree, while others were trying to qualify for promotion in their work. About two-thirds of these graduate extension students were earning credit to be applied toward a master's degree, while a very small number (6 per cent) were working toward a doctor's degree. Approximately a fourth of them were not interested in a degree but were taking the work for other reasons not stated.

2. Not only were people of all ages enrolled in graduate extension classes but graduate extension instructors reported a wide range of ages within the classes.

3. According to the graduate extension instructors, the graduate extension students were rated above the campus students in their participation in informal class discussions and they were rated below them in the amount of outside reading they accomplished. In reading of the text, promptness, written papers, oral reporting, test scores, and final grades received, there was no appreciable difference between the two groups. It was the opinion of the majority of the instructors that the general achievement of both campus and extension graduate students was the same.

4. Practices varied regarding the use of counseling services among the extension divisions in this study, according to the graduate school deans. In approximately half of the programs, the graduate students were required to secure permission to register through the extension division for course work and counselors were assigned to the students in advance of registration. In the remaining divisions the students

usually had taken some work before seeking counsel and before being admitted to graduate standing.

5. The majority of the students said that a counselor was available and yet a considerably smaller percentage of them made use of the counseling services. About two-thirds of the students had been admitted to graduate standing and even larger percentages had planned their programs and already knew that the credit being earned would be accepted at full value in their graduate schools.

6. Nearly all graduate extension study was provided through extension center classes, non-center evening classes, and campus evening classes; and the students rated these the most satisfactory arrangements for them to use. Correspondence study was considered least satisfactory of all methods mentioned for providing graduate study. Although thesis writing was conducted through the extension divisions of some schools, it was reserved for the campuses in the majority of the institutions studied.

Provisions for Libraries, Laboratories, and Classrooms

1. The problem of insuring the adequacy and availability of library and laboratory facilities for graduate extension work has been one of continuing concern to graduate school deans, graduate school staff members, directors of extension, and graduate students enrolled in extension classes.

2. Faculty members in this study reported that about half of their students had access to a campus library and the others had a local public library available. The deans of the graduate schools

also said that local public libraries were available to the students enrolled in their isolated evening classes, but that the students in the permanently established centers used the center libraries. Nearly three-fourths of the students rated their library facilities satisfactory.

3. About half of the graduate school deans placed the responsibility of library adequacy on the instructor who, in turn, solicited the cooperation of the extension division and the institutional librarian in assembling and transporting the books when necessary. Students were seldom required to provide their own libraries.

4. Two-thirds of the staff members said the library facilities for extension students were not as adequate as were those provided for the campus students and almost as many staff members stated that extension students did not use the facilities which were available as much as did the campus students.

5. The graduate extension students were divided equally in their replies concerning the use of the facilities as compared with the use of the same facilities on the campuses and they were somewhat in disagreement with faculty members in this regard. Slightly more than half of the students replying stated that they did as much library and reference work as when they were campus students and said that they used visual aids as much. The students were equally divided in their opinions as to whether maps, charts, and other illustrative materials were used as much in graduate extension courses as in graduate campus courses.

6. Students were also evenly divided in their opinions about the use and adequacy of laboratory equipment as compared with their campus experience. Laboratory classes were not offered off campus in the

majority of the institutions studied but where they were organized in some governmental and industrial locations, the laboratories were deemed superior to those of the campuses. Public school classrooms were also considered to be highly satisfactory laboratories. In half of the extension divisions studied, the instructors could alter the laboratory courses to fit the facilities which were available.

7. Both students and faculty members found graduate extension classrooms adequate in size, light, heat, and furniture. Faculty members found their classes to be located conveniently even though, in the large majority of cases, they were located off campus.

The Status of Graduate Extension Credit

1. In all of the institutions studied, graduate extension credit could be applied in varying amounts toward an advanced degree or degrees and in no institution was graduate extension credit discounted. In less than half of the institutions in this study, the credit earned in non-center classes was designated as "course" credit but the amount which could be applied toward graduation was limited as if it were non-residence credit, while that earned in the permanently established extension centers was considered as residence credit. Half of the graduate school deans reported that their institutions would accept extension credit from another institution if, in turn, theirs was acceptable to the other institution. All of the institutions distinguished between extension credit and campus credit on the student's permanent record so that it was possible to check students who might be exceeding the limit of extension credit which was permitted.

2. The following tabulation shows the range of limits placed on extension credits according to academic degrees in various institutions.

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Number of institutions</u>	<u>Range of credit</u>
Masters	5	8 to 16
Master of arts	7	6 to 24
Master of arts in general studies	2	22 to 32
Master of science	6	6 to 24
Master of science in general studies	1	- to 10
Master of education	6	8 to 24
Master of political science	1	- to 24
Doctor of education	5	varies
Doctor of philosophy	6	varies

3. Very few students reported they could apply more than eighteen semester hours of graduate extension credit toward an advanced degree, and the largest group said they were permitted to apply from six to twelve hours only. Only 7 per cent of the students said they could apply more than eighteen semester hours of graduate extension work toward a graduate degree.

Conclusions

The data gathered in this study indicate that there is an increasing acceptance of the idea of providing graduate level work through university extension to those desiring it. Among the member institutions of the National University Extension Association, the number has grown

from eight in 1919 to sixty-five in 1953. A representative minority of fifteen institutions in the association still insists, however, that all graduate work should be done on the campuses and that to do otherwise is to lower established standards and to reduce the quality of instruction.

This study was made to determine: (a) the attitudes of staff members instructing graduate extension courses toward the quality of instruction and student achievement; (b) the controls and requirements exercised by the graduate schools; (c) how graduate students use and evaluate the services of university extension; and (d) the scope of the graduate extension program, its limitations, and its supervision as reported by directors of extension.

The Attitudes of Staff Members Instructing Graduate Extension Courses Toward the Quality of Instruction and Student Achievement

1. The quality of instruction is as high as for the same courses on the campuses. The quality of instruction is not materially affected by factors of time, distance, location, or compensation arrangements.

2. The achievement of graduate extension students is generally as high as that of graduate students on the campuses when evaluated on the basis of performance in class, test scores, and final grades.

3. Campus students do more outside reading than do extension students while extension students participate more in class discussion.

4. Permanently established extension centers are considered more suited for graduate level instruction than are other arrangements such as independently organized classes or correspondence study.

The Controls and Requirements Exercised
by the Graduate Schools

1. Institutional faculty members and non-staff specialists, who have graduate school approval, usually teach extension classes. In one-fourth of the fourteen institutions in the study only graduate school campus staff members may instruct the courses.

2. Competence in instruction is of primary importance to graduate school deans. Academic degrees and ranks are of secondary importance.

3. Most graduate courses taught through extension are deemed to be identical in content with those taught on the campuses. Many graduate school deans insist on using their own staff members to insure the quality of the course content.

4. The graduate school is the approving authority for all graduate courses and their instructors in university extension.

5. The amount of graduate extension credit acceptable in these institutions toward various degrees varies considerably. There is need for cooperative study of this problem among the institutions.

6. Instructors should be held responsible for requiring sufficient books and the extension division should be responsible for providing them.

7. Off-campus laboratory classes are the exception. Some classroom situations in public schools and in some industrial and government laboratories are considered superior to those of the campuses.

How Graduate Students Use and Evaluate the
Services of University Extension

1. Students are sincerely appreciative of the opportunity to study at the graduate level during the evening hours when they are not working. These students believe it is the responsibility of higher education to provide this instruction for them. Seventy-five per cent of them are interested in applying the credit toward an advanced degree.

2. Graduate extension students rate their instruction as high in quality as the graduate instruction they have received on the campuses. The work is considered especially valuable when provided through in-service programs. Students believe work should be "adapted" to off-campus situations.

3. Motivation is just as high among graduate extension students as among graduate campus students. The work is usually elected and related to need. Students report their achievement in extension as measured by final grades to be the same as that for similar work on the campuses.

4. Library facilities are not available to about one-fifth of the graduate extension students and two-fifths of these students fail to make much use of available library facilities. Visual aids, maps, charts, and other learning aids are sometimes found to be inadequate.

5. Many graduate extension students do not use the counseling services which are provided and others do not find such services available. Approximately two-thirds of the students have been admitted to graduate standing, however.

6. The permanently established extension centers serve over half of the graduate students in extension and about a third of them are registered in independently organized evening classes. These independently organized evening classes are very important means of providing instruction in isolated and less populated areas.

The Scope of the Graduate Extension Program,
Its Limitations, and Its Supervision as Reported
by Directors of Extension

1. Although graduate extension courses are offered in nearly all of the organized subject fields, the largest programs in terms of enrollment are in the fields of education, engineering, business administration, social work, and the social sciences. Specially organized in-service programs are partially responsible for the high enrollments in these fields.

2. Approximately 17 per cent of all extension students in the thirteen extension divisions in this study are graduate students. This percentage will increase, directors believe, when campus policies have changed to permit an expanded graduate extension program which is designed to serve more segments of the adult population. Some directors believe that quite often campus students might well be scheduled in certain extension classes to "round out" their training.

3. Lack of available staff, lack of adequate facilities, and lack of financial support from the institutional budget are considered limiting factors by the directors. There is also a need of informing the campus staff and administration concerning the purposes and functions of extension.

4. Extension instructors enjoy the same academic freedom in extension instruction that they do in campus instruction. They are not supervised by the administrative staff of the extension division. Extension directors believe it is desirable that extension instructors have campus attachments and loyalties.

5. It is important that extension directors cooperate at the national level to bring about a better understanding of their mutual problems so that the status of graduate study through extension may be improved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beals, Ralph A. and Leon Brody. The literature of adult education. N.Y., American association for adult education, 1941. 493p.
2. Bowman, Eugene W. A comparative study of teachers' and Oregon school administrators' attitudes toward selected personnel administration problems. Ed.D. thesis. Eugene, Oregon, University of Oregon, 1952. 196p.
3. Brady, Thomas A. The university and statewide adult education. Proceedings of the national university extension association 33:21-25. 1950.
4. Burke, James W., et al. Report of committee on reports and business practices. Bloomington, Indiana, 1952. 74p. (Unpublished mimeographed report, National university extension association.)
5. Chaffee, Maurice A. The challenge of adult education to university extension. Proceedings of the national university extension association 30:19-24. 1947.
6. Creese, James. The extension of university teaching. N.Y., American association for adult education, 1941. 170p.
7. Dey, Raymond H. A study of certain phases of the organization and administration of university extension divisions. Ed.D. thesis. St. Louis, Washington university, 1950. 224p.
8. Dixon, J. Floyd. In-service training of teachers by the extension method. Proceedings of the national university extension association 25:179-184. 1942.
9. Elder, Walter T., et al. Report of committee on reports and business practices. Proceedings of the national university extension association 31:177-191. 1948.
10. _____. Report of committee on reports and business practices. Proceedings of the national university extension association 33:161-186. 1950.
11. Good, Carter, A. S. Barr, and Douglas E. Scates. The methodology of educational research. N.Y., Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1941. 890p.

12. Hall, Ford P., et al. Report of the committee on research. Proceedings of the national university extension association 34:20-27. 1951.
13. Hall-Quest, Alfred L. The university afield. N.Y., Macmillan, 1926. 292p.
14. Hayes, Cecil B. The American lyceum, its history and contributions to education. Washington, U. S. Government printing office, 1932. 72p. (U. S. Department of education. Bulletin no. 12)
15. Henderson, W. D., et al. Report of the committee on standardization of extension credit courses. Proceedings of the national university extension association. pp. 60-130. May, 1924.
16. Higher education for American democracy. A report of the President's commission on higher education. Volume 1. Washington, U. S. Government printing office, 1947. 103p.
17. James, George Francis (ed.). Handbook of university extension. Philadelphia, American society for the extension of university teaching, 1893. 425p.
18. Kerrison, Irvine L. H. Worker's education at the university level. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers university press, 1951. 177p.
19. Kibler, L. W. Post-graduate medical instruction by extension. Proceedings of the national university extension association. pp. 127-130. April, 1928.
20. Koos, Leonard V. The questionnaire in education. N.Y., Macmillan, 1928. 178p.
21. Lowry, F. C. The situation in the south. Proceedings of the national university extension association 21:101-105. 1938.
22. _____. Evaluation of graduate work offered by land-grant institutions through off-campus study arrangements. Proceedings of the national university extension association 33:48-51. 1950.
23. Marberry, J. O. Thesis writing off the campus for the masters' degrees. Proceedings of the national university extension association 24:200-204. 1941.
24. Mader, Albert E., Jr. The university providing service to the people in an industrial state. Proceedings of the national university extension association 31:82-93. 1948.

25. Monroe, Walter S. (ed.). Encyclopedia of educational research. N.Y., Macmillan, 1950. 1520p.
26. National university extension association. Proceedings of the annual meeting. April - May, 1925. 154p.
27. Patrick, Wellington. Limitations on extension credits. Proceedings of the national university extension association. pp. 145-150. April, 1928.
28. Powers, Alfred. Graduate work in extension. Proceedings of the national university extension association. pp. 162-176. May, 1929.
29. Price, Richard. The center for continuation study at the university of Minnesota. Bloomington, Indiana, The national university extension association, 1943. 8p. (Studies in university extension education no. 1)
30. Reber, Louis E. University extension in the United States. Washington, U. S. Government printing office, 1914. 63p. (U. S. Bureau of education, Bulletin no. 19, Whole no. 592)
31. Rees, Carl J. Off-campus graduate studies. Unpublished mimeographed report to Association of land-grant colleges at Washington, Nov., 1952. 11p.
32. Robertson, C. B. Graduate credit for work in extension courses. Proceedings of the national university extension association. pp. 51-52. January, 1919.
33. Round the world college. Newsweek 35:86-87. June 12, 1950.
34. Rowden, Dorothy. Handbook for adult education in the United States. N.Y., American association for adult education, 1936. 423p.
35. Seig, L. P. Graduate study by extension. Proceedings of the national university extension association 17:57-64. 1934.
36. Shelby, T. H. Practices of member institutions with respect to graduate credit for extension class teaching. Proceedings of the national university extension association 19:95-103. 1936.
37. _____. Graduate credit for work done by correspondence and extension class in member institutions of the N.U.E.A. Report of the committee on extension teaching credit courses. Proceedings of the national university extension association 26:88-90. 1943.

38. _____, et al. Report of the committee on extension teaching. Proceedings of the national university extension association 28:65-105. 1945.
39. _____. Report of the committee on extension teaching policies. Proceedings of the national university extension association 34:144-145. 1951.
40. _____. Report of the committee on extension teaching policies. Proceedings of the national university extension association 19:144-145. 1936.
41. Shipley, F. W. Fundamental studies and investigations. Proceedings of the national university extension association 13:179-183. 1930.
42. Snell, Chester D. University extension post-graduate medical instruction. Proceedings of the national university extension association. pp. 104-108. April, 1923.
43. Stockbridge, F. P. A university that runs a state. Worlds work 25:702. April, 1913.
44. Tandy, Lucy. A study of the extent to which N.U.E.A. members use graduate level correspondence courses. Proceedings of the national university extension association 33:98. 1950.
45. The directors' roundtable. Proceedings of the national university extension association 28:23-24. 1945.
46. Tidwell, R. E., et al. Report of the committee on accreditation. Proceedings of the national university extension association 29:174-177. 1946.
47. Universities in adult education. Paris, France, United nations educational, scientific, and cultural organization, 1952. 172p.
48. University and the people. National education association journal 39:301-302. April, 1950.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A**LIST OF INSTITUTIONS REPLYING TO PRELIMINARY INQUIRY LETTERS**

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS SHOWING WHICH GRADUATE SCHOOL DEANS AND DIRECTORS
OF EXTENSION REPLIED TO PRELIMINARY INQUIRY LETTERS AND SHOWING WHETHER
GRADUATE CREDIT MAY BE EARNED THROUGH UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Institution	Grad.Schl. Deans Replying	Ext.Div. Directors Replying	Offers Grad.Ext. Credit
University of Alabama	yes	yes	yes
University of Arizona	yes	yes	yes
University of Arkansas	yes	yes	yes
University of California	yes	yes	no
University of Southern California	yes	yes	yes
University of Colorado	yes	yes	yes
University of Connecticut	yes	yes	yes
University of Delaware	no	yes	yes
University of Florida	yes	yes	yes
University System of Georgia	yes	yes	no
Georgia Institute of Technology	yes	yes	no
University of Hawaii	yes	no	no
University of Illinois	yes	yes	yes
Southern Illinois University	yes	yes	yes
University of Chicago	no	yes	yes
Indiana University	yes	no	yes
Purdue University	yes	yes	yes
State University of Iowa	yes	yes	yes
Iowa State College	yes	yes	yes
University of Kansas	no	yes	yes
Kansas State College	yes	no	yes
University of Kentucky	yes	yes	yes
University of Louisville	yes	yes	yes
Louisiana State University	yes	yes	yes
University of Maine	yes	yes	yes
University of Maryland	yes	yes	yes
Johns Hopkins University	no	yes	no
Harvard University	yes	no	no
Massachusetts Division University			
Extension*	-	yes	no
University of Massachusetts	yes	yes	no
University of Michigan	yes	yes	yes
Michigan College of Mining and Technology	yes	yes	no

* No graduate school involved.

(con'd) Institution	Grad.Schl.	Ext.Div.	Offers
	Deans	Directors	Grad.Ext.
	Replying	Replying	Credit
Michigan State College	yes	yes	yes
University of Minnesota	yes	yes	yes
University of Mississippi	yes	yes	yes
Mississippi State College	yes	yes	yes
University of Missouri	yes	no	yes
Washington University	yes	yes	no
Montana State University	yes	yes	yes
University of Nebraska	yes	yes	yes
University of Omaha	yes	yes	no
University of New Hampshire	yes	yes	yes
Rutgers University	yes	yes	yes
University of New Mexico	yes	yes	yes
New York University	yes	yes	yes
Cornell University	yes	yes	yes
Syracuse University	yes	yes	yes
University of North Carolina	yes	yes	yes
North Carolina State College of Agriculture*	yes	no	yes
University of North Dakota	yes	yes	no
North Dakota Agriculture College	no	yes	no
Ohio University	yes	yes	no
Western Reserve University	yes	yes	no
University of Oklahoma	yes	yes	yes
Oklahoma A and M College	yes	yes	yes
Oregon State System of Higher Education	yes	yes	yes
University of Pennsylvania	yes	yes	yes
Pennsylvania State College	yes	yes	yes
University of Pittsburgh	yes	no	yes
Temple University*	yes	no	yes
University of Rhode Island	yes	yes	yes
University of South Carolina	yes	yes	yes
University of South Dakota	yes	yes	yes
University of Tennessee	yes	yes	yes
Southern Methodist University	yes	yes	yes
University of Texas	yes	yes	yes
Texas Technological College	yes	yes	yes
University of Utah	yes	yes	yes
Brigham Young University	yes	yes	yes
Utah State Agriculture College	yes	yes	yes

*Arrived too late to be included in the report.

(con'd)	Institution	Grad.Schl.	Ext.Div.	Offers
		Deans	Directors	Grad.Ext.
		Replying	Replying	Credit
	University of Virginia	yes	yes	yes
	University of Washington	yes	yes	yes
	State College of Washington	yes	yes	yes
	West Virginia University	yes	yes	yes
	University of Wisconsin	yes	yes	yes
	University of Wyoming	yes	yes	yes

APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY INQUIRY LETTER WRITTEN TO DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION

October 10, 1952

To Directors of Extension:

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education, upon the recommendation of Dr. J. F. Cramer, Dean, General Extension Division, has granted me a four-months' sabbatical during which time I am to study The Status of Graduate Study Through General Extension.

Preliminary to the actual work of the study, I need to receive assistance from you as a dean or director of extension education at your institution. Will you be so kind as to respond to the following requests?

1. Please forward to me by return mail, if possible, all official publications, bulletins, announcements, etc., of your institution or division which mention graduate work through extension. Any notations you wish to make will be appreciated.
2. Please write me a candid letter concerning your point-of-view about graduate work through extension. Be sure to answer the following questions:
 - (a) Do you offer such work? Give your reasons whether yes or no.
 - (b) Do you believe graduate work should be offered through extension? Please give your reasons if your answer is different from (a) above.
 - (c) If you offer graduate work through extension, what kinds of programs are organized? Which are most successful?
 - (d) What was your total enrollment in extension classwork for the academic year 1951-1952? Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____
Fall term, 1952? Undergraduate _____ Graduate _____.
 - (e) Do you observe any trends? What are they?

I hope my request for help will not place an undue burden upon you and that you will be able to give me an immediate reply. When I have finished the study, I shall be happy to make the report available to you. A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

VIRON A. MOORE, ASSISTANT DEAN
GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION

vm;hb
enc.

APPENDIX C

PRELIMINARY INQUIRY LETTER WRITTEN TO DEANS OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

October 13, 1952

To Deans of Graduate Schools:

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education, upon recommendation of Dr. J. F. Cramer, Dean, General Extension Division, has granted me a four-months' sabbatical during which time I will study The Status of Graduate Study Through General Extension.

Preliminary to the actual study itself, I am writing to you as a key person in your institution for background information. As you know, some institutions offer graduate work through extension and some do not. Among those who do there is a great difference in point-of-view and in practice. Your candid replies to the following questions will be of material assistance to me in planning the study.

1. Does your office authorize and approve graduate study through extension?
2. If such work is approved, what are the governing rules and regulations? (Include reference to staff, time and place, quantity and quality of work, method of giving approval, and kinds of programs.)
3. Does your Graduate School accept any graduate credits earned through extension? If so, on what basis and for what purpose?
4. What do you believe about the offering of graduate work through correspondence study?

I trust I may have a very early reply to my inquiry so that I may progress rapidly. When the study is completed, the results will be made available to you.

You will find a self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

VIRON A. MOORE, ASSISTANT DEAN
GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION

vm;hb
enc.

APPENDIX D

**LETTER TO DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION ACCOMPANYING QUESTIONNAIRES
FOR GRADUATE SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS, GRADUATE SCHOOL DEANS,
AND GRADUATE EXTENSION STUDENTS**

November 10, 1952

To Directors of Extension:

Recently I wrote to about one hundred and fifty Extension Directors and Deans of Graduate Schools, requesting certain information preliminary to making a study of The Status of Graduate Study Through Extension, and the response was most gratifying. As a result of this preliminary inquiry, I have been able to discover a select group of extension divisions offering considerable graduate level work. Yours is one of them.

I have conferred with Dean J. F. Cramer, of our own Extension Division, and he agrees I should solicit your cooperation in studying further the graduate extension work at (name of institution).

It is my plan to study rather intensively the programs of about a dozen divisions by working closely with the Director of Extension in each case. With the help of your office, I hope to receive replies from (1) 200 graduate extension students taking courses currently, (2) 25 graduate school faculty members who are instructing or who have been instructing graduate extension courses, (3) one from your Graduate School Dean, and (4) one from you as Extension Director.

I desire very much to include (name of institution) in the study and to save time I am forwarding under separate cover sufficient questionnaires to be distributed as indicated above. You will notice for nearly all responses there is little else to do but check (✓) "yes" or "no"! To each questionnaire is attached a self-addressed stamped envelope. About all your office needs to do is to distribute the questionnaires and encourage all participants to check them at once and place them in the return mail. While I could mail Dean _____ his directly, I thought perhaps you would prefer to hand it to him. The one I am requesting you to fill out will be mailed at a later date.

A committee, appointed by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, is working on a similar study for its member institutions.

Page 2
Directors of Extension
November 10, 1952

The findings of that committee and those of my study (which is not limited to Land-Grant Colleges and Universities) should provide a backlog of material of great value, especially to the membership of the National University Extension Association.

Since I have been granted a sabbatical of four months to work on this special project, my time is limited. I shall be most appreciative of any action you may take to speed up the process. The final report will be made available to you, of course.

Sincerely,

VIRON A. MOORE, ASSISTANT DEAN
GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION

vm;hb

APPENDIX E**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATE SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS**

VIRON A. MOORE
Assistant Dean

General Extension Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Eugene, Oregon

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GRADUATE SCHOOL FACULTY
INSTRUCTING GRADUATE COURSES THROUGH EXTENSION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine, in some measure, the status of graduate study through extension classes. Other inquiries are being sent to Graduate School Deans, Extension Directors, and Graduate Students. Your serious and honest judgments are solicited in your responses to the various parts of the inquiry.

There are great differences nationally in points-of-view and in practices regarding the offering of graduate work through extension. Your filling out this form will be a definite contribution. Arrangements have already been made through your Extension Director to work through his office. The final results will be made available to him and to you if you so desire.

You will notice no reference is made to your name in the questionnaire. In most places, a check ☒ mark is all that is required. A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided for your convenience. Sincere appreciation is expressed for your cooperation in returning it to me not later than November 25.

A. THE INSTRUCTOR

1. Sex: (a) Male _____ (b) Female _____.
2. Age at nearest birthday: _____.

B. ACADEMIC STATUS

1. Do you hold a college degree? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
2. Please check the highest degree held:
 (a) _____ Bachelor's degree (c) _____ Doctor's degree
 (b) _____ Master's degree (d) _____ List other degrees held
3. Are you a regular member of the graduate school faculty of your own institution? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
4. Do you have academic rank in the institution? (a) Yes _____
 (b) No _____ If "no", explain: _____
5. Please check the rank you hold:
 (a) _____ Instructor (d) _____ Full Professor
 (b) _____ Assistant Professor (e) List any other _____
 (c) _____ Associate Professor
6. Are you a non-staff specialist, especially approved for the courses you instruct? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.

C. EXPERIENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

1. Total years of experience in all institutions of higher learning: _____.
2. Total years teaching has been part of your assignment: _____.
3. Total years you have taught at least half-time: _____.
4. Total years employed in present institution: _____.
5. Total years in present position: _____.
6. What is your present position? _____.

D. ACADEMIC LOAD

1. Extension work is (a) part of the regular assignment _____ (b) in addition to the regular assignment _____.
2. Amount of preparation time for graduate extension work compared with preparation time for graduate campus work is (a) same _____ (b) more _____ (c) less _____.
3. In size, graduate extension classes, compared to graduate campus classes, are (a) same _____ (b) more _____ (c) less _____.
4. The amount of time spent with individual graduate extension students compared with graduate campus students is (a) same _____ (b) more _____ (c) less _____.

E. REASONS FOR INSTRUCTING GRADUATE COURSES THROUGH EXTENSION (If you check more than one reason, check in 1, 2, 3 order according to their importance.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. _____ Expected of staff. | 5. _____ Need extra money. |
| 2. _____ Desire to become better known out in state. | 6. _____ To attract graduate students through extension to campus. |
| 3. _____ To enlarge institutional influence. | 7. Other: _____ |
| 4. _____ Prefer to teach adults. | _____ |

F. COMPENSATION

1. Does your present contract include an obligation to teach graduate extension classes without additional salary payments? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
2. May you accept extra salary for teaching graduate extension classes? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
3. Does pay rate for instructing graduate extension classes compare favorably with that of graduate campus classes? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. If "no", please explain: _____

4. Does the rate of compensation affect your availability to instruct graduate extension classes? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

G. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

1. In your opinion, is the quality of graduate extension instruction as high generally as graduate campus instruction?
(a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

2. Is your own graduate extension instruction as high in quality as graduate campus instruction? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
Please explain: _____

3. Does preparation for graduate extension instruction require as much time as preparation for graduate campus instruction?
(a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

4. Does the amount of salary received for graduate extension have anything to do with the quality of instruction? (a) Yes _____
(b) No _____. Please explain: _____

5. Does the time of meeting affect the quality of instruction?
(a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

6. Does the place of meeting affect the quality of instruction?
(a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

7. Does the distance you travel off campus affect the quality of your instruction? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

8. How far are you now traveling (a) to your extension classes: _____ miles, (b) to do your regular daytime work on the campus: _____ miles.

H. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

1. In your opinion, how does the achievement of graduate extension students compare with the achievement of the regular daytime graduate students? (a) same ____ (b) above ____ (c) below ____.
2. Using an A, B, C, D, F grading scale, compare the grade distribution for the same class the last time it was taught as a daytime campus class. Please give both the number of each grade earned and the per cent each represents of the total.

GRADES	EXTENSION		CAMPUS	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
A				
B				
C				
D				
F				

3. How do graduate extension students compare with regular campus graduate students in the following items? Please check ✓ in the appropriate column for each.

ITEM	SAME	ABOVE	BELOW
(a) Test scores			
(b) Oral reporting			
(c) Written papers			
(d) Informal class discussions			
(e) Promptness to do assignments			
(f) Amount of outside reading			
(g) Reading of class text			

I. CLASS MEMBERSHIP

1. What is the approximate spread of ages in your graduate extension classes? (a) less than 10 years ____ (b) 10 to 20 years ____ (c) more than 20 years ____.
2. Is there a wider spread of abilities in your graduate extension classes than in your graduate campus classes? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____.
3. Is there a wider spread of test scores in your graduate extension classes than in your graduate campus classes? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____.
4. Is there a wider distribution of final grades earned in your graduate extension classes than in your graduate campus classes? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____.
5. What is the distribution of sex by percentage? (a) Male ____% (b) Female ____%.

J. ORGANIZATION OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

1. How many times does the average class meet per week? _____
2. How many minutes does the average class meet per week? _____
3. How is the class session usually conducted?
 - (a) _____ Straight lectures
 - (b) _____ Part lecture and part class discussion
 - (c) _____ Seminar plan
 - (d) _____ Laboratory
 - (e) Other: _____
4. Please check ☒ from the list below the arrangement you believe most appropriate to instruct at the graduate level in extension. (If you check more than one, please write in 1, 2, 3, according to their appropriateness,)
 - (a) _____ Daytime centers
 - (b) _____ Evening centers
 - (c) _____ Independent evening classes
 - (d) _____ Short courses
 - (e) _____ Conferences
 - (f) _____ Correspondence study
 - (g) _____ Thesis writing
 - (h) Other: _____

K. LIBRARY PROVISIONS FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

1. Is campus library reasonably available? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
2. Is an adequate local public library available? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
3. Does the Extension Division provide a special class library? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
4. Does the Extension Division have a graduate center library? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
5. Does the instructor bring the class library? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
6. Must student provide his own library? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
7. Are the library facilities as adequate as for the daytime campus students? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
8. Are there any other provisions for a library? _____
9. Do extension students use the library facilities as much as the daytime campus students? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain answer: _____

L. PHYSICAL FACILITIES FOR GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

(Please check appropriate answer.)

YES NO

1. Is the classroom you are now using adequate in size? _____
2. Is the classroom you are now using lighted adequately? _____
3. Is the classroom you are now using heated adequately? _____
4. Is the classroom you are now using located conveniently? _____
5. Is the classroom you are now using adequately equipped? _____
6. Are your present graduate extension classes on campus? _____

M. PLEASE USE THE REMAINING SPACE OR THE REVERSE SIDE FOR ANY COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS YOU WISH TO MAKE ABOUT GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION:

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEANS OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

VIRON A. MOORE
Assistant Dean

General Extension Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Eugene, Oregon

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEANS OF GRADUATE DIVISIONS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to discover the role of the Graduate Division regarding the offering of graduate work through extension. For the purpose of this survey, graduate study is defined as graduate level work offered through extension for which graduate credit toward an advanced degree may be earned.

Other questionnaires are being completed by Extension Directors, Graduate School Faculty, and Graduate Students. Since there are great differences, nationally, in points-of-view and in practices concerning the offering of graduate work through extension, the results of this survey should prove very valuable to Graduate School Deans and Extension Directors everywhere.

You will notice, in most instances, all you need to do is to make a check ☒ mark. Your completing the questionnaire and returning it not later than November 25 will be greatly appreciated. Final results will be made available to you.

A. STAFF REQUIREMENTS

1. Who may instruct graduate extension courses?
 - (a) ☐ Members of the regular daytime graduate school faculty only.
 - (b) ☐ Institutional faculty, but must be approved by the Graduate Office to instruct a given course.
 - (c) ☐ Approved faculty members of other institutions.
 - (d) ☐ Non-institutional persons who are specialists in their fields, when approved.
 - (e) ☐ Full-time Extension Division personnel of graduate school faculty standing.
 - (f) ☐ Others: _____
2. What academic rank must an instructor have to instruct graduate extension classes?
 - (a) ☐ Instructor.
 - (b) ☐ Assistant Professor.
 - (c) ☐ Associate Professor.
 - (d) ☐ Full Professor.
 - (e) ☐ Other: _____
3. What academic degree must the instructor of graduate extension possess?
 - (a) ☐ Bachelor's degree.
 - (b) ☐ Master's degree.
 - (c) ☐ Doctor's degree.
 - (d) ☐ No degree. Please explain:

B. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. Are graduate extension courses identical in content to graduate campus courses? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain:

2. Must an instructor proposing to instruct a graduate course through extension submit a syllabus or course outline? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

3. Must instructors assign special course papers and course projects to graduate extension students? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

4. Is the time requirement the same for graduate extension classes as for graduate campus classes? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

5. Are there specific library requirements for graduate extension courses? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

6. Are instructors required to provide time for staff-student individual conferences? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. Please explain: _____

3. Will your institution accept graduate extension credit from another institution within the state? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____.
Please explain: _____

4. Will your institution accept graduate extension credit earned out-of-state? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

5. May any entire degree be earned through extension? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

6. Do you have any schools or departments which do not accept any graduate work through extension? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . If so, list them and give their reasons: _____

7. Do you distinguish between extension credit and campus credit on the graduate student's permanent record? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

8. Do you discount graduate credits earned through extension? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

9. Do you distinguish between "course" credit and "residence" credit in your graduate extension offerings? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

E. KINDS OF PROGRAMS

1. Check ☒ below the types of programs for which you approve graduate extension credits:

(a) <input type="checkbox"/> Daytime centers.	(e) <input type="checkbox"/> Conferences.
(b) <input type="checkbox"/> Evening centers.	(f) <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence study.
(c) <input type="checkbox"/> Independent evening classes.	(g) <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis writing.
(d) <input type="checkbox"/> Short courses.	(h) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

F. LIBRARY REQUIREMENTS

1. Must the instructor submit a bibliography to the Graduate Office for approval? (a) Yes ☐ (b) No ☐. Please explain: _____

2. After an instructor is approved to teach a graduate extension course, is it his responsibility to provide an adequate library? (a) Yes ☐ (b) No ☐. Please explain: _____

3. Do off-campus graduate extension centers provide their own libraries? (a) Yes ☐ (b) No ☐. Please explain: _____

4. Are public libraries used in the case of isolated evening classes? (a) Yes ☐ (b) No ☐. Please explain: _____

5. Are instructors expected to carry books to classes in cases where local libraries are inadequate? (a) Yes ☐ (b) No ☐. Please explain: _____

6. Are graduate students ever expected to provide their own libraries? (a) Yes ☐ (b) No ☐. Please explain: _____

G. LABORATORY REQUIREMENTS

1. Do you approve any off-campus graduate laboratory classes through extension? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

2. Do you find any types of situations where off-campus equipment is superior to campus? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

3. Do you inspect the laboratory facilities of graduate extension classes scheduled off-campus? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

4. May an instructor ever "alter" a course to "fit" the equipment and supplies available? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

H. CORRESPONDENCE STUDY

1. Do you believe graduate students are more qualified to do correspondence work than undergraduates? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

2. Do you offer any graduate work through correspondence? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

3. Do you limit the number of graduate credits which may be earned through correspondence? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain:

I. COUNSELING STUDENTS

1. Must students secure permission in advance before registering in a graduate extension course? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____.
Please explain: _____

2. Are students assigned counselors before beginning their graduate work? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

3. Do students usually take some graduate extension work before seeking counsel? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

4. May students do graduate extension work prior to being admitted to graduate standing? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

5. Are students permitted to write their theses through extension? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Explain: _____

6. Are theses ever supervised by other than campus faculty members? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

7. Are members of the Extension Division staff ever authorized to represent the graduate office in counseling students? (a) Yes ____ (b) No ____ . Please explain: _____

J. PLEASE WRITE A STATEMENT OF YOUR REASONS FOR OFFERING GRADUATE WORK THROUGH EXTENSION.

K. PLEASE USE THE REMAINING SPACE FOR ANY OBSERVATIONS OR COMMENTS YOU WISH TO MAKE CONCERNING GRADUATE WORK THROUGH EXTENSION.

APPENDIX G

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS REGISTERED IN GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

VIRON A. MOORE
Assistant Dean

General Extension Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Eugene, Oregon

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS REGISTERED IN GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine, in some measure, The Status of Graduate Study Through General Extension. Other inquiries are being sent to Graduate School Deans, Extension Directors, and Graduate School Faculty Members. Your serious and honest judgments are solicited in your responses to the various parts of the inquiry.

Nationally, there are wide differences in points-of-view and in practices concerning graduate work through extension classes. Whatever results the author may obtain will be made available to the Graduate School Dean and the Extension Director of your institution and probably through them to you, if you so desire.

Your cooperation in completing this form will be a definite contribution to the study. You will notice that no reference is made to your name here. In most cases, all you need to do is to check (✓) the most appropriate answer or answers in each category. A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided for your convenience. Appreciation is expressed for your cooperation in returning it to me not later than November 25.

A. THE STUDENT

1. Sex: (a) Male ☐ (b) Female ☐.
2. Marital status: (a) ☐ Single.
(b) ☐ Married. (d) ☐ Divorced.
(c) ☐ Separated. (e) ☐ Widowed.
3. Number of children: _____.
4. Your age at nearest birthday: _____.
5. Are you employed? (a) ☐ Full time.
(b) ☐ Part time.
(c) ☐ No.
6. What academic degrees do you now hold? (a) ☐ Bachelor's.
(b) ☐ Master's.
(c) ☐ Doctor's.
7. Are you working toward an advanced degree now? (a) Yes ☐
(b) No ☐ (c) If so, which degree? _____

B. REASONS FOR TAKING GRADUATE WORK THROUGH EXTENSION. (If you check more than one reason, please write in 1, 2, 3, according to their importance.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Work in daytime | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Personal enjoyment. |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> No college nearby. | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Better than campus day-time instruction. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Cannot afford college. | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Not as good as daytime campus instruction, but best I can do. |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Work applies toward promotion in my present position. | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> To apply credit toward advanced degree. | |

C. QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF WORK

1. How does each of the following in your graduate extension work compare with the graduate campus work you have taken? (Please check ☒ in appropriate space.)

ITEM	SAME	ABOVE	BELOW
(a) Quality			
(b) Quantity			
(c) Difficulty			
(d) Instructor's ability			
(e) Instructor's preparation			
(f) Grades earned			

D. LIBRARY AND LABORATORY FACILITIES (Please check appropriate space.)

	YES	NO
1. Do you have access to an adequate library for the graduate work you are taking through extension?		
2. Do you use a campus library?		
3. Do you use an adequate off-campus local library?		
4. Do you have a special library provided for the graduate class?		
5. Were you required to provide your own personal library?		
6. Do you do as much library and reference work as you would in a comparable class on campus?		
7. Do you have as much use of maps, charts, and other illustrative materials as on campus?		
8. Do you have as much use of visual aids (movies, film slides, and glass slides) as for the same work on a campus?		
9. Do you have as much use of laboratory equipment as on a campus for the same class?		
10. Is the laboratory equipment provided as adequate as that on a campus for the same kind of class?		

E. TIME AND PLACE OF MEETINGS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES NOW ATTENDING

1. How many times a week do you meet? (a) one (c) three
(b) two (d) four
2. Do you meet on campus? (a) Yes (b) No (c) If "no",
please name meeting place:

3. Is meeting place adequate? (Please check ☒ appropriate answers.)

ITEM	YES	NO
(a) Adequate in size		
(b) Properly lighted		
(c) Properly heated		
(d) Properly furnished (desks, tables, chairs, etc.)		

F. PLANNING YOUR PROGRAM

1. Is a counselor from the Graduate School available to help you plan your graduate program? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
2. Is an Extension Division representative available to help you plan your graduate program? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
3. Is the course you are now taking through extension a part of your planned program? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
4. Will the course you are now taking be accepted for full value toward an advanced degree? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____. If "no", please explain: _____

5. How many semester hours of graduate work through extension may you apply toward your advanced degree? _____
6. How many semester hours of graduate credit have you earned through extension? _____
7. Have you already used the services of a counselor in planning your graduate program? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.
8. Have you applied for and been admitted to a graduate school? (a) Yes _____ (b) No _____.

G. GRADUATE EXTENSION SERVICES

1. What kinds of extension services have you used or are you using?

(a) <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate center classes	(e) <input type="checkbox"/> Short courses
(b) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-center evening classes	(f) <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence study
(c) <input type="checkbox"/> Campus evening classes	(g) <input type="checkbox"/> Television
(d) <input type="checkbox"/> Conferences	(h) <input type="checkbox"/> Radio

2. If you have used more than one of the above extension services for graduate study, which do you consider the most satisfactory? _____

Explain: _____

3. Which of the above services do you consider the least satisfactory? _____ Explain: _____

- H. PLEASE USE THE REMAINING SPACE OR REVERSE SIDE OF SHEET FOR ANY COMMENTS OR OBSERVATIONS YOU WISH TO MAKE ABOUT GRADUATE STUDY THROUGH EXTENSION:

APPENDIX H

LETTER TO DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION ACCOMPANYING DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

December 22, 1952

To Directors of Extension:

I wish to thank you for your willingness and effort in getting my questionnaires into the hands of graduate extension students, graduate school faculty members, and Dean _____ of your graduate school. Replies are coming in every day.

Several of the Directors have asked me how they may secure the results of my study which apply to their own Extension Divisions. Since my study will not reveal the identity of each Division as far as tabulations and results are concerned, I will be most happy to return to your office, when I have finished with them, all questionnaires received from your students and staff members. The questionnaires will become your property to use as you wish, and from them it seems to me you should be able to make a small study of your own situation.

Below I am summarizing the returns so far from your institution:

	<u>Sent</u>	<u>Returned</u>
Graduate students	—	—
Graduate school faculty	—	—
Dean of the graduate school	—	—

I am enclosing with this letter the questionnaire for you to complete as Director of Extension. The questionnaire has been delayed purposely until this time. I will be most appreciative if you can find time in your crowded schedule to give it your earliest attention.

Sincerely,

VIRON A. MOORE, ASSISTANT DEAN
GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION

vm;hb
enc.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION

VIRON A. MOORE
Assistant Dean

General Extension Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Eugene, Oregon

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DIRECTORS OF EXTENSION DIVISIONS

This questionnaire is part of a survey on The Status of Graduate Study Through Extension. It concerns chiefly the controls and problems of organizing and supervising the graduate extension program. For the purposes of this survey, graduate study is defined as graduate level work offered through extension for which graduate credit toward an advanced degree may be earned.

Other questionnaires covering other segments of the study have already been sent through you to Graduate Students, Graduate School Faculty Members, and the Dean of your Graduate School.

While, in most instances you may respond objectively to the items, there is opportunity in the latter part of the questionnaire to express opinions and to make suggestions. It is hoped you will take advantage of the opportunity.

Please accept my sincere appreciation for your prompt cooperation.

A. THE EXTENSION DIVISION (Please fill in the answers in the spaces which are provided.)

1. What kind, or kinds, of an institution or institutions do you represent?
 - (a) ☐ State university
 - (b) ☐ State college
 - (c) ☐ Land-grant college or university
 - (d) ☐ Private university
 - (e) ☐ Private college
 - (f) ☐ Other (please state) _____
2. ☐ How many institutions of higher learning does your division represent?
3. ☐ What is the total daytime campus enrollment of the institution or institutions your division serves?
4. ☐ How many academic members are there on the daytime campus staffs?
5. ☐ How many staff members are on the graduate school faculty or faculties of the institution or institutions your division serves?
6. ☐ How many other extension divisions of other institutions operate in your state?
7. ☐ What is the population of your state (1950 census)?

8. To give an idea of the development of the graduate extension program in your division, please fill in the student enrollments (including correspondence study) as requested below:

Academic Year	Other Than Graduate	Graduate Credit Only
1914-15		
1924-25		
1934-35		
1939-40		
1944-45		
1950-51		
1951-52		

B. THE GRADUATE EXTENSION PROGRAM

1. Please check in 1, 2, 3 order the three fields with greatest enrollment in the academic year 1951-52.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (a) <input type="checkbox"/> Education | (f) <input type="checkbox"/> Biological and physical sciences |
| (b) <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering | (g) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| (c) <input type="checkbox"/> Business administration | (h) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| (d) <input type="checkbox"/> Social work | (i) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| (e) <input type="checkbox"/> Social sciences | |

2. What specially organized graduate programs do you conduct?

- | |
|---|
| (a) <input type="checkbox"/> On-the-job training of government employees. |
| (b) <input type="checkbox"/> On-the-job training of industrial employees. |
| (c) <input type="checkbox"/> In-service courses and workshops for teachers. |
| (d) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| (e) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

3. Organizational Patterns and Distribution of Graduate Extension Services

Organizational Patterns	Number of Centers	Number of Classes	Enrollment Fall 1952
a. Permanently established off-campus graduate center			
b. Campuses of other colleges and universities			
c. On-campus evening and Saturday classes at parent institution			
d. Off-campus independently organized non-center evening and Saturday classes			
e. Graduate programs established at industrial sites			
f. Graduate programs established at gov't installations			
g. Correspondence study			

C. FACTORS LIMITING THE EXTENT OF THE GRADUATE EXTENSION PROGRAM
(Please check ☒ yes or ☐ no for each of the items appearing below.)

Yes	No	Item
		1. Lack of laboratory facilities.
		2. Lack of library facilities.
		3. Lack of meeting places.
		4. Poorly located meeting places.
		5. Some distances too great for instructors to travel.
		6. Lack of desire on the part of the instructors to teach graduate extension classes.
		7. Conservative attitude on the part of the graduate school.
		8. Conservative attitude on the part of the extension division.
		9. Students are reluctant to enroll because status of the credit is uncertain.
		10. High cost to the student limits enrollments.
		11. Program is too costly to the extension division.
		12. Lack of extension field staff to promote the program.
		13. Graduate school instructors are available but there are not enough of them to go around.
		14. Other: _____

D. METHODS OF APPROVING GRADUATE EXTENSION CLASSES (Please check ☒ in the most appropriate space or spaces.)

1. ☐ The extension division has blanket approval from the graduate school to proceed with the organization of graduate extension classes where they are needed.
2. ☐ The extension division submits to the graduate school a request for approval of each graduate class as it is proposed.
3. ☐ The programs in permanent graduate centers are approved by the graduate school in advance, but individually organized classes must be approved separately.
4. ☐ The graduate school organizes graduate extension classes and then notifies the extension division of the arrangement.
5. ☐ Graduate extension classes are arranged between the extension division and the department or school concerned and, after arrangements are completed, the graduate office is notified.
6. ☐ Other: _____

E. SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE EXTENSION INSTRUCTION (Please check ✓ in the appropriate space or spaces.)

1. ___ The instructor is not supervised. He exercises full academic liberty as to the course content and method of instruction.
2. ___ The instructor is expected to present a course outline to proper extension and/or campus officials.
3. ___ The instructor is expected to use a campus syllabus.
4. ___ The instructor is directly supervised by extension and campus representatives by class visitation.
5. ___ Staff meetings are called from time to time to discuss mutual problems.
6. ___ The instructor is expected to use an established grading system.
7. ___ The instructor may award grades without regard to an established system.

F. STATUS OF GRADUATE EXTENSION CREDIT (Please check ✓ in the most appropriate spaces.)

1. ___ All graduate extension credit is residence credit and may be applied as such toward an advanced degree if approved in the student's program.
2. ___ Permanent center credit has residence status but other extension course work does not.
3. ___ Non-center extension work is considered course credit, but not residence credit.
4. ___ Non-center extension work carries residence credit when approved for the student in advance.
5. ___ All graduate extension credit is strictly limited to a given number of semester hours regardless of the degree sought.
6. ___ The amount of graduate extension credit which may apply toward an advanced degree varies with the individual student's program and with the particular degree sought.

G. SUGGESTIONS AND STATEMENTS OF OPINIONS

1. Would you like a summary of the findings of this study? The summary will not identify any particular institution.

(a) Yes ___

(b) No ___

Signed: _____

5. What opinion or evidence do you have regarding the inferiority or superiority of graduate extension work as compared with regular graduate work on a campus?

6. What suggestions do you have for the improvement of The Status of Graduate Work Through Extension at the local level?

7. What suggestions do you have for the improvement of The Status of Graduate Work Through Extension at the national level?

8. Other comments pertinent to the problem:

9. What do you believe to be the outstanding positive characteristic of your graduate extension program?