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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the historical and conceptual development of the field of student personnel work through an examination of the three major student affairs journals. The study will focus on the issues of the journals published from 1963 to 1982. All of the volumes from 1963 to 1982 of the Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (NAWDAC), the Journal of College Student Personnel (JCSP) and the Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) will be used. The NASPA did not exist until 1963; hence, the time period studied will allow an examination of all three journals from a point at which they all existed to the present (Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Proceedings, 1974; Ulrich, 1984). The following questions guided the study.

Per editorial term in each journal

1. What was the gender of the majority of the contributors to the journals?

2. What roles (type of employment) did contributors to the journals hold at the time of publication?

3. What institutions produced the largest number of contributors (names, Carnegie Commission type, institutional location)?
4. What portion of the articles focused on the individual, the group, the organization, the system?

5. What were the themes and/or topical areas that have been explicitly treated in the articles?

Need for the Study

Most fields have core journals that persons receive as a function of professional membership and it is assumed that such published scholarship in applied fields influences the behavior of practitioners in those fields. These core professional journals, for example, provide a means by which academicians and practitioners present new knowledge, theoretical concepts, speculative thoughts, programmatic innovations and research findings to the scholarly and professional communities (Walton, 1982). They serve as "vehicles for obtaining new information related to one's field or discipline" (Walton, 1982), and are the delivery system by which educators acquire much of their professional understanding of today's educational problems and upon which they base practice" (Ward, Hall, Schramm, 1975).

What kind of knowledge, theoretical concepts, speculative thoughts, programmatic innovations, and research inform the practice of student affairs professionals? What do they read in their professional journals? This study will provide information to respond to some of these questions.

An analysis of published scholarship in professional journals is also one means for assessing the professional status of a field. Kuh, Lardy and Greenlee (1979) state that "one of the standards often used to judge whether an occupation can be considered a profession is the existence of a body of literature reflecting
theoretical bases in which research and practice in the respective field can be
grounded." Penny (1969), Lloyd-Jones (1949), and Parker (1949) have addressed
the issue of professionalism in student personnel work and concluded in the late
1960's that the field was moving toward being a profession but was not yet one
because of the lack of a theoretical base in the literature of the field. More
recently, encouragement for the development of a distinct body of literature for
student personnel work has been voiced (Brown, 1972; Parker, 1971; Sandeen,
1971). Hood, Hull and Mines (1980) echo these sentiments when they state "this
research must be written and published for others to read... as this is an
important mission of the field." Hence, this study should help provide an updated
evaluation of the status of the field on the question of whether the scholarship of
the field expresses increasing or decreasing theoretical bases.

It is also important to understand how research and knowledge are generated
because different methods of inquiry produce different types of information which
dictate different behaviors and understandings. For instance, quantitative meth-
odologies assume data to be objective—results appear to be more generalizable,
precise, tangible, and one is often able to replicate the study. Qualitative
methodologies provide more subjective data, results that are less precise,
tangible, and serve a different purpose—to provide understanding and often, to
empower a client. Such studies are more difficult to replicate.

Based on Kuhn's book, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Halstead
(1980) makes the following points.

1. All scientists adapt analytic models from which they can view their
problems— that is, they mentally construct models or paradigms that
reconstruct reality;
2. The model chosen influences problems and roles looked at, one's theoretical perspective and conclusions made;

3. The value of employing paradigms advanced by the educational or organizational literature is that they provide a conceptual framework to look at the world, to highlight organizational functions, activities, and roles within higher education and to generate further hypotheses of models.

It is also important to understand the knowledge base because it informs what student personnel workers do and provides a sense of the historical development of the field. It helps to answer where the field has been, who the contributors have been, what schools have centers of scholarship and are influencing future directions of the field. Understanding the context and environment in which knowledge is produced is important so that results, conclusions and implications can be interpreted and applied appropriately.

In addition to historical and content perspectives, an analysis of the knowledge base of the field can help one ascertain indirectly the tacit philosophy of the field. A field's philosophy may dictate the definition of a healthy person, an effective environment, how behaviors are viewed, types of interventions to be utilized, what is appropriate behavior, what is acceptable in the literature of the field and what is acceptable or appropriate research.

Student personnel work is concerned with these types of issues and with making decisions about what should and should not transpire in the lives of students on campuses throughout the United States. Student personnel work is concerned with human development and with assisting practitioners to make decisions about people's lives. It is concerned about the management of the
student personnel work functions. For these reasons it is important to understand what the undergirding themes, practices, and the literature are which provide the espoused reasons for why student personnel workers do what they do the way they do it.

Researchers in various fields have utilized the journals in investigations that have provided information about both the journals themselves and their professions. Clark and Guba (1978) utilized professional journal articles to study the productivity levels of research and development in schools of education. Wrenn (1960, 1966) did an historical review of a professional journal, presented evidence of its significance, and provided a topical analysis of articles. Foreman (1966) performed an analysis of articles published in professional journals. Robinson (1970) illustrated the growth of manuscripts submitted, rejected, and pages published in professional journals. Robinson (1970) illustrated the growth of manuscripts submitted, rejected, and pages published in professional journals with annual figures.

Goldstein (1963), Bhon (1966), and Katz and Brophy (1974) studied the institutional affiliation of authors of articles in professional journals and identified major centers of research and scholarship. Studies have been conducted to assess other characteristics of journal authors, including graduate school attended and work (Feeney and Resnick, 1969). Tinsley and Tinsley (1979) examined institutional productivity as reflected in professional journals. Remer and Barclay (1978) studied perceptions in relationship to articles produced in professional journals. Baruth and Miller (1977) quantified professional contributions of 411 counselor educators; whereas Walsh, Osipow, Babbs, Fredricks and Armstrong (1969) reviewed the institutional and individual producers of articles in counseling psychology journals.
Cox and Catt (1977), in their widely cited study, and West (1977) used publication frequency to determine the institutional affiliation of contributors of unsolicited manuscripts and compared the productivity of graduate programs to Roose and Anderson's (1970) ratings of quality graduate faculty in academic departments.

Myers and DeLevie (1966) and Hall (1967) have identified the authors who have been cited most frequently in professional publications, while Cotton and Anderson (1973) have identified both the authors and journals cited most frequently in a professional journal.

Studies specific to student personnel work journals have been done by several researchers. Hood, Hull and Mines (1979), in an examination of citations from various journals in student services areas, attempted to determine the extent to which the JCSP played a significant role as a source for new literature. Tryon (1980) examined the "frequency of 18 student personnel subject areas represented in the 1974 and 1979 issues of the JCSP to determine changes in subjects addressed by journals. Kuh and Bursky (1980) analyzed 1,268 articles in four student affairs journals to determine 1) the institutional rate of student affairs knowledge production and dissemination; 2) the existence of trends in types of articles appearing in journals; and 3) if the rate of knowledge dissemination in student affairs was related to available indices of institutions' scholarly productivity or proclivity. A study of the publishing patterns of the JCSP to provide information regarding "centers of student personnel work research and some understanding of the influences shaping the development of the journals was conducted by Walsh, Pritchard and Passons (1969).
To summarize, the present study will analyze individual productivity by sex, role and institutional productivity at the time of publication, and trends in the types of articles published as defined by the focus, theme and topical area of articles appearing in the JCSP, NASPA and NAWDAC journals from 1963-1982.

The call for this type of research is not new (Roberts, 1982; Hood, Hull and Mines, 1979; Belson, 1974; Walsh, Pritchard and Passons, 1969). Such a study will provide perspective and data on student personnel work as a developing profession. The data and implications can be the basis for understanding the value and utility of the literature in student personnel work. It can be used to aid in "more accurately assessing the impact of publication upon professional development" (Belson, 1974).

Organization of the Study

The research study will consist of five chapters. In Chapter II, the pertinent literature will be reviewed. The methodology will be presented in Chapter III. A statement of findings of the study will be presented in Chapter IV. The conclusions and implications for further research will be developed in Chapter V.
A survey of the literature indicates that studies examining the content and the historical development of student personnel work journals are sparse. Few studies have examined the journals and much of the research has been incidental, focusing on the publication history of the organizations, generated from the association membership. These studies provide answers to general questions about journal content and very little evaluation or critique.

In this examination of the three major student personnel work journals, it is expected that this study will 1) contribute to the small, but growing body of literature which informs student personnel work as a profession and 2) stimulate, as Silverman (1976) suggests, professional fields to "consider the larger meanings of supporting systems, such as journal publications, for they can hinder or help actualize the potential that resides in the collectivities that must meet the challenges of the future."

Since published educational research is the delivery system by which professional educators acquire much of their understanding of today's educational problems (Ward, Hall and Schramm, 1975) and upon which they ground practice, it seems appropriate to better understand the nature of the contributors, the types of contributions and the approaches through which contributions are created. A review of the literature reveals that some research has been done on institutional productivity (which institutions have the greatest number of contributors) but not
much has focused on specific journals (e.g., the JCSP, the NAWDAC, or the NASPA). The review of the related literature includes three areas. The first area is the content of knowledge produced in journals, in particular, that produced in the NAWDAC, the JCSP and the NASPA. The second is the demographics of contributors to the journals. The third area is the role/function of journal editors, particularly the gatekeeping activities they perform in the knowledge production and dissemination process—deciding the "who and what" that gets published.

Content of Knowledge Produced in Journals

Walsh, Pritchard and Passons (1969) studied the publishing patterns of the JCSP to provide information about "centers of student personnel research and some understanding of the influences shaping the development of the journals" (Walsh, Pritchard and Passons, p. 403). The analysis included the 1959-1968 publications. The nine year time span was divided into two periods (years 1-5 and years 6-9) and each period was analyzed separately. Each article was categorized by a topical schemata used to index articles in the journal; by author(s); by institutional affiliation of the author(s); and by geographic region. The conclusion of the study was that the "JOURNAL has provided a public avenue for discussion and research on a broad range of topics in the student personnel arena" (Walsh, Pritchard, and Passons, p. 405).

Beverly Belson (1974) did an historical analysis of the development of the NAWDAC from its beginning through 1974 to 1) identify designated Association members who had contributed their professional expertise to the publication in the role of Editor, Associate Editor, Managing Editor, Section Editor or other officer of the Association; 2) to trace, historically the format of the journal as it
relates to the inclusion or exclusion of special interests sections; 3) to report, on the basis of article theme or topic, those issues and concerns which have been presented in an attempt to meet the members' needs for knowledge of the profession; 4) to identify the contributing authors by sex, membership status, and by occupation at the time of the contribution of the material; and 5) to determine to what degree the journal article contents speak to the concerns of a single sex or whether it was of general value to professional guidance/student personnel workers of both sexes. Belson concluded 1) that Ruth Strang and Kate Hevner Mueller (first two editors) were the only individuals who contributed their personal expertise to the publication because of their editorial style, which was to personally solicit manuscripts and to be personally responsible for final decisions as to what materials would be included—in contrast to their predecessors whose style was to openly solicit manuscripts and use an editorial board to referee articles so that final decisions were consensual and not individual; 2) in terms of Special Sections, four—"Book Routes," "Secondary School Exchange," "College and University Exchange," and "We Deans"—had existed for twenty-five years and that they reflected the membership's interest in sharing programs and project ideas and news of a professional and personal nature; 3) that an analysis of the journal articles by title, topic or theme indicated that 705 content articles were published in 36 issues; 75% of the content articles related to the three topical area themes of human development, methods and techniques and substantive areas; areas of professional orientation and context and setting have received more attention in the 1960's and 1970's than in other time in publication history; two thirds of the articles addressed themselves to concerns of personnel workers in postsecondary education; articles dealing with concerns of educators at the secondary level and
below had declined in the last six years; 4) that an analysis of author occupations showed that 91.90% of the contributors were employed in education, 500 were employed at the postsecondary level and 203 were at the secondary level or below; 5) that analysis by sex of author indicated that 482 authors were female and 292 male; 6) that the journal was of general value to personnel and guidance and student personnel work professional and not to just female professionals since only 20.28% of the articles dealt with primarily female concerns.

Hood, Hull and Mines (1979) examined citations from two major texts in the field, College Student Personnel (Fitzgerald, Johnson, Norris, 1970) which includes a cumulative bibliography of recommended journal articles published through 1968 as well as articles published ten years prior to 1968 and College Student Personnel Services which basically provides citations and a review of the literature from 1965-1974 in student personnel work to determine if the JCSP had made a significant contribution to the student personnel work literature. Their findings showed that the JCSP was cited more frequently than any other individual source. After examining the number of JCSP articles related to 18 student personnel work areas that were published from 1969-1974, Hood, Hull and Mines (1979) found student characteristics, counseling, housing, academic achievement and professional problems to be the topics appearing most frequently in the journal.

Fifty percent of the articles were research and evaluation in nature; nineteen percent were philosophical and theoretical in nature and five percent were literature reviews. The majority of the articles were from the midwest, the south and the northeast in that order.
Researcher Georgiana Schick Tryon (1980) (1981) has continued the investigation of the role of student personnel work journals in the knowledge production and dissemination process. In the first study Tryon (1980) examined the 1974 and 1979 issues of the JCSP to determine the frequency of the representation of 18 student personnel work subject areas (counseling, student characteristics, professional problems, housing, academic achievement, administration, college climate, student conduct, vocational choice, academic advising, admissions and retention, educational skills, financial aids, orientation, student activities, fraternities and sororities, foreign students, and placement). All articles published in 1974 and 1979 were examined, except for editorials and book reviews. The researcher categorized 199 articles according to classification schema utilized by editorial staff in Volume 15 of the JCSP. The findings were that there was "a consistency in the frequency of different student personnel subject areas covered in the JCSP; that topics such as counseling, student characteristics, housing and professional problems accounted for more than 50% of articles, and that vocational choice was a topic which appeared more frequently in 1979 than in 1974."

Most recently Tryon (1981) analyzed articles published in the JCSP during 1974 and 1979 to determine if a change had occurred in women's publication patterns in that journal and if so, to identify the nature of the change. Dr. Tryon tabulated the ordinal positions of all contributors in the 1974 and 1979 issues of the JCSP. Articles in which sex of contributors could not be determined were eliminated. One hundred seven articles and 377 authors were examined.

Findings were that women published "almost twice the percentage in 1979 as they did in 1974" which seems to indicate that women had become more professionally active as judged by their publication rates.
One other study that pertains to knowledge production and dissemination activities of the journals was conducted in 1936 by Anastasia Doyle. A content analysis was executed of articles appearing in the NAWDAC's predecessor, the N.A.W.D. Yearbook, (1924-1935) to determine under which student personnel work subject areas the greatest number of articles fell. Doyle and some of her colleagues at Stanford developed a list of twenty student personnel work topical areas after scanning the content pages of the Yearbooks and classified the number of articles falling under each topical area according to the schema. The results were as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data by Topics</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum and Administration</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Character Building</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dean - Problems and Duties</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dean - Qualifications and Professional Training</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dean - Relationships to Groups Outside the School</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Freshman Problems and Orientation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Guidance - Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Guidance - Social</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Guidance - Vocational</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Health - Mental</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Health - Physical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Housing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Methods and Research</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Scholarship</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Scholarships</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sororities</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Social Programs and Activities</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excluding Student Government)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Social Programs and Activities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Student Government)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tryon (1981) contends that issues in which practitioners express an interest are usually reflected in the literature of the field. She did a study examining the frequency of 18 student personnel subject areas that were represented in the JCSP in 1974 and 1979. The study helped validate that activities with which professionals were working in the field are reflective of the literature being published.

The bibliographic citations characteristics of journals have been measured by researchers in psychology and other empirically-based fields (Daniel, 1967; Appel and Gurr, 1964; Bradford, 1950) to determine patterns of information flow created by scientists and researchers through their work (Selby and Eberley, 1972).

James Selby and Robert Eberley studied the JCSP to determine its information flow patterns as created by researchers and to determine the diversity of the authors' literature needs (Selby and Eberley, 1972). Volumes one, four, seven and nine were selected from the first ten years of the journal's publication. Only journal citations were examined. The bibliographic entries of the journal were categorized into four areas:

a. Self - the Journal of College Student Personnel
b. Core - journals directly related to student personnel services
c. Interdisciplinary - all other psychology and education journals
d. Cognate - journals outside the fields of education and psychology.

For each volume the researchers enumerated (a) the number of articles; (b) the number of different journals; (c) the total number of citations; and (d) the number of citations per article. An analysis, which indicates cumulative percentages of bibliographic entries, was performed to ascertain the diversity of
author bibliographic needs. Selby and Eberley (1972) concluded that 1) the JCSP has provided a body of usable research articles for college student personnel work as it has developed; 2) authors of articles feel free to quote the journal as a legitimate source; 3) self citations will continue to increase minimally in the journal; 4) authors' tendencies will be to refer more frequently to selected journals, though both the numbers of journals cited and the total number of citations continue to increase; and 5) citation characteristics of the journal are balanced in that they are similar to characteristics of journals in other scientific fields.

Walter Hobbs and John Bruce Francis (1973) examined articles in order to "develop a taxonomy by which a distinction could be made among higher education publications." Their article categorized knowledge produced in journals into three areas: a) descriptive materials, b) value statements and c) theoretical statements; and argues for a change in emphases in work produced in the publications (Hobbs and Francis, 1973). Descriptive materials include technical data and reports. They communicate inter, intra and extra institutional information. Value statements include articles that analyze information and then recommend an action to be taken. Value statements are often referred to as "gut pieces" in that they are non-objective, emotional reactions of the writer to a personal experience or to a topic of great personal importance (Hobbs and Francis, 1973). Theoretical pieces attempt to present an empirically based, scientific approach/explanation of the subject matter at hand. Hobbs and Francis view these as "some ways" and not "the only ways" of knowing and producing knowledge. They too concur with Silverman's (1974) arguments that we are creating "closed systems" and are admonishing higher education scholars that this is a threat to the creative process when they state:
It is necessary that higher educationists generate, test, extend and capitalize upon broadly applicable explanations of the concrete phenomena they study. Otherwise, the field will continue to grow but not to develop, to remain forever vulnerable to the influence of persuasive spokes­persons whose arguments cannot be tested until too late.

They conclude that more theory, more theorists and the solicitation of new knowledge by the publication channels (journals) in the field are a partial answer (Hobbs and Francis, 1973). There has been some concern that since government and private agencies sponsor much of the knowledge production and dissemination research (Machlup, 1972) it appears that both groups select persons whose values are in agreement with theirs, or persons whose research interests and/or perspectives are congruent with theirs, which again highlights the problem which editors face—the closed system.

Demographics of Contributors to the Journals

Kuh and Bursky (1980) analyzed articles in four student affairs journals, NAWDAC, NASPA, Personnel and Guidance Journal and JCSP, to determine types of articles published and institutional productivity rates. They examined the institutional rates of student affairs knowledge production and dissemination; whether trends existed in the types of articles that appeared in various journals; and whether rates of knowledge dissemination in student affairs were related to other available indices of institutional scholarly productivity or proclivity. The researchers concluded that a) midwestern institutions had the highest knowledge production and dissemination rates; b) trends did exist judged by the types of articles that appeared in various journals; for instance, a large number of JCSP manuscripts are data based and have a research/evaluation orientation, the NASPA articles were generally program descriptions, philosophical and
theoretical in orientation and reflected a big degree of concern with practitioner-related issues; c) it is very likely that publishing in student affairs programs, such as the facts that many student personnel preparation programs exist in midwestern institutions which may be the reason that a large number of authors are from these locations; and in high producing institutions a "pervasive norm often operates that essentially requires knowledge production and dissemination."

Over the last five years research in this area has been conducted by Professor George Kuh and teams of graduate students from Indiana University.

Hunter and Kuh (1984) attempted to develop a profile of the prolific contributors to the higher education literature by answering the following questions in their investigation: 1) what are the biographical characteristics of prolific contributors to the higher education literature; 2) what factors at certain times (prior to college, during undergraduate school, during graduate school and in postdoctoral professional periods) are related to the development of a prolific scholar; and what experiences do prolific scholars believe significantly influenced their predilection for and subsequent research activity? The researchers designed a questionnaire (The Scholarly Publication Productivity Questionnaire) specifically for this study to elicit pertinent information about the backgrounds, personality traits, educational experiences, and scholarly activities of prolific contributors to the higher education literature. The instrument was divided into six sections. In section one respondents indicated the degree to which Likert scale items described their personality. In section two respondents were asked expectations for engaging in research and collaborative research activities with colleagues. In section three respondents were questioned regarding their major program of study, opportunities to engage in research, mentoring relationships, research
activity of faculty in their graduate program, types of assistantships held and perceived relevance of coursework to current research interests and activities. Section four queried respondents about major field, academic honors, participation in co-curricular activities, mentoring relationships, collaboration with faculty and peers and asked respondents to indicate the degree to which they, as undergraduates, were similar to each of the four Clark-Trow (1960) sub-culture types (academic, vocational, collegiate, non-conformist). Respondents were questioned regarding family life and childhood recollections in section five. An open-ended question which asked respondents to note any factors that they thought were critical in encouraging them to become prolific knowledge producers was the content of section six. In addition, respondents were asked to include a recent detailed vita listing significant professional accomplishments including professional positions held, publications, and awards or honors. The questionnaire was mailed to eighty-five persons. Seventy-seven persons returned the completed questionnaire.

Demographic Profile

1. Out of the seventy-seven persons surveyed, 83% were male and 17% were female.

2. The majority of persons were employed in public Ph.D.-granting institutions.

3. The average number of years in current employment was ten years.

4. The majority of persons were faculty members (46%); thirty-two percent were administrators; and twenty percent were classified as both faculty and administrators.
5. Fifty-seven percent of respondents were full professors, thirty-four percent were associate professors and nine percent were assistant professors.

6. They enjoy engaging in scholarly activities.

7. Respondents appear mildly motivated by salary incentives to engage in research.

8. Respondents regularly engage in scholarly activities during the evenings and weekend hours.

9. Respondents hold varied and wide interests/ideas that they consider to be creative.

10. As early as high school, respondents held the expectation that they would become outstanding in their chosen profession.

11. Women, more than men, appear to have stronger academic records in both high school and college.

Publication Activity

1. Between 1979 and 1983 2.8 books or monographs were published per person. Forty-two percent published 1-7 books or monographs and nineteen percent published 30 or more articles/chapters.

2. Eight and five tenths is the mean number of books and monographs published during the scholar's lifetime; forty-eight percent published 3-50 books or monographs.

3. Article and chapter production ranged from 4 to 300 with the average number of total articles or chapters published being forty-two.

4. Faculty members within a student's major department in college were reported to have greater impact than classwork. Such faculty were very active in publication activities according to respondents.

5. Respondents indicated that they were able to work closely with graduate school faculty on research projects.

6. This contact with faculty influenced subsequent publication activity more than did course work.

7. Most respondents had published while in graduate school and most reported that collaborative efforts with members of their graduate school faculty resulted in their first publications.

8. Dissertations contributed to a portion of their early publication records.

9. Collaboration with fellow graduate students appears not to have resulted in early publications for these individuals.
10. Higher education scholars are usually about forty when they become regular contributors to the literature in comparison with natural science scholars who typically establish themselves at a younger age.

11. Women, more than men, reported that they collaborated with others especially their graduate students in publication activities.

Scholars had conducted more data-based research than the scholar-practitioners and played a more prominent role in the analysis of their research data. And scholars were employed in positions with greater expectations for them to engage in research and publication.

**Graduate School Experiences**

1. Eighty-four percent of the respondents earned a Ph.D.; thirteen percent an Ed.D.; two percent a Master of Science; and one percent a Juris Doctorate.

2. Seventy-nine percent earned graduate degrees at public institutions.

3. Eighteen different doctoral degree programs were listed by respondents with the majority of persons in the following areas: higher education (33%); counseling psychology (9%); general psychology (9%); educational administration (8%); and college student personnel administration (8%).

4. The number of years since the receipt of the doctorate ranged from 4 to 50 years.
5. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents received masters degrees from public institutions and twelve percent from private institutions.

6. Twenty-four different master degree programs were listed with the top three areas being college student personnel administration (19%), counseling and guidance (16%), and general psychology (15%).

7. Five percent of the respondents had earned a second masters degree, half of which were in business administration.

8. The average number of years between the completion of the doctorate and the masters degree was five.

9. Women were more likely to have been students in graduate programs that were characterized as "practitioner-oriented" and were less pleased with their academic preparation for conducting research.

College Activity

1. Of the undergraduate institutions attended, forty-six percent went to public Ph.D.-granting institutions; seven percent to public M.A.-granting institutions; three percent to public baccalaureate institutions; sixteen percent to private Ph.D-granting institutions; twelve percent to private M.A.-granting institutions, and eighteen percent to private baccalaureate institutions.

2. Respondents reported twenty-five different majors with the top three being psychology (17%), history (10%), and sociology (8%).
3. The mean undergraduate grade-point average was 3.2 on a 4.0 scale. The highest GPA reported was 4.0 and the lowest was 2.4.

4. Sixty-three percent of the respondents received the Bachelor of Arts degree; thirty-two percent received the Bachelor of Science degree; three percent received a double B.A./B.S. degree; and one percent received degrees in business administration and mechanical engineering.

5. The average number of years between the receipt of the bachelors degree and the masters degree was 3.2.

Pre-College Activity:

1. High school grade point averages ranged from A to D with three fourths of the respondents receiving a B+ average or higher.

2. Approximately one third of the respondents indicated that 76% to 100% of their high school friends attended college.

3. Eighty-four percent of the respondents indicated that it was a parental expectation that they attend college, even though the parents did not graduate from college.

4. Over half (52%) of the respondents indicated that they were influenced to a major extent to read for leisure by parents. Ten percent indicated that parents influenced them to write creatively.

The researchers concluded that their findings "acknowledge the importance of anticipatory socialization for prolific higher education scholars ... and indi-
cate the need for modeling appropriate behavior and for providing opportunities for participation in research projects."

Kuh, Bean, Bradley, Coomes and Hunter (1984) reviewed the college student personnel literature published between 1969 and 1983 in eleven selected journals in order to describe the methods, substantive topics and types of papers that were characteristic of the periodicals. The following questions guided the study: 1) Have the substantive topics examined in the college student research reported in selected journals changed between 1969 and 1983; 2) Have the methods used in the study of college students changed during this period; 3) Have the types (i.e., intended use of knowledge) of papers reporting college student research changed during this period? Data about the articles was gathered using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into four sections. Section one contained items pertinent to the publication of the article; primary and secondary topics addressed in articles were recorded using one or more of five major categories in section two; section three was divided into three categories where sample characteristics, kinds of data collection methods employed and sources of data used per article were recorded; section four addressed the design and analytical techniques employed; and in section five the type of article was identified utilizing a knowledge typology developed by researchers earlier. All articles in all issues of these periodicals from every other volume year from 1969 to 1983 were reviewed in the following journals: American Educational Research Journal, Journal of College Student Personnel, Journal of Counseling Psychology, Journal of Educational Psychology, Journal of Higher Education, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors Journal, Personnel and Guidance Journal, Review of Higher Education, Research in Higher Education and Sociology of Education.
The researchers concluded that 1) the methodology used in college student research published in the eleven high circulation periodicals became more sophisticated between 1969 and 1983; 2) that researchers' preference for pencil and paper instrumentation remains solid, but the uses of standardized instruments declined significantly in the past fifteen years; 3) that most studies used samples from state-supported doctoral granting institutions (only a handful of articles were concerned with students from community college or baccalaureate-granting institutions or with ethnic minority students); and 4) that the popular topics appearing in the periodicals were legal issues, educational aspirations in the 1960's and 1970's and non-traditional students.

A 1985 article by Bradley, Coomes, and Kuh describes a knowledge schema that they developed to provide a framework for categorizing the different kinds of information produced in a field. Their typology is based on the earlier work of Berlyne (1974), Kellams (1975), Culbertson (1977), Mitroff and Kilmann (1978) and Silverman (1982). The typology is composed of six categories which can be divided into two groups. The first three categories represent knowledge assumed to be generalizable and used to inform, enlighten, or increase understanding, not necessarily to culminate in specific action. The second three categories represent knowledge as usually context-specific and has immediate implications for practice.

The Categories

1. Descriptive Inquiry: In this category, information about a particular topic is sorted or arranged into meaningful categories for visual comparisons. Prediction, hypothesis generation,
theory development and policy implications are either not included or receive only cursory attention.

2. Theory Development: Articles that aim to establish causal relationships among sets of variables are placed in this category. Through refinement and extensions of extent theory, second generation theory is created. Models are estimated and tested using empirical evidence. The distinction between this type of inquiry and others is the intended generalizability of results and the prediction of behavior across a wide range of settings.

3. Concept Integration: This category contains papers that produce new knowledge about college students through analysis and integration of existing ideas. Data are usually collected from multiple sources, such as literature reviews and case surveys, and are analyzed through sifting, classifying, and differentiating pertinent variables.

4. Policy Formulation: This category includes articles that describe how policies related to student behavior in institutions of higher education are created, the manner in which policy is enacted by institutional agents, or how policies related to student life can be modified and improved.

5. Decision-making: This category includes articles that provide information used to assist institutional agents in evaluating curriculum and student life programs and personnel. These papers often report summative evaluation strategies, program reviews, and personnel and program evaluations.
6. Developmental: This category includes papers that provide detailed descriptions of innovations in areas such as curriculum, residential living environments, and faculty mentoring to enhance the quality of student life. Developmental inquiries typically include field testing. They may also mention strategies such as formative evaluation by institutional agents to solve particular institutional problems.

Since articles could encompass elements of several categories, the following coding system was devised:

a. primary thrust - elements of this category dominate and match purpose of paper

b. secondary thrust - the paper reflects elements of a category which are complementary but secondary to elements/characteristics of another category

c. uncertain.

In another study, Kuh, Bean, Bradley, and Coomes (1985) investigated the student affairs literature in order 1) to determine if topics addressed in, and methods used to produce the college student research papers published in student affairs journals between 1969 and 1983 differed from those which appeared in other high circulation education periodicals; 2) to determine if the topics addressed in, and the methods used to produce the college student research papers published in four student affairs journals between 1969 and 1983 differed; and 3) to determine if changes have occurred during this period in the college student topics selected and research methods used for articles published in those journals. The case survey methodology was used to codify information from existing
documents such as the journal articles. The data sources were articles from the 
Journal of College Student Personnel, National Association of Student Personnel 
Administrators Journal, National Association for Women Deans, Administrators 
and Counselors Journal, Journal of Counseling and Development, American 
Educational Psychology, Journal of Higher Education, Research in Higher Educa-
tion, Review of Higher Education and Sociology of Education.

Data about articles were compiled through the use of the College Student 
Research Case Study Questionnaire that was designed by the authors. The first 
section of the questionnaire elicited information such as publication date, name of 
the journal, volume number. In the second section, primary and secondary topics 
addressed were classified into one of five categories structured by authors based 
on their expertise with the college student literature. Sample characteristics, 
kinds of data collection methods employed, sources of data used in each article, 
the design and analytical techniques employed in the study were identified in 
section three. In section four, the type of article was identified using a 
knowledge typology developed specifically for the student affairs literature. All 
articles in all issues of the periodicals from every other volume year 1969 to 1983 
were reviewed.

In order to answer the questions posed in this study, the following hypo-
theses were tested.

Hypothesis #1: Compared with non-student affairs journals, student affairs 
journals will publish more descriptive and developmental papers than theory 
development or conceptual integration papers.
Hypothesis #2: Compared with the published papers in student affairs journals, the papers appearing in the other journals will use more sophisticated methods and analytical techniques.

Hypothesis #3: Over the past three decades, student affairs staff have used two dominant philosophical perspectives to guide their work, in loco parentis and student development. It is expected that these philosophical guideposts will influence the substantive topics addressed in the student affairs journals compared with non-student affairs journals, and that student affairs journal will publish more articles on topics such as discipline.

Hypothesis #4: If student affairs as a field of professional practice is in its adolescence, the profession may not have as rich a theory base as some fields. Therefore, use of theory should be a distinguishing characteristic of the articles published in the two groups of journals.

Hypothesis #5: More sophisticated research methods are expected to characterize papers published in the JCSP compared with other student affairs periodicals.

According to the researchers, the hypotheses received varying degrees of support. For hypothesis #1, developmental papers were characteristic of the student affairs journal group and theory development and conceptual integration papers were typical of the other journals after 1975. However, descriptive papers did not differentiate between the journal groups. Results from testing hypothesis
#2 indicated that more sophisticated methods would characterize the college student research published in other journals, and that use of data reduction methods and other statistics was more typical of papers in other periodicals. Methods used in the college student research published in these four journals after 1975 did not become more rigorous or sophisticated over the years covered by this study as anecdotal information was found to be more typical of student affairs journals and experimental methods more characteristic of papers in other journals. Hypothesis #3 was supported according to the investigators in that it was substantiated that *in loco parentis* and student development perspectives would influence the substantive topics of student affairs journal articles. Partial support was found for hypothesis #4. It was partially substantiated that non-student affairs journals publish more theory-based papers. After 1975 papers in the other journals were more likely to be grounded in theory, while articles in student affairs journals reflected a praxiological orientation (Parker, 1971) suggesting that many of those papers were written with the interests of practitioners in mind. In addressing hypothesis #5, it was stated that papers published in the *JCS* would use more sophisticated methods of analytical techniques. It was partially supported. While the *JCS* did publish more papers using data reduction and other statistics than the other three student affairs journals, there is not evidence that the use of these methods had increased during the fifteen year period.

**Editors**

That editors of journals greatly influence the knowledge production and dissemination process has been well documented (Spender, 1981; Silverman, 1976;
Barclay and Remer, 1978; Altbach, 1976). Silverman (1974) comments, "Editors of journals (in education) do not simply mirror the development of a field; they in fact create it by commissioning and selecting the messages that force readers into their implicit patterns. Not only do they select manuscripts, they decide criteria and appoint reviewers who referee manuscripts." Several scholars and researchers have given attention to this phenomenon. Exum and Menges (1983) and Spender (1981) address the issue of homogeneity involved. The majority of editors, in control of the communication networks in which decisions are made, are typically homogenous in terms of race - caucasian; class - middle to upper; gender - male; and research methodological orientation - quantitative. These researchers surmise that not only are editors characterized by this homogeneity but that typical contributors to their journals express a white, male, middle class, quantitative perspective.

Regarding editors' influence, Silverman notes that editors are very instrumental in determining what is published in that they accept and/or reject manuscripts based on peer review systems, promote certain themes, and invite papers with specific orientations. It has been reported that historically, editors have used their media to influence educational perspective and direction by publishing articles on designated topics, by rewording of those who were published, and in the manner and choice of editorial advice offered to unsuccessful authors. Overall, Silverman suggests that editors influence subtly through covert roles and that through implicit interests and explicit policies models are created by journal editors which hold as the standard (1974).

Gatekeepers are "the people who set the standards, produce the social knowledge, monitor what is admitted to the system of distribution, and decree the innovations in thought, or knowledge, or values (Smith, 1978).
In academic communities, persons functioning in these roles are usually editors of journals, referees or reviewers or advisors to publishers. Dale Spender (1981) makes the argument that such functionaries control and are instrumental in determining what does and does not get published. By so doing they shape the field which, she believes, is just cause for concern, for others who attempt to produce publishable material in a way that "challenges mainstream orthodoxies."

Spender (1981) states, "For gatekeepers (editors) are in a position to perpetuate their own schemata by exercising sponsorship and patronage towards those who classify the world in ways similar to their own."

In an examination of editors' relationships, Silverman uses excerpts from researchers David Berger and Richard Peterson. These scholars studied another communication medium, the record industry—specifically, the roles of recording industry producers whose functions are much like that of journal editors. The study indicated that producers stand and mediate between the known and the new in the selection of performing groups and tunes to be used.

Success in the recording industry is judged by how well the selection process is carried out. The music must be attention getting and familiar enough to catch the audience's ear but distinctive and different enough to be perceived as new. Editors are seen as functioning in a similar manner with manuscripts—based on their perceptions of what their audiences will read and will continue to purchase (p. 482). The following quotes by journal editors aid in supporting this notion:

I would like to have (the journal) on the growing edge. In other words, the needed changes are kind of obvious and I would like to have the journal just far enough ahead to stimulate people to move ahead but not so far ahead that people cannot identify with it. I would like to have the journal noted and quoted (p. 482).
... to list the journal as a forum for provocative ideas or critiques of current practices, for presenting research that seems to push a field forward or to cause an alternative way of looking at some mode of instruction, and the key word is to be "fresh" and at the front of where we are ... We seek to present new ideas in areas that our advisory committee can surely tell us; whether or not this is a viable trend (p. 482).

Based on this scholarly "examination of editors' roles (Silverman, 1974) several points need to be recognized. First, it seems that editors regard themselves as the voice of the members. Secondly, editors, in order to maintain publishing stability, must mediate among a variety of elements—publishers' interests, new and old printing technologies, subscribers' demands, the direction of the field and the editors' own standards and commitment to publishing quality manuscripts.

On future notions, Silverman (1984) noted the following.

a. The formulation, as well as the act of describing the image of the future, may influence the future itself.

b. Editors voice the most conventional of forward looking thought ... they appear to be seduced by their own rhetoric which they publish with its implicit dynamic of the inevitability of continuation of progress.

c. Incremental thinking based on editorial response is an inherent part of editors' roles caused by "shepherding" readers; competition for power and shaping that is the result of effects of technology on the printing process.

d. Editors assume that if accurate information is available then successful decisions will be made.
e. Editors assume that institutions of higher learning can be influenced by journals.

f. Editors imply that ... because a particular innovation or method was successfully adopted in one system, correct decisions were made, and hence these can be used to ascertain the success or failure of similar methods or innovations in the same system at different times or even in other systems; ... there are certain specific individuals in the system that would, if altered, make the system more viable; ... that the setting of specific and determinate goals or criteria for information and knowledge utilization is not only a virtue, but that it is possible to establish such criteria for others besides oneself.

In summarizing Silverman's posture on editors' future notions, the implications are 1) that an allowance for the creation of future professional options is made by gatekeepers who impact their colleagues and the field via the publishing processes; and 2) that due to the fact that supportive systems can be destructive or constructive forces in actualizing potential, one should strive to understand the context and the larger meaning of these systems.

Remer and Barclay's (1978) study of journal editors supported the conjecture that journal content influences practice in the field, and it is in this light that they see editors as having a tremendous amount of control and power. Editors are powerful in that they can legitimate an author and/or a topic. Lockheed and Stein (1980) contend that published research serves two purposes: the dissemination of knowledge about a topic and the legitimization of an author's productivity record. Articles published in what are considered prestigious, widely read association journals, such as the ones used in this study, are indicative of a research topic's
status. In addition, the scientific status of the researcher is measured by the quantity of articles one has published in such journals.

Citing the observation that editors wield a tremendous amount of control and power, as one of the bases for his investigation, Gladdings (1982) became interested in answering the question, "Who becomes a journal editor?" The purpose of his study was fourfold to answer the following questions.

1. What are the similarities that APGA members who become editors have in common?
2. How would editors describe the job?
3. What advice would APGA editors offer to those who aspired to be editors?
4. Did former editors feel that being an editor affected this APGA involvement?

Gladding selected forty current and previous editors of APGA journals. He designed and used a twenty-eight question survey asking about personal backgrounds of editors, professional background of editors (i.e., number of years on executive board), number of publications, experience of being an editor (i.e., positive and negative association with position), what advice editors would give an aspiring editor-to-be. Two mailings were sent three weeks apart. Only raw data, percentages, rank, mean scores and standard deviations were reported due to the nature of the questionnaire used.

The results were 1) all editors were committed to the profession (counseling and guidance); 2) all editors have advanced degrees; 3) all have an outstanding history of publication in both APGA and non-APGA journals; 4) all have spent and continue to spend a great deal of time in working on the publication of their
journals and on professional improvement; 5) editors enjoy different aspects of their jobs; and 6) they are a high achievement oriented group.

In a 1976 study, Silverman surveyed 248 editors to ascertain the patterns of knowledge production and utilization in education journals. The essence of this article argues that "educational journals are typically producer planned, not consumer stimulated" due to the fact that "editors shape their readers and the field by selecting among methodologies, with implicit assumptions, and among data sources, legitimizing and excluding professional focal areas (Silverman, 1976).

In an unpublished paper (1984) titled "Scholarly Journals and Knowledge Policy" Silverman argues that persons usually 1) define goals and establish means of accomplishing them in a manner that allows them to redefine/reshape the environment which is a way of controlling all crucial elements; 2) maximize winning and minimize losing through the owning and controlling of tasks; and 3) tend to prohibit the manifestation of negative feelings as a way of protecting selves, which are reasons offered to explain the way in which editors influence and control knowledge production processes. This type of behavior on the part of editors may result in decreased effectiveness in that they result in defensive norms, non-trusting relationships and limiting examinations that would question and challenge the existing system—its norms, goal assumptions and principle of operation. The world that editors "create, control, select" and manipulate is much like this. They select the topics, the editorial board members, the referees, they decide how the selection process will be done, on what criteria the decisions to accept/reject will be based. More to the point, Silverman states:
We sanitize the emotional reactions, as we transmit to authors the reasons for rejection, to protect the author and to provide the appearance of referee rationality.

We do not 'reject' but 'fail to accept' to soften the blow suggesting to authors that failure is theirs, not the journals.

Holding up our criteria and procedures as catechism there is infrequently, if ever, an opportunity to examine genuinely how we do what we do. In this way we are 'self sealing systems.' It is frightening to consider how such a system impacts on the kind of knowledge it labels legitimate (Machlup, 1962).

This study differs in several respects. It describes the trends in communication content and traces the development of scholarship in the three major journals from 1963 to 1982. It is a study of an entire population and not just a study of a sample from the population. Each year is examined from the editors' perspectives—what trends were evident per editorial term? In addition, data were compiled on each individual contributor to the journals to determine the contributors' profile. It is hoped that this study will contribute to the growing body of student personnel literature.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study employed content analysis as the research methodology to guide the data collection procedure. Content analysis is a method of collecting data through carefully specifying and counting social artifacts such as books, songs, speeches, paintings, etc. (Babbie, 1979). It is a technique for the classification of sign vehicles which relies solely upon the judgements of an analyst or a group of analysts. The results of a content analysis state the frequency of occurrence of signs or groups of signs for each category in a classification scheme (Janis, 1943) and allow researchers to make replicable and valid inferences from data to their context (Krippendorf, 1980). According to Krippendorf (1980) this research technique is a tool to be utilized in providing "knowledge, new insights, a representation of 'facts,' and a practical guide to action by processing scientific data."

It is an appropriate methodology for this study and was used to describe trends in communication content and to trace the development of scholarship in the three major student personnel work journals. It has a number of advantages. First, it is an unobtrusive technique. This study does not require reactive techniques (experiments, interviews, questionnaires, etc.) but requires information retrieval and information recording. Second, it is context sensitive. In order to define the meaning of the data collected, it will be important to understand
contextual constraints—for the meaning of words or phrases may be different now than the meaning at the time the data (journals) were initially created. Third, it accepts unstructured materials. Content analysis allows one to look at multiple items and a conglomeration of data and organize it in such a fashion as to infer trends, patterns or direction. Content analysis is a technique which is utilized in the process of creating and establishing meaning. This study is an attempt to make meaning of what and who has been published in the three major student personnel work journals. Fourth, it is capable of handling large volumes of data. This study examines all articles published in three journals from 1963 to 1982. Eight variables will be recorded per article and a tabulation of each variable will be made per editor's term.

The questions that this study will examine per editorial term are:

1. What was the gender of the majority of the contributors to the journals?
2. What roles (type of employment) did contributors to the journals hold at the time of publication?
3. What institutions produced the largest number of contributors (institutions' names, Carnegie Commission types, institutional locations)?
4. What portion of the articles focused on the individual, the group, the organization, the system?
5. What were the themes and/or topical areas that have been explicitly treated in the articles?

Data Source

The data were all articles in all issues of the JCSP, the NAWDAC, and the NASPA from 1963 to 1982. Since the NASPA did not exist until 1963, an
examination of all journals from 1963 to 1982 seemed to be a more appropriate period over which to do the analysis. These journals were selected because they are the major journals published in the field of student personnel work.

Two thousand five hundred thirty-four articles were included. All entries were counted as articles except reports, book reviews and editorials. All volumes from 1963 to 1982 of all three journals were examined to determine the editor of each issue, gender of contributor(s), names of institutions at which contributor(s) were employed at the time of publication of the article, role of contributor(s) at the time of publication of the article, focus of each article—group, individual, organization or system, and the student personnel work topical area of each article.

**Procedure**

Data collection cards were prepared.

Figure 1

**Data Collection Card**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOURNAL:</th>
<th>Article:</th>
<th>AUTHOR:</th>
<th>GENDER:</th>
<th>ROLE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION:</th>
<th>FOCUS:</th>
<th>AREA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One card was used to collect data from each article. Each article was
examined for the following.

1. **JOURNAL TITLE** - name was recorded from the front cover of
publication.

2. **VOLUME NUMBER, ISSUE** - the numbers were recorded from the
content page of each issue.

3. **DATE** - the month and year of publication were recorded from the
content page.

4. **TITLE** - the heading above the body of the article was recorded.

5. **EDITOR** - the name of the editor was recorded from the cover page.

6. **GENDER** - the gender of each contributor was classified as "male," "female," or "other" based on the name. If the gender was unclear
then contributor was categorized in "other" category.

7. **CONTRIBUTOR'S TITLE** - title was copied from the article. There
were seven categories into which the types of roles were classified:
Administration, Counseling, Teaching, Research, Student, Government,
and Other for titles that were unlisted. In instances when one
contributor had two or more titles listed, only the first title was used.

8. **FOCUS** - articles were classified in four areas under this section. The
four areas were individual, group, organization and system. If the
article discussed one person as the subject, classification was Indivi­
dual. If the article discussed two or more persons as the subject,
classification was Group. If the article discussed building(s), institu­
tion(s), agency (agencies), classification was under Organization. If
the article discussed a way of doing something, an idea, a philosophy, a
process, classification was under System.
9. STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK AREA -

AREA I - If article focused on the role behavior of principals, superintendents, departmental chairs, directors, deans, presidents, classification was under Area I.

AREA II - If article focused on the role behavior of guidance counselors, continuing education advisors, counselor educators, vocational placement counselors, pre-college and academic advising classification was under Area II.

AREA III - If article focused on the role behavior of persons working in residence life, Greek life, admissions, student activities, government, orientation, women's centers, and intramurals/intercollegiate athletics, classification was under Area III.

AREA IV - If article focused on the role behavior of persons who are fulltime faculty and teachers at all levels, classification was under Area IV.

AREA V - If article focused on the role behavior of persons involved in profit sector, agencies, or implementation of governmental programs (Affirmative Action, EEOC, Job Corps, Title IX, etc.) classification was under Area V.

AREA VI - If article focused on continuing education, returning older students, etc., classification was under Area VI. (This classification schema was developed by the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1982).

10. SUBJECT - Articles were classified into eighteen student personnel subject areas. This classification schema was published in the index of Volume 15 of the JCSP. It has been used previously as a classification guide in research of this nature (Tryon, 1980). The subject areas are as follows: Counseling, Student Characteristics, Professional Problems, Housing, Academic Achievement, Administration, College Climate, Student Conduct, Vocational Choice, Academic Advising, Admissions and Retention, Educational Skills, Financial Aids, Orientation, Student Activities, Fraternities and Sororities, Foreign Students, and Placement.

11. INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION - Name of college, university or agency was recorded from article byline. The Carnegie Commission
Classification system was then used to classify each institution. This system, listed below is composed of five major categories which are subdivided into eighteen areas. They are as follows.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTRIBUTORS - CARNEGIE TYPES

1. Doctoral-Granting Institutions
   1.1 Research Universities I. The fifty leading universities in terms of federal financial support of academic science in at least two of three academic years, 1968-1969, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971, provided they awarded at least five Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s, if a medical school was on the same campus) in 1969-1970, provided they met these criteria. Rockefeller University was included because of the high quality of its research and doctoral training, although it did not meet these criteria.

   1.2 Research Universities II. These universities were on the list of one hundred leading institutions in terms of federal financial support in at least two out of the above three years and awarded at least sixty Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if a medical school was on the same campus) in 1969-1970, or they were among the leading fifty institutions in terms of the total number of Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus) awarded during the years quite meet these criteria, but that have graduate programs of high quality and with impressive promise for future development, have been included in 1.2.

   1.3 Doctoral-Granting Universities I. These institutions awarded 40 or more Ph.D.'s in 1969-1970 (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus) or received at least $3 million in total federal financial support in either 1969-1970 or 1970-1971. No institution is included that granted fewer than twenty Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus), regardless of the amount of federal financial support it received.
1.4 Doctoral-Granting Universities II. These institutions awarded at least ten Ph.D.'s in 1969-1970, with the exception of a few new doctoral-granting institutions that may be expected to increase the number of Ph.D.'s awarded within a few years.

2. Comprehensive University and Colleges I

2.1 Comprehensive University and Colleges I. This group included institutions that offered a liberal arts program as well as several other programs, such as engineering and business administration. Many of them offered master's degrees, but all lacked a doctoral program or had an extremely limited doctoral program. All institutions in this group had at least two professional or occupational programs and enrolled at least two thousand students in 1970. If an institution's enrollment was smaller than this, it was not considered comprehensive.

2.2 Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II. This list includes state colleges and some private colleges that offered a liberal arts program and at least one professional or occupational program such as teacher training or nursing. Many of the institutions in this group are former teachers colleges that have recently broadened their programs to include a liberal arts curriculum. Private institutions with fewer than fifteen hundred students and public institutions with fewer than a thousand students in 1970 are not included even though they may offer a selection of programs, because they were not regarded as comprehensive with such small enrollment differentiation between private and public institutions was made because the public state colleges are experiencing relatively rapid increases in enrollment and are likely to have at least one thousand
five hundred and one students within a few years even if they did not in 1970. Most of the state colleges with relatively few students were established quite recently.

3. Liberal Arts Colleges

3.1 Liberal Arts Colleges I. These colleges scored five or above on Astin's selectivity index or they were included among the two hundred leading baccalaureate-granting institutions in terms of numbers of their graduates receiving Ph.D.'s at forty leading doctoral-granting institutions from 1920 to 1966 (National Academy of Sciences, Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities, 1958-1966, 1967, Appendix B). College is not clear-cut. Some of the institutions in this group have modest occupational programs but a strong liberal arts tradition. A good example is Oberlin, which awarded ninety-one Mus.B. degrees out of a total of five hundred sixty-four bachelor's degrees in 19676, as well as thirty-one M.A.T. degrees out of a total of forty-one master's degrees. Its enrollment in 1970 was 2,670. Or, consider two Pennsylvania institutions, Lafayette and Swarthmore. Lafayette awarded 113 B.S. degrees in engineering in 1967 and had a 1970 enrollment of 1,164. Swarthmore has a strong liberal arts tradition and did not meet our minimum enrollment criterion for a private college to be classified as a Comprehensive College II, but our decisions in the cases of Oberlin and Lafayette had to be at least partly judgmental.

3.2 Liberal Arts Colleges II. These institutions include all the liberal arts colleges that did not meet our criteria for inclusion in the first group of liberal arts colleges. Again, the distinction between "liberal arts" and "comprehensive" is not clear-cut for
some of the larger colleges in this group and is necessarily partly a matter of judgment. In teacher training, but future teachers tend to receive their degrees in arts and sciences fields, rather than in education.

4. Two-Year Colleges and Institutes

5. Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions

5.1 Theological seminaries, bible colleges, and other institutions offering degrees in religion (not including colleges with religious affiliations offering a liberal arts program as well as degrees in religion).

5.2 Medical schools and medical center. As indicated in our previous discussion, this category includes only those that are listed as separate campuses in Opening Fall Enrollment. In some instances, the medical center includes other health professional schools; for example, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing, etc.

5.3 Other separate health professional schools

5.4 Schools of engineering and technology. Technical institutes are included only if they award a bachelor's degree and if their program is limited exclusively or almost exclusively to technical fields of study.

5.5 Schools of business and management. Business schools are included only if they award a bachelor's degree or higher and if their program is limited exclusively or almost exclusively to a business curriculum.

5.6 Schools of art, music, and design.

5.7 Schools of law

5.8 Teachers colleges

5.9 Other specialized institutions. Includes graduate centers, maritime academies, military institutions (lacking a liberal arts program), and miscellaneous.
6. Non-Traditional Institutions of Study
7. Unlisted (added by researcher)

Data were tabulated by variable per issue of each journal. Summations of data were made for each journal per year and per editors' terms for the twenty year period. Only major articles listed in the content page were included in the data collection process. No conference speeches, reports, editorials, book critiques, reviews and miscellaneous items were included. All volumes of the journal were available. Data collection, tabulation and summation processes were performed during 1981-1983.

Upon completion of this portion of the research, the researcher selected a professor of education, a doctoral candidate and a layperson as reviewers of articles for the reliability check. The investigator met individually with each person and explained the process of collecting the data on the cards. Each person reviewed thirty common articles. Every eightieth article was selected for review. Interrater agreement was estimated by calculating the proportion of items on which the reviewers agreed (P = number of identical ratings/total number of ratings). P was computed for the thirty common articles. This is the only meaningful statistic to measure interrater agreement when utilizing multiple raters with nominal data (Kuh, Bean, Bradley, Coomes and Hunter, 1984).
Interreviewer agreement was very high between author and all reviewers; 100-98% agreement on variables such as gender, role and institution. Interreviewer agreement between the author and reviewer #1 was high (98%) on variables such as focus and theme, but low (68%) between all other raters. This was possibly due to the fact that rater #1 classified articles immediately after receiving instructions, whereas reviewers #2 and #3 allowed a one to three week time lapse between receiving instructions and reviewing the articles, or to the fact that categories 8, 9 and 10 were defined in such a fashion that the articles were not always a clear fit. Some independent decision making on the part of the reviewers was required which may account for differences in rates of agreement among the reviewers. All persons received identical instructions (verbal and written). All reviewers had access to the author for further clarification of instructions should that have been necessary.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (mean, mode, median) were used to describe trends in communication content and to identify the patterns in the development of the scholarship in the field. Additional or stronger statistical tests were not needed due to the fact that the study examined all of the journals—the entire population—and not a sample of the population.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the study that addresses the major problem, "What is the nature of the knowledge base in student personnel work as reflected by the three major journals?" Specifically, by journal and per editorial term, what were the characteristics of the contributors and what kind of information was published?

The following questions guided the study and will guide the organization of this chapter.

1. What was the gender of the majority of the contributors to the journal?
2. What roles (type of employment) did contributors hold at time of publication?
3. What were the leading institutional producers?
4. What portion of the articles focused on the individual, the group, the organization, the system?
5. What were the themes/topical areas that have been explicitly treated?

1. What was the gender of the majority of the contributors to the journal?

There were 3,800 total contributors to all three journals from 1963 to 1982. Of this number, 2,676 were male, 1,039 were female and 85 were undetermined.
Two thousand two hundred and sixty four (60%) were from the JCSP. Of this number, 1,722 (78%) were male, 446 (20%) female and 46 (2%) undetermined. Table 1 indicates that the two coed association journals, the JCSP and the NASPA, each have male contributors for approximately 80% of their articles. In the female association journal, the NAWDAC females contributed approximately 65% of the articles and males contributed approximately 35% of the articles. It would seem that the NAWDAC was attempting a more equal representation by contributors by gender than the other two journals.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Contributor</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon examining Table 2 the data on the JCSP distribution of contributions by males was consistent over the 20-year period in contrast to the distributions by females where the percentage of females increased at least by one half each time there was a change in the editorship. Since the time span under observation was the 1960-1980s this change may have resulted from influences that editors may have felt from social change taking place in the culture regarding women's rights, affirmative action in academia and other human/civil rights issues.
The NAWDAC, the only journal published by a female association and the only journal that has had all female editors has consistently had a higher percentage of female contributors. Mueller, Berry, and Gartland all had a larger percentage of female contributors but it is interesting to note that Soldwedel had a larger percentage of male contributors (51.02% male and 47.95% female) though the breakdown is very close.

In the NASPA, the distribution for male contributors remains at approximately 90% during the editorships of Siggelkow, Shaffer and Meade and then drops to an average of approximately 75% for the terms of Tilley, O'Donnell and Ebbers.

Contributions from females averaged about 9% during the terms of Siggelkow, Shaffer and Meade. There were increases in the percentage of female contributors during the terms of Tilley (from 11.18% to 15.45%), O'Donnell (from 15.45% to 23.70%), and Ebbers (from 23.70% to 26.47%). All of the editors were male except O'Donnell, in whose term there was the greatest increase (8%) in the percentage of female contributors. The largest increase in percentage of female contributors during the term of a male editor was 4%. This was during Tilley's term. This seems to suggest that much of the data were coming from a male perspective and that it does make a difference in terms of who gets published when the editors were all male, all female or a combination of male and female. When there were all male editors the majority of the contributors were male. When the editors were all female, the majority of contributors were all female. When the editorial staff had male and female editors, there appeared to be an attempt to increase the percentage of female contributions. The data seemed to support the notion that the sex of the author might influence, to an extent, the sex of the contributor.
### Table 2

Frequencies and percentages of gender of contributors to the JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA per editorial term, 1963–1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Contributor</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Callis</td>
<td>Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64 68.67</td>
<td>672 87.40</td>
<td>651 82.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10 10.31</td>
<td>60 11.11</td>
<td>131 16.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>2 2.70</td>
<td>8 1.48</td>
<td>10 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>76 540</td>
<td>765 795</td>
<td>855 685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years of Publication:**

**JCSP**
- Lewis 1963 – 1964
- Callis 1964 – 1970
- Hood 1971 – 1976
- Fitzgerald 1976 – 1982

**NAWDAC**
- Mueller 1963 – 1969
- Soldwedel 1970 – 1973
- Berry 1973 – 1980
- Gartland 1980 – 1982

**NASPA**
- Siggelkow 1963 – 1969
- Shaffer 1969 – 1972
- Meade 1972 – 1975
- Tilley 1975 – 1978
- Ebbers 1981 – 1982
It is evident from Table 3 that overall the largest number of articles had a single male authorship (41.51%); a male/male authorship (22.77%), authorship or a single female (18.58%) authorship. This is also true of the journals except for the NAWDAC, the female association journal, in which the largest number of articles were produced by single female authors (51.48%), single male authors (24.42%) and female/female authors.
Table 3

Gender patterns for first and second authors of articles written by one or more authors in the JCSP, NAWDAC and NASPA -1963 -1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Contributors</th>
<th>JCSP No.</th>
<th>JCSP %</th>
<th>NAWDAC No.</th>
<th>NAWDAC %</th>
<th>NASPA No.</th>
<th>NASPA %</th>
<th>TOTAL No.</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/Male</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>22.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Female</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>41.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>51.48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>18.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 4, 5 and 6 provide a breakdown of type of authorship by individual editors per journal. Table 4 is a representation of data from editors of the JCSP. All of the editorships reflect a dominant single male authorship except for Fitzgerald, the only female editor, who published a majority of male/male authored articles. She had the greatest number and percentage of female authored articles.

Table 5 is a representation of the distribution in the NAWDAC by editor. The majority of articles were produced by single female and single male authors during the editorship of Mueller, Soldwedel, and Berry. Gartland's term was different in that the majority of articles were produced by single female authors and female/female authors.

Table 6 is a representation of data from editors of the NASPA.

The pattern for all the editors except Siggelkow is that the majority of articles were produced by single male authorship and male/male authorships; whereas, single male and single female authorships accounted for the majority of contributions during Siggelkow's term. One other interesting observation is that there were no female/female authored contributions from 1963 to 1974 during Siggelkow's, Shaffer's and Meade's terms. The first combination showed up for the first time in 1975 (and has continued) during Tilley's editorship.
Table 4

Gender patterns for first and second authors of articles written by one or more authors in the JCSP - 1963 - 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Contributors</th>
<th>Lewis 63-64</th>
<th>Callis 64-70</th>
<th>Hood 71-76</th>
<th>Fitzgerald 77-82</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>53.23</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Gender patterns for first and second authors of articles written by one or more authors in the NAWDAC - 1963 - 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Contributors</th>
<th>Mueller 63-69</th>
<th>Soldwedel 70-73</th>
<th>Berry 73-80</th>
<th>Gartland 80-82</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35.24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>55.06</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Contributors</td>
<td>Siggelkow 63-69</td>
<td>Shaffer 69-72</td>
<td>Meade 72-75</td>
<td>Tilley 75-78</td>
<td>O'Donnell 78-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female/Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>82.88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66.94</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **What roles (type of employment) did contributors hold at time of publication?**

Table 7 and Table 8 present a summary of the data on employment roles that contributors held at the time of publication per journal and per editorial term, respectively.

Of the 3,825 roles accounted for in the journals, 1,033 (27%) persons were involved in administration, 514 (13.43%) were involved in teaching, 119 (3.11%) were students, 103 (2.69%) were counselors, 55 (1.43%) were researchers, 52 (1.35%) were involved in student services, and 1 (.02%) was employed by the government. Of this number a substantial amount (1,948 or 50.92%) were classified as undetermined. This is due to the fact that some issues of the journals did not list the contributor’s role in the article byline.

The **JGSP** was responsible for 2,266 (59.24%) of the total number of roles. Data on this journal indicates that 1,829 (80.60%) of the roles were undetermined as this is the journal that did not record the roles of its contributors in several issues. Two hundred twenty (9.69%) of the contributors were involved in administration, 148 (6.52%) in teaching, 29 (1.27%) in counseling, 16 (.70%) were students, 14 (.61%) in research and 10 (.44%) in student services.

The **NAWDAC** was responsible for 790 (20.65%) of the total number of contributors' roles. Of this 790, 331 (41.89%) of the contributors were administrators, 232 (29.36%) were teachers, 74 (9.36%) were students, 58 (7.34%) were undetermined, 53 (6.70%) were counselors, 25 (3.16%) were researchers, 16 (2.02%) were in student services, and 1 (.12%) was employed with the government.

Of the total number of contributors' roles, the **NASPA** was responsible for 769 (20.10%). Of this number, 482 (62.67%) were administrators, 134 (17.42%) were teachers, 61 (7.93%) were undetermined, 29 (3.77%) were students, 26
(3.38%) were involved in student services, 21 (2.73%) were counselors and 16 (2.08%) were researchers.

The data in Table 8 indicates that the majority of editors in the NAWDAC (except for Gartland), the JCSP and the NASPA had a majority of contributors in roles of administration and teaching, respectively. Whereas the editor Gartland had the majority of contributors in roles of teaching and administration, respectively, just the reverse of the overall pattern.

Student personnel work is an applied field, which from observation of the past, has been in a practice to theory to practice mode, though the field has been attempting more recently to operate from a theory to practice perspective. Data from the tables indicate that across the journals, fourteen of the sixteen editorships had persons holding administrative positions producing the greatest number of articles. Much of the published material is an attempt by practitioners to question practices, to report what does and does not work and to explore philosophical approaches to issues in the field. There were also attempts to legitimize practice by substantiating it with the use and development of theory with an empirical base. It is viable that persons responsible for setting policy and determining the basis for principles of operation would be involved in the knowledge, creation, production and dissemination processes in the field.

On reviewing the stated purposes of the journals listed below, it seems appropriate that the majority of knowledge production and dissemination in the journals was done by administrators—practitioners—in the field.

According to early issues of the JCSP (JCSP 6, 3; JCSP 1, 27) the purpose of this journal was to illustrate broad professional concerns of both the journal and the association and to serve as a vehicle to enable the membership to maintain close contact.
Early issues of the NAWDAC (NAWD 10, 2; NAWD 10, 98) state that this journal's purposes were to serve as a communication linkage; to make contributions to the knowledge of the field; to address issues of concern to the constituency; and to include articles written by authorities who supply background and new points of view for our field; concrete practical descriptions written by 'deans at work' or members of their staff—and research—or a useful summary of data obtained from the field.

The youngest journal, the NASPA, had its purpose summarized by Mikell O'Donnell, one of its more recent (1978-1981) editors who states that the "journal is to produce articles of timely interest, book reviews and communications to the membership. The NASPA is not primarily a research journal in the specialized sense, although articles based on research and written for the generalist are welcome. For our Journal, research articles should stress the underlying issues or problems that stimulated the research, treat the methodology concisely and offer a full discussion of the results, implications and conclusions. Articles should be written for the student affairs generalist who has broad responsibilities for educational leadership, policy, staff development and management" (NASPA 19, 3).

The journals were created as communication networks or linkages so that the memberships could share information. They were a means by which practitioners and theorists could share, exchange and solicit ideas.

In addition to the statements of purposes influencing who was published in the journals, it seems that the roles of the editors might also have been influential factors. The majority of contributors in the journals were in administration or teaching. The majority of editors were administrators and professors, in that order.
Lewis - Vice President of Student Affairs
Callis - Professor
Hood - Professor
Fitzgerald - Dean of Graduate School, University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh

**NAWDAC**

Mueller - Professor, Indiana University
Soldwedel - Deputy Director, Women's Job Corps Centers, U. S. Department of Labor
Berry - Director of Developmental Programs, University of Texas - Austin, 1973 - 1976
- Director of University Writings, Collections and Assistant Director of Historical Projects, University of Texas
Gartland - Assistant Vice President, The American College Testing Program

**NASPA**

Siggelkow - Dean of Students, SUNY - Buffalo
- Vice President for Student Affairs, SUNY - Buffalo
Shaffer - Professor, Indiana University
Meade - Dean of Students, Wichita State University, Kansas
- Dean of Students, Ottawa University, Kansas
Tilley - Research Associate, SUNY - Stony Brook
- Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, University of California, Santa Cruz
Table 7

Frequencies and percentages of contributor's role in JCSP, NASPA, and NAWDAC -1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Contributor</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%J</td>
<td>%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>80.60</td>
<td>47.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>2,266</td>
<td>59.24</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%J = % of Journal Total
%T = % of Total
%C = % of Category Total
### Table 8

**Frequencies and percentages of contributor's role in the JCSP, NASPA, and NAWDAC – 1963–1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Contributor</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% T</td>
<td>% J</td>
<td>% T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>113.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>115.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>199.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% J = percent of Journal total  
% T = percent of Total

**Years of Publication:**

- **JCSP**
  - Lewis: 1963–1964
  - Callis: 1964–1970

- **NAWDAC**
  - Berry: 1973–1980

- **NASPA**
  - Siggelkow: 1963–1969
  - Shaffer: 1969–1972
  - Meade: 1972–1975
3. **What were the leading institutional producers?**

This question was approached by looking at 1) institutions' names to determine the majority of institutional contributors; 2) Carnegie Commission classifications to determine the types of institutions producing the majority of publications; and 3) geographic regions to determine the location of institutions producing the majority of publications.

**Institutional Producers**

Table 9 provides a listing by name of the twenty institutions producing the majority of articles in the three journals (combined) over the twenty year period. The top six institutions, University of Minnesota (12.27%), Indiana University (11.48%), University of Maryland (10.69%), University of Illinois (7.52%), University of Missouri (6.13%) and Michigan State University (5.34%), comprise a little more (53.43%) than 50% of the total and the majority of these institutions are located in the midwest.

Tables 10, 11 and 12 reflect the same data for the top ten institutional producers for the **JCSP, NAWDAC** and **NASPA**, respectively.

The top six institutional producers in the **JCSP**, the University of Minnesota, University of Maryland, University of Missouri, Colorado State University, University of Nebraska and Kansas State University, account for 69% of articles published. Four of the six are located in the midwest, one in the east and one in the west.

In Table 11 the data shows that the following six institutions were responsible for 75% of the articles produced in the **NAWDAC** for this time period: Indiana University, University of Illinois, University of Maryland, University of
Wisconsin, Purdue University and Michigan State University. Five of the six are
located in the midwest and one in the east.

In Table 12 the five institutions producing the majority of articles were
Indiana University, University of Illinois, Iowa State University, University of
California – Berkeley, and Oregon State University. They account for 62.16% of
the NASPA total. Three institutions were located in the midwest and two in the
west.
Table 9

Top 20 leading institutional producers of articles in the JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA -1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>JCSP No.</th>
<th>NAWDAC No.</th>
<th>NASPA No.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Calif. - Berkeley</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 291   | 121   | 93    | 505   |
### Table 10

**Top 10 leading institutional producers of articles in the JCSP - 1963-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Lewis 63-64</th>
<th>Callis 64-70</th>
<th>Hood 71-76</th>
<th>Fitzgerald 77-82</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>293</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Leading institutional producers of articles in the **NAWDAC - 1963-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Mueller 63-69</th>
<th>Soldwedel 70-73</th>
<th>Berry 73-80</th>
<th>Gartland 80-82</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Leading institutional producers of articles in the NASPA - 1962-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>Siggelkow</th>
<th>Shaffer</th>
<th>EDITOR</th>
<th>Tilley</th>
<th>O'Donnell</th>
<th>Ebers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63-69 No.</td>
<td>69-72 No.</td>
<td>72-75 No.</td>
<td>75-78 No.</td>
<td>78-81 No.</td>
<td>81-82 No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Calif.-Berkeley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State College LA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of New York</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1962-1983
A listing of the institutions where editors were located during their editorships compared to the location of the institutions producing the majority of articles does not indicate a definite relationship between the two although six of the editors' institutional locations appear in the table (9) of twenty leading institutional producers of articles; what does seem significant is that the majority of editors' institutions were located in the midwest as were the majority of the leading institutional producers. Most of the institutions which have student personnel work programs, which are concerned with the practice of student personnel work as a profession, are also located in the midwest. It might have been more helpful to look at the location of the editors' graduate institutions and/or the location of their mentors' institutions in an attempt to establish a rationale to explain the meaning of the data.
Institutional Types

To classify the overall institutional types, the name of the college, university or agency was recorded from the article byline. The Carnegie Commission Classification system was then used to classify each institution. This system, as stated earlier, is composed of six major categories--Doctoral Granting, Comprehensive, Liberal Arts, Two-Year Professional/Specialized and non-traditional institutions--which are sub-divided into eighteen areas.

There were 3,815 (see Appendix B) total contributors. Of this number, the distribution per type was Research Universities I - 1,211, Research Universities II - 702, Doctoral-Granting Universities I - 407, Doctoral-Granting Universities II - 197, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I - 464, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II - 60, Liberal Arts Colleges I - 83, Liberal Arts Colleges II - 71, Two-Year Colleges and Institutes - 137, Theological Seminaries - 2, Medical Schools - 5, Schools of Engineering and Technology - 3, Schools of Business Management - 2, other specializing institutions - 3, unlisted - 218, and other -250.

According to Table 13, the majority (78%) of contributors were from Research Universities I - 1,211 (31.74%), Research Universities II - 702 (18.40%), Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I - 464 (12.16%), Doctoral-Granting Universities I - 407 (10.66%) and Doctoral-Granting Universities II - 197 (5.16%). This is represented in Table 13 (code for types on pages 43-47). The institutional types that account for the majority of the total contributors are Research Universities I, Research Universities II and Doctoral-Granting Universities I.

In the JCSP, Research Universities I (34.31%), Research Universities II (19.03%), Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I (11.08), and Doctoral-Granting Universities II (6.22%) account for 70% of contributors to the journal.
Callis' and Hood's distributions follow the same pattern as the journal; however, Lewis' distribution differs in that Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I is the second largest category and Research Universities II are the third. Fitzgerald's distribution differs in that Doctoral-Granting I is her third largest area and Comprehensive I is the fourth (see Table 14).

Table 13 indicates that in the NAWDAC, Research Universities I (34.98%), Research Universities II (12.97%), Comprehensive Colleges and Universities I (12.34%), and Doctoral-Granting Universities I (10.30%), account for 70% of the contributors to this journal.

R-I/R-II/C-I/DG-I is the pattern of the majority of contributors for institutional types in this journal.

Though none of the editorial distributions replicate this pattern entirely, all are composed of the same categories. Mueller (R-I/R-II/C-I/DG-I) and Gartland (R-I/R-II, C-I/DG-II/DG-I) come closest to replicating the overall journal pattern but differ with each other as well as the overall pattern on the four largest categories. Berry's distribution pattern (R-I/C-I/DG-I, R-II/DG-II) and Soldwedel's distribution (R-I/DG-I/R-II/C-I) are like the overall journal patterns and patterns of other editors in that the largest category is R-I.

Table 13 indicates that Research Universities II (22.09%), Research Universities I (20.78%), Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I (15.16%), and Doctoral-Granting Universities I (14.50%) account for 72.5% of the contributors to the NASPA.

R-II/R-I/C-I/DG-I is the distribution pattern of the four largest categories of institutional types in the NASPA.
In Table 14 data indicates that none of the individual editorial distributions follow this pattern exactly, but all are comprised of the same components. Distribution patterns during editorial terms of Shaffer (R-II/R-I, DG-I/C-I), O'Donnell (R-II/R-I/DG-I/C-I), and Ebbers (R-II/R-I/DG-I/DG-II, C-I) are similar to each other and the overall pattern of the journal on the first three categories. Siggelkow (R-I/R-II/C-I/DG-I) and Meade (R-I/R-II/C-I/DG-I) share similarities with each other on the first three items of their distribution patterns. Tilley's distribution pattern (DG-I/R-II/R-I/C-I) is the one that is comprised of all the components, but shares no similarities, in terms of order of categories with other editors' or the journal's distribution pattern.
Table 13

Frequencies and percentages of contributors' institutions by Carnegie type in the JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA - 1963 - 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%J</td>
<td>%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities I - 1.1</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities II - 1.2</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral-Granting Universities I - 1.3</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral-Granting Universities II .14</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I - 2.1</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II - 2.2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Colleges I - 3.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Colleges II - 3.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year Colleges and Institutes - 4.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminaries - 5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Schools and Medical Centers - 5.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%J</td>
<td>%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Separate Health Profession Schools - 5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Engineering and Technology - 5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Business and Management - 5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Art, Music and Design - 5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Law - 5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Colleges - 5.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Specialized Institutions - 5.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional Institutions of Study - 6.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted - 7.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - 8.0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 2,264 786 765 3,815

%J = % of Journal Total
%T = % of Total
%C = % of Category Total
Table 14

Frequencies and percentages of contributors' institutions by Carnegie type in the JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA - 1963 - 1982 according to editors' terms

| Carnegie Type | Research Universities I + II | Research Universities I - II | Doctoral-Granting Universities I | Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I - III | Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II - III | Liberal Arts Colleges I - III | Liberal Arts Colleges II - III | Two-Year Colleges and Institutes | Theological Seminaries | Medical Schools and Allied Health Professions Schools | Other Separate Health Professions Schools | School of Engineering and Technology | Schools of Business and Management | School of Art, Music and Design | Schools of Law and Judges | Teachers' Colleges | Other Specialized Institutions | Non-Traditional Institutions of Higher Education | United - States | Other | Total | % of Total |
|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| JCSP          | Lewis                       | Callis                      | Ford                            | Fitzgerald                      | Lewis                           | Mueller                          | NAWDAC                           | Siggelkow                  | Ziffelkow                      | Shaffer                          | Meade                            | tilt                            | O'Donnell                        | Ebbers                           | 114 | 500 | 735 | 835 | 212 | 96 | 220 | 196 | 117 | 155 | 156 | 110 | 135 | 18 | 3,015 |
Table 15

Carnegie Commission Classification types by editorial term in JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA - 1962-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis Callis</td>
<td>Hood Fitzgerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-I</td>
<td>R-I</td>
<td>R-I</td>
<td>R-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-I</td>
<td>R-II</td>
<td>R-II</td>
<td>R-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-II</td>
<td>C-I</td>
<td>C-I</td>
<td>DG-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG-I</td>
<td>DG-I</td>
<td>DG-I</td>
<td>DG-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mueller Soldwedel Berry Gartland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-I</td>
<td>R-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-II</td>
<td>DG-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-I</td>
<td>R-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG-I</td>
<td>C-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Siggelkow Shaffer Meade Tilley O'Donnell Ebbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-I</td>
<td>R-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-II</td>
<td>R-II/DG-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-I</td>
<td>C-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG-I</td>
<td>TY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 16 and 17 contain data on the contributing institutions representing geographic regions. Of the total number of contributors, the distribution was as follows: 734 (19.34%) of the contributors were from the East North Central region, 643 (16.94%) were from the South Atlantic region, 551 (14.51%) were from the West North Central region, 512 (13.49%) were from the Middle Atlantic region, 341 (8.98%) were from the Pacific region, 257 (6.77%) were from unlisted sources, 208 (5.48%) were from the Mountain region, 202 (5.32%) were from the West South Central region, 177 (4.66%) were from the New England region, 147 (3.87%) from
the East South Central region, and 23 (.60%) were from foreign institutions of learning. The majority (64%) of the contributors are from what is typically referred to as the midwestern states (East and West North Central) which comprise 34% of the total, the southern states (South Atlantic) which comprise 17% of the total and the east coast states (Middle Atlantic) which comprise 13% of the total.

Table 17 contains data that indicates the distribution of contributors by region per journal editor.

**JCSP**

According to Table 16, of the 3,795 contributors over the 20 year period, the **JCSP** accounted for 2,262 (60%) of this total. The distribution for this journal was as follows: 406 (18%) were from the West North Central region, 405 (18%) were from the East North Central region, 390 (17%) were from the South Atlantic region, 256 (11%) were from the Middle Atlantic region, 210 (9.28%) were from the Pacific region, 151 (7%) were from unlisted sources, 132 (6%) were from the Mountain region, 105 (5%) were from the West South Central region, 100 (4%) were from the New England region, 85 (4%) were from the East South Central region, and 22 (1%) were from foreign countries.

Table 17 indicates that editors Lewis' and Callis' terms had a majority of contributors from the East North Central region whereas editors Hood and Fitzgerald had a majority of contributors from the South Atlantic region.

**NAWDAC**

Table 16 indicates that in the **NAWDAC** the distribution was as follows: 171 (23%) were from the East North Central region, 154 (20%) were from the South
Atlantic region, 108 (14%) were from the Middle Atlantic region, 66 (9%) were from the West North Central, 54 (7%) were from the West South Central region, 53 (7%) were from the Pacific region, 43 (6%) were from unlisted sources, 39 (5%) were from the Mountain region, 35 (5%) were from the New England region, 32 (4%) were from the East South Central region, and 1 (1%) was from a foreign country. Contributors from the South Atlantic region (23%) the East North Central region (20%) and the Middle Atlantic (14%) regions account for 57% of the contributions in this journal.

Data from Table 17 indicates that of the 756 contributors to the NAWDAC during the twenty year period, 227 were from Mueller's term as editor, 98 from Soldwedel's, 355 from Berry's, and 96 from Gartland's. Mueller and Soldwedel both had a majority of contributors from the East North Central region whereas Berry and Gartland each had a majority of contributors from the South Atlantic region.

NASPA

Data from Table 16 indicates that in the NASPA, the distribution of contributors was as follows: 158 (20%) were from the East North Central region, 148 (19%) were from the Middle Atlantic region, 99 (13%) from the South Atlantic region, 79 (10%) were from the West North Central region, 78 (10%) were from the Pacific region, 63 (8%) were from unlisted sources, 43 (6%) were the West South Central region, 42 (5%) were from the New England region, 37 (5%) were from the Mountain region, and 30 (4%) were from the East South Central region. The East North Central region (20%), Middle Atlantic region (19%), South Atlantic region (13%), West North Central region (10%) and the Pacific region (10%) accounted for the majority of contributors in the NASPA.
Table 17 indicates that of the 777 total contributors to the NASPA, 157 were from Siggelkow's term, 155 from Shaffer's, 152 from Meade's, 110 from Tilley's, 135 from O'Donnell's and 68 from Ebbers'. Siggelkow and Tilley drew the largest number of contributors from the Middle Atlantic region. Shaffer and Meade had the largest representation from the East North Central region. O'Donnell and Ebbers drew the largest number of contributors from the South Atlantic region.
Table 16
Frequencies and percentages of distribution of contributors by region in the JCSP, NAWDAC and NASPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NASPA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%J</td>
<td>%T</td>
<td>%C</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%J</td>
<td>%T</td>
<td>%C</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%J</td>
<td>%T</td>
<td>%C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>56.59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>28.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>55.17</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>60.65</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>15.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>21.76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>51.98</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>21.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>63.46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>61.58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>22.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>95.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>24.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%J = % of Journal Total  
%T = % of Total  
%C = % of Category Total
Table 17

Geographic distribution of contributing authors of articles in JCSP, NAWDAC, NASPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>16.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Publication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of the editors (nine) resided in the East and West North Central regions, which reflects the results in Tables 16 and 17. It seems that editors did, to an extent, select articles from the regions in which they resided during their editorship. The largest number of articles were from the East North Central and the South Atlantic region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region of Residence</th>
<th>Highest Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callis</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldwedel</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartland</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siggelkow</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaffer</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meade</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilley</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Donnell</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebbers</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What portion of the articles focused on the individual, the group, the organization, the system?

Table 18 is a composite of the foci of all three journals. "Focus" was a term used to describe whether the subject of each article, as described in the abstract or methodology section, was an individual, a group, an organization or a system.
Overall, the foci of the majority of the articles (55%) were on groups, then systems (31%), individuals (11%) and organizations (3%), in that order. In the JCSP the majority of articles had a group focus. The NAWDAC had a majority of articles that focused on the group also, but the majority of articles (53%) in the NASPA focused on the system. The JCSP and NAWDAC articles focus primarily on the group, while the NASPA articles focused primarily on systems.

Tables 19, 20 and 21 provide a breakdown by editor per journal so that the exact distribution per editor can be determined. The editors' distributions reflect the overall composite.
Table 18

Frequencies and percentages of articles' focus in the JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA – 1963–1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>JCSP No.</th>
<th>JCSP %</th>
<th>NAWDAC No.</th>
<th>NAWDAC %</th>
<th>NASPA No.</th>
<th>NASPA %</th>
<th>TOTAL No.</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>66.14</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>31.07</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>55.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>39.37</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>52.77</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>30.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>53.35</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19

**Frequencies and percentages of focus in the JCSP - 1963-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Lewis 63-64</th>
<th>Callis 64-70</th>
<th>Hood 70-76</th>
<th>Fitzgerald 77-82</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>47.46</td>
<td>63.44</td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>68.43</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>24.19</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>33.26</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Frequencies and percentages of focus in the **NAWDAC - 1963-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Mueller 63-69</th>
<th>Soldwedel 70-73</th>
<th>Berry 73-80</th>
<th>Gartland 80-82</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49.12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.28</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Frequencies and percentages of focus in the NASPA - 1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Siggelkow 63-69</th>
<th>Shaffer 69-72</th>
<th>Meade 72-75</th>
<th>Tilley 75-78</th>
<th>O'Donnell 78-81</th>
<th>Ebbers 81-82</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>2 1.37</td>
<td>14 11.57</td>
<td>12 11.21</td>
<td>19 24.05</td>
<td>19 22.35</td>
<td>3  7.89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>28 19.18</td>
<td>33 27.27</td>
<td>26 24.30</td>
<td>37 46.84</td>
<td>35 41.18</td>
<td>20 52.63</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>31.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>12 8.22</td>
<td>9 7.44</td>
<td>2 1.87</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1  1.18</td>
<td>0  0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>104 71.23</td>
<td>65 53.72</td>
<td>67 62.62</td>
<td>23 29.11</td>
<td>30 35.29</td>
<td>15 39.47</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>52.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>146 38.70</td>
<td>121 33.47</td>
<td>107 27.68</td>
<td>79 18.99</td>
<td>85 25.19</td>
<td>38 11.56</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 18 shows that the JCSP and the NASPA journals had at least 12% of the articles that focused on the individual. The NAWDAC had less than 3% of articles which focused on the individual.

The JCSP and the NAWDAC have an average of 60% of their articles focusing on the group. The NASPA has about one half this amount.

In terms of focus on the organization, all three journals have a low percentage of articles in this category. The NAWDAC and NASPA each have approximately 4% of their articles in this category, whereas the JCSP has approximately 2% of its articles in this category.

The NASPA had over 50% of its articles that focused on the system, the NAWDAC had approximately 40% of its articles that focused on the system, and the JCSP had a little more than 15% of its articles that focused on the system. The reasons for these distribution patterns are not clear. The overall distribution pattern of the journals is group/system/individual reflects an interest from the general to the specific. Applied research utilized in fields like student personnel work typically attempts to examine the whole or the group first and then generalize about the individual.

Data from Table 19 indicates that in the JCSP there was an increase in the percentage of articles with an individual focus over the years. The number of articles focusing on the group increased significantly from Lewis' to Callis' editorship and then remained constant throughout Hood's and Fitzgerald's editorships. The percentage of articles focusing on organization and system decreased steadily across the years.

Table 20, which shows the distribution patterns of editors in the NAWDAC, indicates that this journal, over the years and across editorships, had very few
articles which focused on the individual or the organization, but a large number which focused on the groups and the system. It would appear that this journal is looking at phenomena from the perspective of the whole and then making meaning for individuals from this data. Research may have been done that embraced a general to specific orientation.

The NASPA, as reported in Table 20, and similar to data on the NAWDAC, had a low percentage of articles that focused on the individual and the organization, but a high percentage of articles that focused on the group and the system. The general to specific research orientation seems to be operational here as well.

When the data are examined across editorial terms, it shows that there was initially very little interest in the individual as reflected in articles published during Siggelkow's term. There was an increase in the publication of this type of article throughout the terms of Shaffer, Meade, Tilley and O'Donnell, but a decrease again during Ebbers' term. Articles that focused on the group averaged approximately 23% of articles published during terms of Siggelkow, Shaffer and Meade. Then there was almost a 50% increase in this type of article being published throughout the terms of Tilley, O'Donnell and Ebbers.

The number of articles with organization as the focus were sparse, beginning with Siggelkow's editorship and continued to experience a decline throughout this twenty-year period in the journal.

A high percentage (50-70%) of articles that focused on the system were published during the editorships of Siggelkow, Shaffer and Meade. There was a decrease during Tilley's term, and an increase in O'Donnell's and Ebbers' terms as editor. More background information on the editors, their philosophies, and their research orientation might be useful in examining these phenomena.
5. What were the themes and/or topical areas that have been explicitly treated in the articles?

The question was approached by examining student personnel work areas and topics covered in the articles. The student personnel work area classifications used were as follows:

STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK AREA -

AREA I - If article focused on principals, superintendents, departmental chairs, directors, deans, presidents, classification was under Area I.

AREA II - If article focused on guidance counselors, continuing education advisors, counselor educators, vocational placement counselors, pre-college and academic advising classification was under Area II.

AREA III - If article focused on persons working in residence life, Greek life, admissions, student activities, government, orientation, women's centers, and intramurals/intercollegiate athletics, classification was under Area III.

AREA IV - If article focused on persons who are fulltime faculty and teachers at all levels, classification was under Area IV.

AREA V - If article focused on persons involved in profit sector, agencies, or implementation of governmental programs (Affirmative Action, EEOC, Job Corps, Title IX, etc.) classification was under Area V.

AREA VI - If article focused on continuing education, returning older students, etc., classification was under Area VI.

Table 21 provides a graphic representation per journal of the number of articles that fell into each area and it provides a total perspective on all the journals. Overall, the largest number of articles had content that reflected Area II (58%) and the smallest number of articles were classified in Area VI.

In the journal of JCSP, 7% of the articles were classified in Area I, 64% in Area II, 19% in Area III, 7% in Area IV, 1% in Areas V and VI, and .07% were undetermined.
In the NAWDAC, 13% of the articles were classified in Area I, 68% in Area II, 9% in Areas III and IV, 1% in Area V and .2% in Area VI.

In the NASPA, 38% of the articles were classified in Area I, 36% in Area II, 21% in Area III, 3% in Area IV, 2% in Area V, and .2% in Area VI.

The majority (865 - 64%) of the articles in the JCSP and the majority (412 - 68%) of the articles in the NAWDAC are in Area II, whereas the majority (217 - 37%) of articles in the NASPA are in Area I, though Area II is a close second (205 - 36%). All three journals have the smallest number of articles classified in Area VI which is a reflection of the overall total of the journals. The majority (58%) of articles discussed principals, superintendents, departmental chairs, directors, deans, presidents and administrators. Area III, which contains students as a topic area, was the category that came in second overall with 17% of the articles classified in that area.

Tables 22, 23 and 24 show a breakdown of the distribution of articles by editors of all three journals. Nothing is significantly different per editorial term. Areas I through IV still contain the majority of the articles per editorial term.

According to Table 22, from Lewis' term to Callis' there was a significant decrease in the percentage of articles with subjects categorized in Area I. During Hood's and Fitzgerald's terms there was an increase each time, but never as high of a percentage as during Lewis' term.

Area II articles were in approximately 30% of articles published during Lewis' editorship. This percentage increased by half (to 60%) during Callis' term and remained at this level throughout all the editorships.

Articles categorized in Area III were 40% of the articles during Lewis' term but experienced 13% decrease under Callis, 9% decrease under Hood and a 3% decrease under Fitzgerald.
Articles categorized in Area IV, were about 15% of the articles published during Lewis' term. During Callis' term there was a decrease by more than half. However, increases took place during the terms of both Hood and Fitzgerald which brought the percentage of articles up to approximately 8%, half of the original amount.

Not very many articles were published during the entire twenty year period which were classified in Area V. The percentage was low (3%) during Lewis' term and the percentage followed in pattern of decline throughout the remaining editorships.

There were no articles classified in Area VI during Lewis' and Callis' terms due to the fact that there were so few or no returning students initially. There were increases in the percentage of this type of article during both Hood's and Fitzgerald's terms which were at a period in time when colleges and universities were adjusting and readjusting to the returning older student.

Table 23 shows that in the NAWDAC articles categorized in Area I experienced a fairly steady increase in percentage across editors for the twenty-year period.

Articles classified in Area II were 50-70% of articles published by all the editors over the twenty-year period. There were some decreases during Soldwedel's and Gartland's terms but never below the 55% level.

A low percentage of articles classified in Area III were published during Mueller's term. There was an increase in the publication of this during Soldwedel's term only to be followed by decreases in both Berry's and Gartland's terms which showed that less articles were published in this area in the 70s and 80s than had been published in the 60s.
Articles published in the journal and classified in Area IV averaged approximately 8% of each editor's total percentage. There were increases and decreases, but none of significance. The 8% average across editorial terms is the significant point here.

No articles classified as Area V were published during the editorships of Soldwedel and Gartland. A percentage, less than one half of a percent, of such articles were published during Mueller's term. Berry published the largest percentage (2.42%) of such articles. This category focused on persons involved in profit sector, agencies, or implementation of governmental programs (Affirmative Action, EEOC, Job Corps, Title IX, etc). It would seem that Soldwedel, who had been employed with the Job Corps as Deputy Director, and not Berry would have been the one to publish the majority of such articles.

Articles classified in Area VI were non-existent during the terms of Mueller, Soldwedel and Berry. Gartland, the editor of the 80s is the only one to publish articles about the returning older student, though this was a phenomenon of the 70s as well.

In Table 25, data indicates that NASPA editors Siggelkow, Shaffer and Meade each published an average of 46% of the articles classified in Area I during their terms as editor. During Tilley's, O'Donnell's, and Ebbers', the average percentage per editorial term decreased to 20%.

Articles classified in Area II accounted for 26% of the articles published by Siggelkow. Then there was a decrease by one half of this type of article being published during Shaffer's term. However, there was an increase by fifty percent during Meade's term, another increase by fifty percent during Tilley's term,
whereas O'Donnell's and Ebbers' contributions served to keep the journal averaging a 60% publication rate of this type of article.

Articles classified in Area III accounted for approximately twenty-six percent of the articles during Siggelkow's, Shaffer's and Meade's term. Then there was a sharp decrease to a six percent of these articles being published during Tilley's term. There was an increase in the percentage in this type of article being published during O'Donnell's and Ebbers' terms, but not enough to equal the initial twenty-six percent.

Articles classified in Area IV experience a flux throughout the entire twenty-year period. A very low percentage of this type of article was published during Siggelkow's term. There was an increase in the percentage published during Shaffer's term, a decrease during Meade's, an increase during Tilley's, a decrease to an all time low of .00% and an increase during Ebbers' term. These articles, on the average, accounted for 3.75% of the total number of articles per editorial term.

No articles classified in Area V were published during the terms of the first editor, Siggelkow or the last editor, Ebbers, and the largest percentage (7.06) was published by O'Donnell. The overall pattern exhibits a flux. From Siggelkow's to Shaffer's terms, there was an increase in the publication of Area V articles, from Shaffer's to Meade's a decrease, from Meade's to Tilley's an increase, from Tilley's to O'Donnell's an increase, and a decrease from O'Donnell's to Ebbers' terms.

Articles classified as Area VI were published only during the 80s during Ebbers' editorship. Like the other two journals, the topic of the older returning student was not an area of interest or was not an observable phenomenon during the other editors' terms.
Table 22

Frequencies and percentages of student personnel work area for JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA - 1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPW Area</th>
<th>JCSP No.</th>
<th>JCSP %</th>
<th>NAWDAC No.</th>
<th>NAWDAC %</th>
<th>NASPA No.</th>
<th>NASPA %</th>
<th>TOTAL No.</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>15.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>63.93</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>67.87</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35.59</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>58.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area III</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>17.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area IV</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area V</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area VI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeter-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>53.35</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Frequencies and percentages of student personnel work areas for JCSP - 1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPW Area</th>
<th>Lewis</th>
<th>Callis</th>
<th>Hood</th>
<th>Fitzgerald</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63-64</td>
<td>64-70</td>
<td>70-76</td>
<td>77-82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>66.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area III</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25.81</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area IV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area VI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>472</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Frequencies and percentages of student personnel work area for NAWDAC - 1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63-69 %</td>
<td>70-73 %</td>
<td>73-80 %</td>
<td>80-82 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>24 10.48</td>
<td>11 14.10</td>
<td>33 13.31</td>
<td>13 25.00</td>
<td>81 13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td>164 71.62</td>
<td>43 55.13</td>
<td>174 70.16</td>
<td>31 59.62</td>
<td>412 67.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area III</td>
<td>18 7.86</td>
<td>16 20.51</td>
<td>17 6.85</td>
<td>3 5.77</td>
<td>54 8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area IV</td>
<td>22 9.61</td>
<td>8 10.26</td>
<td>18 7.26</td>
<td>4 7.69</td>
<td>52 8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area V</td>
<td>1 .44</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>6 2.42</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>7 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area VI</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>1 1.92</td>
<td>1 .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>1 .04</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>229 37.72</td>
<td>78 12.85</td>
<td>248 40.85</td>
<td>52 8.53</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

**Frequencies and percentages of student personnel work areas for NASPA - 1963-1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-69</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-72</td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area I 65 44.52 63 52.07 45 42.06 15 18.99 20 23.53 7 18.42 215 37.33
Area II 38 26.03 15 12.40 31 28.97 49 62.03 47 55.29 25 65.79 205 35.59
Area III 39 26.71 34 28.10 27 25.23 5 6.33 12 14.12 3 7.89 120 20.83
Area IV 4 2.74 5 4.13 3 2.80 6 7.59 0 .00 2 5.26 20 3.47
Area V 0 .00 4 3.31 1 .93 2 2.53 6 7.06 0 .00 13 2.26
Area VI 0 .00 0 .00 0 .00 0 .00 0 .00 1 2.63 1 .17
Undetermined 0 .00 0 .00 0 .00 2 2.53 0 .00 0 .00 2 .34

TOTAL 146 121 107 79 85 38 576
**Topic/Theme**

Administration (21%), counseling (15%), student characteristics (14%) and college climate (10%) were the topics which were of concern to authors the majority of time as is indicated by Table 26. In the **JCSP**, counseling (19%), student characteristics (18%) and college climate (10%) were topics covered the majority of the time. In the **NAWDAC**, administration (33%), student characteristics (12%), college climate (11%) and counseling (10%) are the topics which were covered the majority of the time. In the **NASPA**, administration (47%) and college climate (10%) were topics that received a majority of the coverage during this time period.

Tables 27 and 28 indicate the distribution of articles by journal editor for the **JCSP**, **NAWDAC** and **NASPA** respectively.

**JCSP**

Table 27 indicates that during Lewis' editorship, housing (14%), student characteristics (12%), counseling (10%), college climate (10%), administration (10%) and academic achievement (10%) were the topics of the majority of the articles.

During Callis' term, student characteristics (19%), counseling (13%), college climate (12%), academic achievement (10%), and housing (10%) were the topics the majority of the articles.

Counseling (20%), student characteristics (18%) and housing (10%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Hood's editorship.

Counseling (20%) and student characteristics (19%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Fitzgerald's term as editor.
NAWDAC

One interesting pattern noted in Table 28 is that in this journal all four editors included a significant number of articles with administration as a topic: Mueller (28%), Soldwedel (29%), Berry (38%) and Gartland (39%).

During Mueller's term, the topics of the majority of the articles were administration (28%), counseling (14%) and student characteristics (13%).

Administration (29%), college climate (18%) and student characteristics (10%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Soldwedel's term.

Berry's editorship saw the inclusion of articles which covered the topics of administration (38%), college climate (14%) and student characteristics (11%) the majority of the time.

The topics of the majority of the articles during Gartland's editorship were administration (39%), vocational choice (20%) and student characteristics (17%).

NASPA

Table 29 indicates the distribution of articles by topic per editor of the NASPA. Administration (28%), student conduct (28%) and college climate (19%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Siggelkow's term.

Administration (46%), college climate, student conduct and housing (11% each) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Shaffer's editorship.

Administration (55%), college climate (8%) and housing (6%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Meade's editorship.

Administration (42%), college climate (13%) and student conduct (9%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Tilley's editorship.
Administration (43%), counseling (11%) and professional issues (8%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during O'Donnell's term as editor.

Administration (67%), student conduct (5%), professional issues (5%) and vocational choice (5%) were the topics of the majority of the articles during Ebbers' editorship.

According to the data, the topics of administration, counseling, student characteristics, college climate, housing and academic achievement were of concern to authors the majority of the time. A review of the list suggests that the journals, in their twenty year coverage, have attempted to present old solutions that continue to be successful and new solutions/approaches to address old, recurring problems in a new and/or better way.
### Table 26

Frequencies and percentages of topical entries in JCSP, NAWDAC, and NASPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>JCSP</th>
<th>NAWDAC</th>
<th>NASPA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>33.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Climate</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Choice</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisement</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Retention</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Skills</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aids</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Issues</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td></td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Frequencies and percentages of topical entries in JCSP - 1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Lewis 63-64</th>
<th>Callis 64-70</th>
<th>Hood 71-76</th>
<th>Fitzgerald 77-82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
<td>Freq. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>6 10.16</td>
<td>48 12.73</td>
<td>95 20.47</td>
<td>116 24.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>7 11.86</td>
<td>71 18.83</td>
<td>84 18.10</td>
<td>88 18.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8 13.55</td>
<td>37 9.81</td>
<td>45 9.69</td>
<td>22 4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>6 10.16</td>
<td>37 9.81</td>
<td>23 4.95</td>
<td>20 4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6 10.16</td>
<td>37 9.81</td>
<td>23 4.95</td>
<td>20 4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Climate</td>
<td>6 10.16</td>
<td>45 11.93</td>
<td>57 12.28</td>
<td>31 6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>4 6.77</td>
<td>23 6.10</td>
<td>34 7.32</td>
<td>14 2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Choice</td>
<td>1 1.69</td>
<td>4 1.06</td>
<td>10 2.15</td>
<td>27 5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisement</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>7 1.85</td>
<td>9 1.93</td>
<td>16 3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Retention</td>
<td>3 5.08</td>
<td>14 3.71</td>
<td>23 4.95</td>
<td>16 3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Skills</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>5 1.32</td>
<td>4 .86</td>
<td>23 4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aids</td>
<td>4 6.77</td>
<td>8 2.12</td>
<td>10 2.15</td>
<td>5 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>3 5.08</td>
<td>16 4.24</td>
<td>9 1.93</td>
<td>4 .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>1 1.69</td>
<td>9 2.38</td>
<td>5 1.07</td>
<td>3 .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>11 2.91</td>
<td>14 3.01</td>
<td>7 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>1 1.69</td>
<td>10 2.65</td>
<td>2 .43</td>
<td>7 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>2 .53</td>
<td>1 .21</td>
<td>3 .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2 3.38</td>
<td>7 1.85</td>
<td>5 1.07</td>
<td>5 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Issues</td>
<td>1 1.69</td>
<td>5 1.32</td>
<td>0 .00</td>
<td>22 4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (1,371)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 28

Frequencies and percentages of topical entries in the **NAWDAC – 1963–1982**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Mueller 63-69</th>
<th>Soldwedel 70-73</th>
<th>Berry 73-80</th>
<th>Gartland 80-82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Climate Student Conduct</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Choice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Retention Educational Skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aids Orientation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities Greeks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students Placement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professional Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**: 197 83 250 46
Table 29

Frequencies and percentages of topical entries in NASPA - 1963-1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topical Entries</th>
<th>Siggelkow 63-69</th>
<th>Shaffer 69-72</th>
<th>Meade 72-75</th>
<th>Tilley 75-78</th>
<th>O'Donnell 78-81</th>
<th>Ebbers 81-82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46.49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Climate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Conduct</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Choice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aids</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this dissertation was to determine the nature of the knowledge base in student personnel work as reflected by the three major journals in the field by examining published articles. Factors examined per article were gender of contributors, institutional affiliation of contributors, topics of articles, employment status of contributors, location of institutional producers, foci of articles and the student personnel areas covered by the articles.

This chapter is devoted to a discussion of the results of the study, a presentation of the conclusions and implications drawn from the study.

Conclusions

The results have indicated the following conclusions:

1. The majority of articles were written by male persons
2. The majority of institutional contributors were from the midwest
3. The majority of articles were written about administrative activities
4. The majority of articles were written by persons who held administrative roles
5. The majority of institutions producing articles were ranked 1.1 on the Carnegie Commission Classification scale
6. The majority of articles focused on groups
7. The majority of articles published were classified in the student personnel work areas of counseling and student development.

108
Gender

That the majority of contributors in the journals are male is a fact supported by the literature (Tryon, 1981; Exum and Menges, 1983; Roberts, 1981; Lockheed and Stein, 1982) and by the results of the study. It seems that the sex of the editor to some extent did influence the sex of the contributors. For instance, during the terms of male editors, the majority of contributors were male. During the terms of most female editors, the majority of contributors were female. However, the female editors, in a basically male or coed journal, produced more male articles but they also produced a greater number of female articles than did their male counterparts.

On the topic of who gets published in journals, Kuhn (1975) postulated that persons with established reputations (who may include editors, reviewers or advisors) represent certain schools of thought and have a vested interest in preserving the authority of their work and in the process can and do suppress "fundamental novelties" which challenge or reflect unfavorably on their work. This type of behavior leads to the predicament which is referred to as "the closed system." A closed system is a structural exclusion of groups whose values and beliefs do not agree with the values and viewpoints of the gatekeepers--of persons who determine what is and is not appropriate for publication. As was suggested in Chapter II, gatekeepers are in positions which allow them to perpetuate certain viewpoints by exercising sponsorship and influence toward persons who classify the world in much the same way that they do (Roberts, 1981). According to researcher Dale Spender (1981), women are one of the excluded groups. "Women are not the only outsiders but are a significant group and there is considerable evidence which suggests that women's schemata does not at times
'match' with men's." This is not necessarily the result of deliberate policy to exclude women or other groups with values and viewpoints which differ from the gatekeepers, but is the result of closed debate where such groups are not represented and their views, therefore, not heard (Spender, 1981). Since women are 50% of the population and the majority of student personnel practitioners are female, it is important that perspectives, values and research of this group be reflected more proportionately in the literature of the field by women who express themselves from both masculine and feminine perspectives.

Roles

Persons holding administrative roles produced the greatest number of articles, followed closely by persons holding roles in teaching. There may be two reasons for this: 1) all of the editors of the journals were administrators or professors who, perhaps, shared the same perspective on issues as their contributors; 2) much of the published material is an attempt by practitioners to reaffirm approaches, question practices, report what does and does not work and to explore different approaches to problems in the field. Administrators are typically the practitioners who make decisions regarding the philosophy underlying programs/practices and the implementation of programs/practices. It seems appropriate that they would be at the forefront of knowledge production communicating and sharing their ideas with others via the journals.

Professors—those in teaching roles—are the persons involved in the preparation of others for careers in the field. That they be concerned and involved in the knowledge production process is reasonable for they need to keep up with what is happening in the field so that they can in turn impart this information to others.
Administrators can be called practitioners. These articles are attempts by practitioners to legitimate practice by substantiating it with the use and development of theory.

Leading Institutional Producers

This question was addressed in three ways. What were the names of the institutions producing the largest number of articles? What was the Carnegie Classification(s) of the institutions producing the largest amount of articles? And what was the regional location of the institutions producing the largest number of articles. The results indicated that the names of the institutions producing the largest number of articles were the University of Minnesota, University of Maryland, University of Missouri, Colorado State University, University of Nebraska, Kansas State University, University of Iowa, Ohio State University, Indiana University and Michigan State University. All of the institutions were rated 1.1 - Research I institutions on the Carnegie Classification scale which means they are one of "50 leading universities in terms of federal financial support of academic science in at least two of three academic years, 1972-1973, 1973-1974 and 1974-1975 provided they awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s plus M.D.'s if a medical school were on the same campus" (Carnegie Council on Higher Education, 1976). The majority of institutions were located in the midwest.

That the majority of articles were from persons employed by institutions located in the midwest is congruent with the historical development of student personnel work. Most student personnel work programs are housed at land-grant institutions where traditionally the focus has been on research and the practical application of theory which has been tried and tested in the field. The "empirical
dustbowl," which is the nickname given to midwestern higher education institutions, is and has been the source from which the majority of student personnel work has emanated.

Most of the editors were located at midwestern institutions during their editorships and many of the pioneers in the field and first journal editors (Cowley, Clark, Nygreen, Mueller, Shaffer, Greenleaf, Lewis and Goodnight) were also from midwestern institutions rated 1.1 The location of these persons may have influenced sources from which articles were contributed.

Student personnel is an applied field that is theory based—it deals with application of practical theories to everyday problems. That the literature should come from such institutions is congruent with the history of higher education (Rudolph, 1962).

Focus

Studies focused primarily on the behavior of groups upon which generalizations could be made about populations and larger systems of operation. In studying groups, data are compiled that are helpful in the examination of both the individual and the group. This makes the use of group behavior as the subject of studies most appropriate considering student personnel work's concern with the group, as well as the individual, perspective on issues.

The majority of articles were written about administrative activities and not student activities. This seems reasonable since the field is in the process of establishing its legitimacy empirically and there is an intense examination of practice as it relates to theory. In addition to this, the roles in the field have become more numerous, diverse and more decentralized as the number and types
of institutions have increased. As a result, some positions/activities may be classified as administrative when in reality the actual function is one of service. For example, offices of student life are classified as administrative when, in reality, their function is one of service.

Summary

Based on information cited above, it would seem student personnel work is 1) a field where persons are attempting to establish an empirical knowledge base, 2) has been compiled by practitioners as well as theoreticians, and 3) has a male dominated perspective. Student personnel work knowledge bases appear "soft" due to the fact that it is a study of the encouragement of the growth, development and maturation of individuals—some of these types of experiences are non-quantifiable or are difficult to quantify. The field can also be characterized as being empirically based, primarily concerned with people, and supported by practitioners and theoreticians in the field.

This study was designed and conducted to examine the nature of the knowledge base in student personnel work as reflected in three major journals, and to provide a profile of who and what has been published. Articles published from 1963 to 1982 were examined to determine demographics of contributors, focus of articles, student personnel work topical areas of articles, types of institutions involved in the knowledge production and dissemination process, and the gender of contributors to the journals. It is hoped that this study will provide information that is the base upon which others might build.
Some Topics for Further Study

1. What do these profiles mean when placed within a historical context of events taking place in colleges and universities in the United States?

2. What do the profiles mean when one has a better understanding of each editor's purpose/goals during the editorship?

3. Based on the profile for the last twenty years, what might a projection be concerning the field?

4. Do editors influence significantly what is published and if so, how and to what extent in all three journals?

5. What are the philosophical statements of the journals? What are the goals/philosophies of the editors? Do they influence what and who publishes?

6. Do the graduate school origins of editors influence what is published in the journals? The location of the editors' major professors and mentors--do they and informal networks influence what is published?
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The correct total is 3,800. Due to keypunch error, the result was the totals listed above. The difference between the accurate total and the working totals is never more than one half of one percent.
APPENDIX B
Region Codes

REGION 1 - NEW ENGLAND REGION
Maine
New Hampshire
Vermont
Massachusetts
Rhode Island
Connecticut

REGION 2 - MIDDLE ATLANTIC REGION
New York
New Jersey
Pennsylvania

REGION 3 - EAST NORTH CENTRAL REGION
Ohio
Indiana
Illinois
Michigan
Wisconsin

REGION 4 - WEST NORTH CENTRAL REGION
Minnesota
Iowa
Missouri
North Dakota
South Dakota
Nebraska
Kansas

REGION 5 - SOUTH ATLANTIC REGION
Delaware
Maryland
District of Columbia
Virginia
West Virginia
North Carolina
South Carolina
Georgia
Florida

REGION 6 - EAST SOUTH CENTRAL REGION
Kentucky
Tennessee
Alabama
Mississippi
REGION 7 - WEST SOUTH CENTRAL REGION
    Arkansas
    Louisiana
    Oklahoma
    Texas

REGION 8 - MOUNTAIN REGION
    Montana
    Idaho
    Wyoming
    Colorado
    New Mexico
    Arizona
    Utah
    Nevada

REGION 9 - PACIFIC REGION
    Guam
    Washington
    Oregon
    California
    Alaska
    Hawaii
    Virgin Islands
    Panama Canal Zone
    Puerto Rico

REGION 10
    Foreign Institutions

REGION 11
    Unlisted