Report of the Survey of Masters Degree Recipients: Academic Year 2003-2004

Office of Institutional Research
Spring 2006
Dr. Arthur Kramer, Director
Mr. Hosam Mansour, Graduate Assistant

Executive Summary

Survey instruments were mailed to master's degree recipients of the academic year 2004-2005. These surveys were similar in content to the one that had been implemented before using a general format compatible with the software application *Remark*. After a series of mailings we received a response rate of 53%.

The results of the survey indicate most of the respondents majored in Special Education (26%). Sixty-nine percent of student took their first NJCU class on campus and 20.8% of graduates obtained their bachelor's degree from NJCU. Thirty percent of respondents were from Hudson County. Forty-three percent describe the master's degree as the highest degree they plan to obtain, but approximately 35% plan to obtain an advanced degree. At the time of the survey, 26% had enrolled in further higher education. About the a third of the respondents had spent three years pursuing their current degree. Almost 84% would "definitely" or "probably" attend NJCU again for their graduate degree if they had to do it over again.

The profile of the respondents created by the ethnicity, gender and age data is one of a white, female, between the ages of 25 and 44.

A series of questions asked the graduates to determine the importance of several factors that influenced their decision to attend NJCU. Results indicate the availability of a particular program was the most important factor, followed by the cost of tuition and proximity to home. In terms of problem resolution, most of the respondents stated that a faculty member was helpful; other members of the university staff were also mentioned as helpful in resolving problems. Many respondents reported the personnel in the Office of Graduate Studies were helpful and knowledgeable; the majority of respondents indicated their graduate advisor was helpful, as well.

A series of questions pertaining to family members of respondents attending NJCU was asked. About a quarter of the graduates had a family member with an NJCU degree; others had a family currently enrolled—some pursuing graduate degrees, others a bachelor's degree.

Many respondents stated they would have preferred a deferred payment option to help pay for their education, and almost three-quarters of the respondents did not find it necessary to apply for a loan to finance their graduate education. A majority of respondents were employed while pursuing their degree, and most of them were employed full-time at the time the survey was administered. Of the total number of respondents who were employed, over a third was earning between $40,000 and $49,000 and a similar number was earning $60,000, or more. Four-fifths of the respondents indicated they had received an increase in salary upon completion of their degree, and the majority of the respondents were employed in the field of education. Slightly less than half of respondents had been at their current jobs for six or more years; and many respondents reported belonging to a professional organization.

Most of the respondents stated the number of courses offered was adequate, and the hours the courses were offered were convenient. Respondents were most satisfied with the four pm class start-time.

Almost ninety percent of the respondents felt the courses required by their major were appropriate, and the respondents were generally satisfied with the availability of their professors.

Overall, the respondents reported that their post-baccalaureate degree had increased their professional competence, and they agreed that they made contact with people instrumental for their careers.

Respondents were generally satisfied with the library and campus security, and when asked if they would recommend NJCU to others, most indicated they would.

A series of questions was asked regarding how well NJCU prepared them in specified areas. Respondents indicated that they were most prepared in the area of "applying new information in daily work," this was followed by the areas of "critical thinking", working in groups, and the ability to work independently. The respondents also felt they were prepared well in the areas of "discussing ideas and alternatives," and "conducting work-related research," "setting personal and professional goals" "organizing work", "using logical problem-solving techniques", "planning", "communicating in writing", and "exercising leadership". The lowest number of responses was received in the areas of "oral communication", "time management", and "computer use". Overall, the results show the respondents felt NJCU provided them with "necessary professional skills and information.

Method

A survey instrument was mailed to 544 master's degree recipients of the Academic Year 2004-2005. The instrument was basically the same as the one that had been mailed in prior years in regard to questions it contained; however, the format was different. The software application, *Remark*, was used in the creation of the form and subsequent scanning of the returned questionnaires. Three mailings were carried out during Spring 2005; an initial mailing, a follow up letter two weeks later, and finally another survey form approximately three weeks after that. Two hundred and ninety-four surveys completed surveys were returned for a response rate of 54%.

Results

Degree Programs

Tables one, three, and four display the degree programs from which survey respondents graduated. The tables indicate most respondents obtained a degree in Special Education (25%), Early Childhood Education (10%), Educational Technology (10%), Health Science (9%); Fine Arts had the least number of graduates.

Table two displays the degree programs of the graduating class. The comparison between the respondents and the class shows the only real disparities are in the area of Health Sciences, which was over represented in the survey responses and Music Education, where there were five responses, but only two graduates—there may be a misunderstanding on the part of three graduates as to their correct program name. There are no data for Fine Arts and Elementary School Reading available in the class data.

Urban Education is uniquely addressed in table 3. It shows the majority (77%) of respondents from the Urban Education Department graduated from Administration and Supervision, followed by graduates of the English as a Second Language program (14%). The program with the fewest graduates was Basic and Urban Studies (2%). Table four indicates three respondents acquired a professional diploma in School Psychology.

Table 1 Survey Respondents

Degree Program by Respondents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Accounting	3	1.0	1.4	1.4
	Counseling	18	6.1	8.4	9.8
	Early Childhood Education	28	9.5	13.0	22.8
	Educational Technology	28	9.5	13.0	35.8
	Fine Arts	1	.3	.5	36.3
	Mathematics Education	6	2.0	2.8	39.1
	Nursing	5	1.7	2.3	41.4
	Art Education	4	1.4	1.9	43.3
	Criminal Justice	5	1.7	2.3	45.6
	Educational Psychology	3	1.0	1.4	47.0
	Elementary School Reading	3	1.0	1.4	48.4
	Health Sciences	26	8.8	12.1	60.5
	Music Education	5	1.7	2.3	62.8
	Reading Specialist	5	1.7	2.3	65.1
	Special Education	75	25.5	34.9	100.0
	Total	215	73.1	100.0	
Missing	-1	79	26.9		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 2

Cross tabulation of Degree Program by Class

			college			
			Arts&Science	Education	Prof Studies	Total
degmaj1	Educational Technology	Count	0	52	0	52
		% of Total	.0%	9.4%	.0%	9.4%
	Special Education	Count	0	131	0	131
		% of Total	.0%	23.7%	.0%	23.7%
	Counseling	Count	35	0	0	35
		% of Total	6.3%	.0%	.0%	6.3%
	MA in Teaching	Count	0	15	0	15
		% of Total	.0%	2.7%	.0%	2.7%
	Early Childhood Education	Count	0	47	0	47
		% of Total	.0%	8.5%	.0%	8.5%
	Urban Education	Count	0	174	0	174
		% of Total	.0%	31.5%	.0%	31.5%
	Art Education	Count	1	0	0	1
		% of Total	.2%	.0%	.0%	.2%
	Mathematics Education	Count	18	0	0	18
		% of Total	3.3%	.0%	.0%	3.3%
	Music Education	Count	2	0	0	2
		% of Total	.4%	.0%	.0%	.4%
	Reading Specialist	Count	0	19	0	19
		% of Total	.0%	3.4%	.0%	3.4%
	School Psychology	Count	8	0	0	8
		% of Total	1.4%	.0%	.0%	1.4%
	Educational Psychology	Count	3	0	0	3
		% of Total	.5%	.0%	.0%	.5%
	Criminal Justice	Count	0	0	8	8
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	1.4%	1.4%
	Music Performance	Count	7	0	0	7
		% of Total	1.3%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
	Nursing	Count	0	0	4	4
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.7%	.7%
	Health Science	Count	0	0	24	24
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	4.3%	4.3%
	Accounting	Count	0	0	4	4
		% of Total	.0%	.0%	.7%	.7%
Total		Count	74	438	40	552
		% of Total	13.4%	79.3%	7.2%	100.0%

Table 3

Urban Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administrative and Supervision	70	23.8	76.9	76.9
	Bilingual/Bicultural	6	2.0	6.6	83.5
	English as a Second Language	13	4.4	14.3	97.8
	Basic and Urban Studies	2	.7	2.2	100.0
	Total	91	31.0	100.0	
Missing	-1	203	69.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 4.

Professional Diploma

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	School Psychology	3	1.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	-1	291	99.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Demographics

The majority of respondents (75%) were female (table 5), as was the majority of the class, as a whole (72%) (table 6). The difference in frequencies between the class and respondents was found to be trivial (Chi-square=1.19; d.f.=1; p>.05).

Table 5

Respondents by Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	70	23.8	25.4	25.4
	Female	206	70.1	74.6	100.0
	Total	276	93.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	18	6.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 6

Class by Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	6	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Male	149	27.4	27.4	28.5
	Female	389	71.5	71.5	100.0
	Total	544	100.0	100.0	

According to table seven, almost two-thirds (64%) of the respondents were White; Hispanics were the second largest group (16%), followed by Black/African-Americans (14%) Asian/Pacific Islanders (3%) and the "Other" category made up three percent (3%). Table eight displays ethnicity of graduates in the class. Overall, the racial/ethnicity data of the respondents are representative of the class when the known categories are assessed (Chi-square=5.61; d.f.=3; p>.05—not significant).

Table 7

Respondents by Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Black/African-American	40	13.6	14.3	14.3
	Asian/Pacific Islander	8	2.7	2.9	17.1
	White	180	61.2	64.3	81.4
	Hispanic	45	15.3	16.1	97.5
	Other	7	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	280	95.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	14	4.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 8

Class by Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	50	9.2	9.2	9.2
	Afro-Amer	51	9.4	9.4	18.6
	Asian	15	2.8	2.8	21.3
	Hispanic	80	14.7	14.7	36.0
	White	346	63.6	63.6	99.6
	NRA	2	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	544	100.0	100.0	

According to table nine, the modal age category of respondents was 25-34 (40%).

With minor exceptions, the respondents were found to be a representative sample of the graduating class.

Table 9

Respondents by Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	24 or under	1	.3	.3	.3
	25- 34	114	38.8	39.9	40.2
	35- 44	77	26.2	26.9	67.1
	45 or over	94	32.0	32.9	100.0
	Total	286	97.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	8	2.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Location:

Most of the respondents took their first NJCU class on campus (70%), as opposed to the 30% that took their first class at an off campus site (table 10), and lived in Hudson County while attending NJCU (30%; table 11)

Education:

Twenty-one percent of the respondents obtained their bachelor's degree from NJCU (table 12); and 23% of the have a family member with an NJCU degree (table 13). Tables 14 and 15 show family members of the graduates were attending NJCU at the time of the survey, in pursuit either a bachelor's or master's degree.

Regarding alumni engaged in life-long learning, over a quarter (26%) of the respondents had enrolled in courses following graduation (table 16). Table 17 shows the majority (83%) of respondents earned the MA and 16% earned an MS; one percent earned a PD, and less than one percent earned an MFA.

It is found (table 18) that 43% of respondents describe the master's degree as the highest degree they plan to obtain, but thirty-five percent plan to earn a doctorate

Most of the respondents (33%) took three years to earn their degree; 28% took two years or less; and 21% spent four years. Smaller percentages took five and six years to complete their degree (8% and 9%, respectively) (table 19).

Eighty-four percent of the respondents said they would choose to attend NJCU if they could start graduate school again (table 20).

Table 10

Location of First NJCU Graduate Course

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	On main campus	202	68.7	69.7	69.7
	An off-campus site	88	29.9	30.3	100.0
	Total	290	98.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	4	1.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 11

County of Residence

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bergen	50	17.0	17.4	17.4
	Essex	39	13.3	13.6	31.0
	Hudson	86	29.3	30.0	61.0
	Monmouth	12	4.1	4.2	65.2
	Sussex	1	.3	.3	65.5
	Middlesex	13	4.4	4.5	70.0
	Union	19	6.5	6.6	76.7
	Passaic	19	6.5	6.6	83.3
	Other NJ County	45	15.3	15.7	99.0
	Out of State	3	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	287	97.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	7	2.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 12

BA Degree from NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	60	20.4	20.8	20.8
	No	229	77.9	79.2	100.0
	Total	289	98.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	5	1.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 13

Family Members with NJCU Degree

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	67	22.8	23.2	23.2
	No	222	75.5	76.8	100.0
	Total	289	98.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	5	1.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 14

Students with Family Attending NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	34	11.6	11.7	11.7
	No	257	87.4	88.3	100.0
	Total	291	99.0	100.0	
Missing	-1	3	1.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 15

Degree Program of Currently Attending Family Member's

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bachelor's Degree	15	5.1	44.1	44.1
	Master's Degree	16	5.4	47.1	91.2
	Non-degree	3	1.0	8.8	100.0
	Total	34	11.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	260	88.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 16

Students Enrolled in courses other than at NJCU since Graduation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	76	25.9	26.3	26.3
	No	213	72.4	73.7	100.0
	Total	289	98.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	5	1.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 17

Highest Degree Obtained

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MA	227	77.2	82.8	82.8
	MS	43	14.6	15.7	98.5
	PD	3	1.0	1.1	99.6
	MFA	1	.3	.4	100.0
	Total	274	93.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	20	6.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 18

Highest Degree Plan to Obtain

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Master's Degree	119	40.5	43.0	43.0
	Doctorate	96	32.7	34.7	77.6
	Professional Diploma	12	4.1	4.3	81.9
	Professional School Degree	1	.3	.4	82.3
	No plans	49	16.7	17.7	100.0
	Total	277	94.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	17	5.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 19

Number of Years Attended in NJCU Graduate School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2 or less	78	26.5	28.2	28.2
	3 years	92	31.3	33.2	61.4
	4 years	58	19.7	20.9	82.3
	5 years	23	7.8	8.3	90.6
	6 or more	26	8.8	9.4	100.0
	Total	277	94.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	17	5.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 20

Graduates Who Would Attend NJCU Again for Graduate School

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Definitely yes	119	40.5	41.2	41.2
	Probably yes	123	41.8	42.6	83.7
	Definitely no	5	1.7	1.7	85.5
	Probably no	16	5.4	5.5	91.0
	Uncertain	26	8.8	9.0	100.0
	Total	289	98.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	5	1.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Decision to Attend NJCU

According to table 21, more than half of the respondents considered tuition a very important factor in their decision to attend NJCU, and table 22 shows the proximity of the school to a student's home was a determinant for attendance, as well: a combined 77% described location to home as important. Seven percent determined it to be not too important and almost four percent determined it to be not important at all

Table 21

Tuition's Importance as a Factor in Attending NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important at all	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Not too important	10	3.4	3.5	4.8
	Neutral	26	8.8	9.0	13.8
	Important	77	26.2	26.6	40.5
	Very important	172	58.5	59.5	100.0
	Total	289	98.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	5	1.7		
Total		294	100.0		

.

Table 22

Home Location's Importance as a Factor in Attending NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important at all	10	3.4	3.5	3.5
	Not too important	20	6.8	7.0	10.5
	Neutral	36	12.2	12.6	23.1
	Important	97	33.0	33.9	57.0
	Very important	123	41.8	43.0	100.0
	Total	286	97.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	8	2.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Proximity of the university to a student's place of employment was also found to be an important factor; almost 75% of the respondents related some degree of importance (table 23). Availability of a specific program was considered important by over 90% of the respondents (table 24), and faculty was considered important by over two-thirds of the respondents (table 25).

Table 23

Job Location's Importance as a Factor in Attending NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important at all	12	4.1	4.2	4.2
	Not too important	20	6.8	7.0	11.2
	Neutral	45	15.3	15.8	27.0
	Important	96	32.7	33.7	60.7
	Very important	112	38.1	39.3	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 24

Program/Major's Importance as a Factor in Attending NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important at all	3	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Not too important	1	.3	.3	1.4
	Neutral	14	4.8	4.9	6.3
	Important	77	26.2	26.8	33.1
	Very important	192	65.3	66.9	100.0
	Total	287	97.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	7	2.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 25

Graduate Faculty's Importance as a Factor in Attending NJCU

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not important at all	12	4.1	4.2	4.2
	Not too important	18	6.1	6.3	10.5
	Neutral	59	20.1	20.7	31.2
	Important	95	32.3	33.3	64.6
	Very important	101	34.4	35.4	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

<u>Problem Resolution</u>

In trying to resolve university-related problems, 79% of the respondents replied the faculty were especially helpful (table 26), and 72% were able to get assistance from someone else on campus. Table 28 shows the other person found to be helpful was the department chair(45%--it is interesting to note that the respondents may not see the department chair as a member of the faculty), then deans (14%), followed by both a graduate advisors and clerical staff (12%). A little over eight percent of respondents had helpful experiences with department directors and ten percent answered "other".

Table 26

Availability of contacted graduate faculty who was especially helpful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	221	75.2	78.9	78.9
	No	59	20.1	21.1	100.0
	Total	280	95.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	14	4.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 27

Availability of Someone Else at the University

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	196	66.7	71.5	71.5
	No	78	26.5	28.5	100.0
	Total	274	93.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	20	6.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 28

The Identity of the Helpful University Contact

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Dean	24	8.2	13.5	13.5
	Graduate Advisor	21	7.1	11.8	25.3
	Department Chair	80	27.2	44.9	70.2
	Department Director	15	5.1	8.4	78.7
	Clerical staff	21	7.1	11.8	90.4
	Other	17	5.8	9.6	100.0
	Total	178	60.5	100.0	
Missing	-1	116	39.5		
Total		294	100.0		

Employment

The majority of students worked while pursuing their graduate degree (table 29) and almost all respondents were working at the time of the survey (table 30).

Table 29

Employed for the Majority of the Time as a Graduate Student

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	274	93.2	94.2	94.2
	No	17	5.8	5.8	100.0
	Total	291	99.0	100.0	
Missing	-1	3	1.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 30

Are You Currently Employed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	281	95.6	98.3	98.3
	No	5	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	286	97.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	8	2.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 31 displays the general areas of employment of the respondents: 87% were working in education; six percent in a health field; one percent were in criminal justice or some "other" field; five percent of the respondents replied they were working in the private sector, and almost half had been at those jobs for more than six years (table 32).

Table 31

Current Place of Employment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Private sector	14	4.8	5.0	5.0
	Education	244	83.0	87.1	92.1
	Health	16	5.4	5.7	97.9
	Criminal Justice	3	1.0	1.1	98.9
	Other	3	1.0	1.1	100.0
	Total	280	95.2	100.0	
Missing	-1	14	4.8		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 32

Length of Time at Current Job

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 3 months	1	.3	.4	.4
	3- 11 months	32	10.9	11.3	11.7
	1-2 years	32	10.9	11.3	23.0
	3-5 years	78	26.5	27.7	50.7
	6 or more years	139	47.3	49.3	100.0
	Total	282	95.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	12	4.1		
Total		294	100.0		

In regard to their salary, almost equivalent numbers were responded to the $40,000-$49,999 and "$60,000 and above" range, and to the $20,000-$29,999 and "less than $20,000" ranges (table 33). Most received pay raises following graduation (82%; table 34), but few received promotions (18%; table 35).

Table 33

Range of Current Salary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than $20000	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	$20000-$29999	3	1.0	1.1	2.5
	$30000-$39999	13	4.4	4.6	7.1
	$40000-$49999	106	36.1	37.7	44.8
	$50000-$59999	53	18.0	18.9	63.7
	$60000 or above	102	34.7	36.3	100.0
	Total	281	95.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	13	4.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 34

Upon Completion of Graduate Work Did You Receive a Salary Increase

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	235	79.9	81.6	81.6
	No	51	17.3	17.7	99.3
	Not applicable: not employed	2	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	288	98.0	100.0	
Missing	-1	6	2.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 35

Upon Completion of Graduate Work Did You Receive a Promotion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	52	17.7	18.4	18.4
	No	224	76.2	79.2	97.5
	Not applicable: Not employed	7	2.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 36 shows almost 80% or the respondents were members of a professional organization.

Table 36

Are You a Member of a Professional Organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	214	72.8	73.8	73.8
	No	76	25.9	26.2	100.0
	Total	290	98.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	4	1.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Academic Offerings and Time of Classes

Table 37 indicates the levels of satisfaction experienced by respondents in regard to the variety of graduate courses provided. Almost 80% replied an adequate variety of courses was provide, and tables 38 through 40 show satisfaction with the time classes were offered: 80% preferred the four o'clock hour and 50% the seven o'clock start time; and in regard to the adequacy of the required course-work, 90% felt the courses were appropriate (table 41).

Table 37

Graduate Division Offers Adequate Variety of Courses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	3	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2- Disagree	14	4.8	4.8	5.9
	3- Neutral	41	13.9	14.2	20.1
	4- Agree	167	56.8	57.8	77.9
	5- Strongly agree	64	21.8	22.1	100.0
	Total	289	98.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	5	1.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 38

Scheduled Class hours Were Convenient

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	1	.3	.3	.3
	2- Disagree	10	3.4	3.5	3.8
	3- Neutral	28	9.5	9.8	13.6
	4- Agree	147	50.0	51.2	64.8
	5- Strongly agree	101	34.4	35.2	100.0
	Total	287	97.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	7	2.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 39

4:00 Class Was Most Satisfactory

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	10	3.4	3.5	3.5
	2- Disagree	36	12.2	12.5	16.0
	3- Neutral	47	16.0	16.3	32.3
	4- Agree	103	35.0	35.8	68.1
	5- Strongly agree	92	31.3	31.9	100.0
	Total	288	98.0	100.0	
Missing	-1	6	2.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 40

The 7:00 Class Was Most Satisfactory

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	20	6.8	7.1	7.1
	2- Disagree	28	9.5	9.9	17.0
	3- Neutral	93	31.6	33.0	50.0
	4- Agree	89	30.3	31.6	81.6
	5- Strongly agree	52	17.7	18.4	100.0
	Total	282	95.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	12	4.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 41

The Required Courses Were Appropriate for My Career Objective

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2- Disagree	10	3.4	3.5	3.5
	3- Neutral	20	6.8	7.0	10.5
	4- Agree	147	50.0	51.4	61.9
	5- Strongly agree	109	37.1	38.1	100.0
	Total	286	97.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	8	2.7		
Total		294	100.0		

When asked if the staff of the graduate office was helpful and knowledgeable, over 75% responded positively; a slightly smaller number reported graduate advisors were helpful (72%) and, just over 70% said professors were available at convenient times for consultation (tables 42 through 44).

Table 42

The Staff at the Graduate Office Was Helpful and Knowledgeable.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	8	2.7	2.8	2.8
	2- Disagree	16	5.4	5.6	8.4
	3- Neutral	43	14.6	15.1	23.5
	4- Agree	119	40.5	41.8	65.3
	5- Strongly agree	99	33.7	34.7	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 43

Advisors Were Helpful During My Period of Graduate Study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	12	4.1	4.2	4.2
	2- Disagree	22	7.5	7.6	11.8
	3- Neutral	46	15.6	16.0	27.8
	4- Agree	115	39.1	39.9	67.7
	5- Strongly agree	93	31.6	32.3	100.0
	Total	288	98.0	100.0	
Missing	-1	6	2.0		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 44

Professors Available for Consultation at Convenient Times

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	13	4.4	4.6	4.6
	2- Disagree	27	9.2	9.5	14.0
	3- Neutral	44	15.0	15.4	29.5
	4- Agree	132	44.9	46.3	75.8
	5- Strongly agree	69	23.5	24.2	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

<u>Opportunities for networking</u>

As indicated in table 45, forty percent of the respondents agreed at some level that opportunities to make professional contacts were available to them while pursuing their degree.

Table 45

Contact with People Instrumental in Advancing Professional Career

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	30	10.2	10.5	10.5
	2- Disagree	51	17.3	17.9	28.4
	3- Neutral	90	30.6	31.6	60.0
	4- Agree	65	22.1	22.8	82.8
	5- Strongly agree	49	16.7	17.2	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 46 reveal over sixty percent of the survey responders reported some level of agreement that library resources were adequate, and almost 60% felt security was adequate (table 47).

Table 46

Resources at Library Adequate for Work Required in Graduate Courses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	5	1.7	1.8	1.8
	2- Disagree	8	2.7	2.8	4.6
	3- Neutral	88	29.9	31.0	35.6
	4- Agree	125	42.5	44.0	79.6
	5- Strongly agree	58	19.7	20.4	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 47

Security on Campus Was Adequate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2- Disagree	13	4.4	4.6	4.6
	3- Neutral	107	36.4	37.7	42.3
	4- Agree	123	41.8	43.3	85.6
	5- Strongly agree	41	13.9	14.4	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Almost 88% of the respondents felt their degree increased their professional competence—coincidentally, the same number responded "agree" as responded "strongly agree" (table 48).

Table 48

Graduate Degree Has Increased My Professional Competence

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	1	.3	.3	.3
	2- Disagree	9	3.1	3.1	3.5
	3- Neutral	22	7.5	7.7	11.2
	4- Agree	127	43.2	44.4	55.6
	5- Strongly agree	127	43.2	44.4	100.0
	Total	286	97.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	8	2.7		
Total		294	100.0		

When asked if they would recommend the graduate program to others, 88% "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that they would (table 49).

Table 49

I Would Recommend Graduate Program to Others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	5	1.7	1.7	1.7
	2- Disagree	9	3.1	3.1	4.9
	3- Neutral	22	7.5	7.7	12.5
	4- Agree	117	39.8	40.8	53.3
	5- Strongly agree	134	45.6	46.7	100.0
	Total	287	97.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	7	2.4		
Total		294	100.0		

It was previously demonstrated that the respondents were basically satisfied with the times classes were offered. Table 50 shows a minority of students (27%) would have preferred to take classes on the weekend.

Table 50

I Would Have Preferred to Take Classes on Week Ends

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Disagree strongly	73	24.8	25.7	25.7
	2- Disagree	68	23.1	23.9	49.6
	3- Neutral	67	22.8	23.6	73.2
	4- Agree	46	15.6	16.2	89.4
	5- Strongly agree	30	10.2	10.6	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Skills Preparation

A series of questions regarding how well the graduates felt their program fostered the development of specific skills and abilities. Response choices were presented as 1 "Not very well" to 5 "Very Well". Table 51 shows, in descending order the abilities rated highest to lowest in terms of skill development. Responses to choices "4" and "5" were aggregated so that a single measure of how well the respondents felt the program prepared them could be obtained. It can be seen that the respondents felt they were best prepared to "apply new information": 82% responding "well" prepared. This was followed closely by "thinking critically (81%) and working in groups (81%); gradually declining percentages were obtained until the area they felt least well prepared in, the ability to "use computer technology" (66%). (Tables 52 to 66 provide the detail of these responses.)

Table 51.

Apply New Information	82%
Think Critically	81%
Work in Groups	81%
Work Independently	80%
Conduct Work-related research	79%
Discuss Ideas & Alternatives	79%
Set Personal & Professional Goals	77%
Plan	75%
Organize Work	74%
Logical Problem-solving	72%
Written Communication	69%
Oral Communication	68%
Exercise Leadership	68%
Manage Time	67%
Use Computer Technology	66%

Table 52

Communication in Writing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	9	3.1	3.2	3.2
	2	17	5.8	6.0	9.2
	3	61	20.7	21.6	30.9
	4	117	39.8	41.5	72.3
	5- Very well	78	26.5	27.7	100.0
	Total	282	95.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	12	4.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 53

Communicate Orally

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	10	3.4	3.6	3.6
	2	15	5.1	5.3	8.9
	3	65	22.1	23.1	32.0
	4	116	39.5	41.3	73.3
	5- Very well	75	25.5	26.7	100.0
	Total	281	95.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	13	4.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 54

Work Independently

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	6	2.0	2.1	2.1
	2	6	2.0	2.1	4.2
	3	46	15.6	16.3	20.5
	4	115	39.1	40.6	61.1
	5- Very well	110	37.4	38.9	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 55

Think Critically

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2	12	4.1	4.2	5.7
	3	37	12.6	13.1	18.7
	4	122	41.5	43.1	61.8
	5- Very well	108	36.7	38.2	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 56

Work in Groups and Participate in Group Process

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2	8	2.7	2.8	4.2
	3	42	14.3	14.8	19.1
	4	115	39.1	40.6	59.7
	5- Very well	114	38.8	40.3	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 57

Plan

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2	9	3.1	3.2	4.6
	3	57	19.4	20.1	24.7
	4	119	40.5	42.0	66.8
	5- Very well	94	32.0	33.2	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 58

Resolve Problems Using Logical Problem Solving

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	5	1.7	1.8	1.8
	2	12	4.1	4.3	6.0
	3	61	20.7	21.6	27.7
	4	127	43.2	45.0	72.7
	5- Very well	77	26.2	27.3	100.0
	Total	282	95.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	12	4.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 59

Exercise Leadership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	6	2.0	2.1	2.1
	2	16	5.4	5.6	7.7
	3	68	23.1	23.9	31.6
	4	101	34.4	35.4	67.0
	5- Very well	94	32.0	33.0	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 60

Apply New Information in My Daily Work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	3	1.0	1.1	1.1
	2	8	2.7	2.8	3.9
	3	39	13.3	13.7	17.6
	4	137	46.6	48.2	65.8
	5- Very well	97	33.0	34.2	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 61

Conduct Research Related to My Work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	8	2.7	2.8	2.8
	2	8	2.7	2.8	5.6
	3	43	14.6	15.1	20.8
	4	126	42.9	44.4	65.1
	5- Very well	99	33.7	34.9	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 62

Discuss Ideas and Alternatives

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2	9	3.1	3.1	4.5
	3	46	15.6	16.1	20.6
	4	132	44.9	46.2	66.8
	5- Very well	95	32.3	33.2	100.0
	Total	286	97.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	8	2.7		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 63

Set Personal and Professional Goals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	5	1.7	1.8	1.8
	2	9	3.1	3.2	4.9
	3	50	17.0	17.6	22.5
	4	116	39.5	40.8	63.4
	5- Very well	104	35.4	36.6	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 64

Organize My Work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	4	1.4	1.4	1.4
	2	16	5.4	5.7	7.1
	3	54	18.4	19.2	26.3
	4	102	34.7	36.3	62.6
	5- Very well	105	35.7	37.4	100.0
	Total	281	95.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	13	4.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 65

Use Computer Technology

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	9	3.1	3.2	3.2
	2	16	5.4	5.7	8.9
	3	70	23.8	24.9	33.8
	4	99	33.7	35.2	69.0
	5- Very well	87	29.6	31.0	100.0
	Total	281	95.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	13	4.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 66

Manage My Time

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	10	3.4	3.5	3.5
	2	14	4.8	4.9	8.5
	3	71	24.1	25.0	33.5
	4	104	35.4	36.6	70.1
	5- Very well	85	28.9	29.9	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 67 provides responses to a question of how well NJCU provided them with the necessary professional skills and information. Respondents answered on a scale ranging from one to five—one being not very well; five being very well. Over 80% responded with a four or five, demonstrating they felt NJCU did a good job in providing the necessary information and opportunity to learn the requisite skills of their professions.

Table 67

Program Provided Necessary Professional Skills and Information

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	1	.3	.4	.4
	2	13	4.4	4.6	4.9
	3	33	11.2	11.7	16.6
	4	132	44.9	46.6	63.3
	5- Very well	104	35.4	36.7	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		

When asked if they would recommend their NJCU program to others, 84% responded positively (table 68); and in response to a question of whether their program helped them develop necessary skills for future employment, 76% percent of the respondents replied their program did help them develop such skills (table 69).

28

Table 68

Would Recommend Program to Others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	5	1.7	1.8	1.8
	2	15	5.1	5.3	7.0
	3	26	8.8	9.2	16.2
	4	109	37.1	38.4	54.6
	5- Very well	129	43.9	45.4	100.0
	Total	284	96.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	10	3.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 69

Overall Program Helped Me Develop Skills Needed For Job I Was Looking For

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1- Not very well	6	2.0	2.1	2.1
	2	16	5.4	5.7	7.8
	3	47	16.0	16.7	24.6
	4	105	35.7	37.4	61.9
	5- Very well	107	36.4	38.1	100.0
	Total	281	95.6	100.0	
Missing	-1	13	4.4		
Total		294	100.0		

Financing Graduate Education

According to table 70, about a quarter (26%) of the respondents found it necessary to apply for a loan to finance their graduate education. Table 71 shows almost two-thirds (66%) of the respondents would have found a deferred payment plan helpful.

Table 70

Necessity of a Loan to Finance Graduate Studies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	74	25.2	26.0	26.0
	No	211	71.8	74.0	100.0
	Total	285	96.9	100.0	
Missing	-1	9	3.1		
Total		294	100.0		

Table 71

Would a Deferred Payment Plan Be Helpful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	186	63.3	65.7	65.7
	No	97	33.0	34.3	100.0
	Total	283	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-1	11	3.7		
Total		294	100.0		