

July 1967

Overcoming the Obstacles to Counselling Research

Marion F. Belka S.M.
Saint Mary's University of San Antonio

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr>

Recommended Citation

Belka, Marion F. S.M. (1967) "Overcoming the Obstacles to Counselling Research," *University of Dayton Review*. Vol. 4: No. 2, Article 13.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol4/iss2/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact mschlangen1@udayton.edu, ecommons@udayton.edu.

Overcoming The Obstacles To Counselling Research

by Marion F. Belka, S.M.

Introduction

Last week I informed the students in our Master of Arts Program in Student Personnel Services (or Counselor Education) of the lecture I was scheduled to give at this Fifteenth Annual Educational Institute sponsored by the Department of Education of Saint Louis University. I also apprised them of the specific topic of my lecture and then asked them to indicate what they believed were the principal “obstacles to counseling research.”

Their opinions, based only on their readings, class discussions and observations as teachers, included the following:.

1. Lack of data;
2. Lack of time for the typically preoccupied counselor;
3. Lack of unanimity of views or convictions, relative to basic concepts in student personnel services, among the recognized authorities in the field;
4. Too many opinions, paralleled by a lack of scientifically established principles;
5. Adverse public reactions to existing pupil personnel programs;
6. Too few follow-up studies of graduates and dropouts who received “assistance” from our present guidance and counseling programs;
7. Lack of sufficient funds for pure research;
8. The difficulties encountered when a researcher attempts to quantify or measure human qualities;
9. Lack of interest and support of existing student personnel programs; and
10. Lack of specific objectives for many of our present student personnel programs.

These were the principal obstacles according to the *opinions* of my students. These same obstacles, I might add, are also the typical ones listed in various texts dealing with research methodology in the broad field of Education and, in particular, in the area of student personnel services.

Although I do not wish to contradict either my students or the authorities in research methodology, I cannot say that I am in complete agreement with the typical enumeration of “obstacles” that we find in the literature today. More specifically, I would say that a careful examination and analysis of what I would designate as the

usual list of "excuses" will indicate that the human element is the common factor that underlies most of these "obstacles."

Without further hesitation, I offer the principal thesis of my paper: THE PRINCIPAL OBSTACLE TO COUNSELING RESEARCH IS THE LACK OF A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF PROFESSIONALLY PREPARED LEADERS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION. I will attempt to at least develop, if not establish, this thesis by considering this principal obstacle in the following five areas:

1. Our present teachers, counselors-in-preparation, and certified counselors;
2. Our present school administrators;
3. Departments, Divisions and Schools of Education;
4. State Departments of Education; and
5. Some national professional organizations.

Our Present Teachers . . .

I do not agree with Dr. James D. Koerner, President of the Council for Basic Education, when he states that "the undergraduates in education generally come from the bottom of the academic barrel, along with students in agriculture and business administration."¹ Neither do I agree with his assertion that his condemnatory statement is "a fact familiar to most academicians and reinforced by every major study that has been made of the subject."² However, I do tend to agree with the implications of the question raised by the professional educator, Dr. George J. Mouly: "If educators are opposed to research, specifically how do they propose to solve their problems?"³ He suggests that the answer seems to be in our reliance on personal experience, and that "it is generally believed that anyone who has been in the profession for twenty-five years is entitled to make dogmatic pronouncements on pedagogical procedures which require no verification whatsoever and are valid by fiat alone."⁴

Perhaps the problem is much wider in scope and we should not give the impression that only people in professional Education are at fault. In fact, Hillway seems to involve most graduate students when he states

The typical American graduate student seems to think of the graduate school as the unavoidable barrier which he must hurdle in his race for a higher degree. The degree itself, and not the education which he is receiving, too often is regarded as the main prize The degree may be necessary to insure the student's advancement in his profession; it is a tangible badge of achievement for all to see and admire. The student is tempted, therefore, to think of all the many requirements which block the way between himself and the degree . . . as annoying and arbitrary obstacles placed in his path by the graduate faculty.⁵

Hillway's solution to this state of affairs may seem a bit idealistic when he declares

that the graduate student should be an apprentice in scholarship,⁶ and that “in learning the vocation of the scholar, the graduate student must become familiar with the methods used in conducting sound research.”⁷

I found in my research for this paper that some of my views were expressed by authorities in the field; I present at least two of these views in the following questions:

1. Do some of our teachers go into graduate work in Education because of the pressure placed on them to improve their “qualifications” if they desire an increase in salary, even though they may possess limited academic suitability?⁸

2. Does our present practice of the “part-time, on-the-job approach” to graduate studies lend itself to productive scholarship and to the preparation of the dedicated, professional educators that we need in the classroom today?⁹

No doubt many of you are asking what solutions do I have to offer to remedy this situation for the teacher in the field. With due recognition of the complexity of the problem and within the time limitations that I face, I offer two suggestions which, if followed, should at least alleviate the problem for some of our teachers.

1. Make every attempt possible to obtain sufficient preparation in the principles and methodology of research — I would even say *demand* this of your professors and of your Graduate School in Education — so that you might engage in research activities on a personal or cooperative basis when the opportunity arises.

2. If you have the leadership that we need so badly in our profession today, initiate, instigate, or at least participate in *action research* — “on-the-spot research, aimed at the solution of an immediate problem”¹⁰ — in your particular school or system.

Not only can teachers become involved in such action research activities as listed above, but that grants can be obtained for such purposes is verified by at least one article in the December, 1962, edition of the *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*.¹¹

It is my impression that our counselors today are subjected to even more criticism than are our teachers. If you are not aware of this possibility, I refer you such books as *The Child Buyer* by John Hersey,¹² *The Brain Watchers* by Martin L. Gross,¹³ or the speech Representative Ashbrook of Ohio delivered on October 10, 1962, before the United States House of Representatives under the title “Nonacademic Brainpicking Tests Constitute Unwarranted Invasion of Individual Privacy and Parent-Child Relations.”¹⁴ These few references plus the recurrent articles in such scholarly journals as *Life*, *Look*, *Saturday Evening Post*, and the magazine section in our Sunday newspapers should give you some cause for concern.

It gives me even greater cause for concern when I read the responses of both elementary and secondary school counselors to two surveys reported by Dr. C. Gilbert Wrenn in *The Counselor in a Changing World*. In one question these counselors were asked “Which of your *present activities* as a counselor are *so basic* that they

should be maintained even with changed social and educational conditions that might be anticipated during the next 20 years?"¹⁵ Only 16 percent of the 242 responding secondary school counselors and 3 percent of the 138 responding elementary school counselors believed that they should maintain their activities in "evaluation, follow-up, (and) research."¹⁶ To assert that some counselors may not have been engaged in these activities and, therefore, could not in all honesty indicate that they should *maintain* similar activities in the future is no real consolation. When these same counselors were asked for their recommendations regarding emphasis in counselor preparation for the future, only 7 percent of the secondary school counselors and not even a half of one percent of the elementary counselors indicated more course work preparation was needed in "statistics and research."¹⁷

At least indirect contradictions of the attitudes expressed by these — should we say professionally prepared — counselors are numerous in the literature. Pepinsky and Pepinsky insist on the dual role of the counselor as both practitioner and scientist;¹⁸ Tolbert claims that the "counselor should use a research approach to his day-to-day work"¹⁹ and that "evaluation and research by the counselor should enable him to do a better job of counseling and help him to appreciate the importance of checking up on himself as well as making use of research of others."²⁰

Smith insists that the college student personnel worker should be a researcher and adds that "research is one of the essentials if student personnel work is to attain the professional status many in the profession desire."²¹

I conclude the first section of this paper with three recommendations which are offered more as reminders than as innovations:

1. As a dedicated, professional counselor, at least keep abreast of current research by reading such journals as the *Annual Review of Psychology*, *Review of Educational Research*, *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, and *The Journal of Counseling Psychology*.
2. Become or remain active in such professional organizations as The American Personnel and Guidance Association, one or more of its six divisions (on the national, state, or local level), and the National Catholic Guidance Conference.
3. Engage in individual or cooperative pure research projects or at least initiate and direct some action research in your local school situation.²²

Our Present School Administrators

I am sure that all of you are quite aware of the fact that American business and industry does not rely only on the three R's of reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic, but that its very life-blood is found in the fourth R, namely, research. The extent of American involvement in research is emphasized by the following statistics: "In 1960 some \$14 billion (2.8 percent of gross national product) was spent on research and development projects of all descriptions in the U.S., up from \$5 billion (1.4 percent of gross national product) in 1953."²³

Even a professional educator, namely, Dr. Carter V. Good, waxes eloquent on this very subject in his text *Introduction to Educational Research* when he states

The advances we are witnessing in the various fields of scientific endeavor are truly spectacular. Not only have we been able to accomplish feats that only a few years ago belonged in the realm of science fiction, but our achievements will undoubtedly become progressively more impressive. Of particular significance in this progress is the almost complete orientation of modern industry toward research as the foundation on which companies — and even nations — must depend for progress and, indeed, for survival. Those who did not experiment were left manufacturing buggy-whips and are no longer, while companies with a progressive and imaginative management have blossomed from backyard garages into national and international prominence. This is the story of America on the industrial and research front. Where new products can do jobs better, where sleeker cars can be sold, where wars need to be won, industrial reliance on research can be depended on.²⁴

What is the situation in the multi-billion dollar business of Education? Julian C. Staley offers one answer — one that you and I may not wish to hear — when he states that “no modern competitive business could survive long if it put as little money, time, and effort into careful research and development as our public (and Catholic) schools.”²⁵

Mouly is just as critical of our present school administrators whom he claims are frequently adverse to the conduct of research, will not conduct research themselves, and tend to refuse to give others permission to conduct research within their systems.²⁶ He is even quite caustic when he states that some of the research departments in our present school systems “cannot be accused of conducting research.” More specifically

School Systems, with financial disbursements in the millions, almost invariably are content with staffing their “research departments” with one or two clerks who, despite such titles as “Research Director,” do the bulk of their “research” by tabulating attendance records and attending to other clerical chores.²⁷

Fortunately, the above criticisms cannot be directed towards all school administrators. Mildred Whitcomb’s article in *The Nation’s Schools* entitled “From Winnetka to You: A Blueprint for Action Research,” describes the various research activities in her school system. This particular system we readily grant may not have the financial limitations that others cannot ignore; also, they have available and use consultants from Northwestern University, the National College of Education of

Evanston, Illinois, and the University of Chicago. Foundation support is obtained for not only system-wide projects, but also for some twenty smaller, independent research studies conducted by individual teachers and committees.²⁸

Although we cannot expect the busy school administrator to become personally involved in research, there are certain realistic expectations that we might express relative to the administrator.

1. A basic understanding of the nature, principles, purposes and methodology of educational research.
2. At least the encouragement of experimentation by teachers and even a certain degree of personal involvement in such projects. For, as one principal of a large (3,900 pupils and over 160 staff members) academic high school states,

when all is said and done, it is my firm belief that the most important factor in experimentation within a given school is the principal himself. A school is, as it has been said so often, “a reflection of the length and shadow of the principal.”²⁹

3. Cooperation with projects in pure research conducted possibly by some of his own staff members, staff members from the central office, or even graduate students who seek his cooperation and assistance.

If, to restate my thesis, “the principal obstacle to counseling research is the lack of a sufficient number of professionally prepared leaders in the field of Education,” our thoughts — and possibly an accusing finger — naturally turn to the departments, divisions and schools of Education, and particularly, the graduate programs in this area. For, as it has been said, “the graduate school is probably the key to the future of education, for, in no small measure, it determines the kind of leadership education will get both at the local and at the national level.”³⁰

Departments, Divisions and Schools of Education

Although we have no desire to emphasize the negative, nevertheless, we cannot overlook the sharp criticisms leveled at educational research by some of our own professional educators. Kerlinger points out that educational research is frequently characterized by triviality, superficiality and scientific naiveté;³¹ Eurich indicates that much educational research can be labeled as “the accumulation of irrelevant statistics in order to proceed from unwarranted hypothesis to a foregone conclusion;”³² and Brownwell believes that what he calls our “shoestring” approach to research has exposed us to the ridicule of our more scientifically sophisticated colleagues.³³ Perhaps Mouly, then, is correct when he suggests that “the difficulty probably stems in large measure from the lack of orientation toward research of the whole teacher-education sequence, a program in which answers — even at the graduate level — are more frequently given than found, and in which the answers that are given have unwarranted finality and universality of application.”³⁴

Yes, it is true that many graduate schools in Education require at least an introductory course in "Methods of Research." In addition to the fact that one course in research has very limited potential for developing research scholars (a view that is substantiated by educational leaders),³⁵ I would like to offer some statistics relative to the emphasis on research, or lack thereof, in our counselor education programs.

1. According to a government publication entitled *Status Preparation Programs for Guidance and Student Personnel Workers*, there were at least 223 institutions offering preparation programs at the graduate level for guidance and student personnel workers in the summer of 1956 and during the 1956-57 school year. Of the 152 schools, or 84 percent, that responded to a questionnaire, only 74 percent of these schools who offer a program on the master's level required a course in "Methods of Research and Evaluation (including statistics)." The average number of hours required was four semester hours.³⁶
2. In a survey that I conducted in 1961 among Catholic schools of higher education and reported on at the Seventh Annual Meeting of Catholic Counselors in Denver, 86 percent of these schools required on the average some 4.3 semester hours in the same area. A more careful analysis of this data indicated that only 61 percent specifically required a course(s) in research proper.³⁷

What positive suggestions do I have to offer relative to the departments, divisions and schools of Education?

1. Greater selectivity of candidates for admission, retention, and certification in teacher education, counselor education, and, most assuredly, in administrator education.
2. At least some basic introduction to the nature, purpose, and methodology of educational research in our undergraduate programs and a partial replacement of theoretical term papers with projects that stimulate an interest in research even if it is only on a very elementary level.³⁸
3. An extension of the preparation programs for counselors and administrators above the minimum state requirements with the possibility then of more extensive work in research and evaluation (including statistics).
4. A limitation on the graduate-student-load carried by full-time teachers who pursue their graduate studies on a part-time basis.
5. A more extensive participation of the graduate school Education faculty in pure research as well as publication (the two are not synonymous).³⁹ If we must "publish or perish," we can surely make a greater contribution to the professionalization of Education through scholarly research which should, in turn, stimulate our graduate (and undergraduate) students to greater interest and participation in research activities.
6. College-supported faculty research programs and even student research fellowships on the graduate and undergraduate levels. That such a "dream" can become a reality is verified by Woodward's recent article in *School and Society*.⁴⁰

State Departments of Education

All of us naturally look for and expect to find the highest degree of professional leadership in Education from our state departments of Education. One rhetorical question that I might ask is: "Do you and I always find this leadership at the state level?"

One possible indirect and partial measure of this leadership is evidenced — at least according to my opinion — by the state standards for the certification of various school personnel. In the development of this paper, we are particularly interested in the guidelines (or requirements) offered by the states concerning the preparation recommended (or required) for future school counselors and administrators in the area of *research*.

I am sure that all of you are well acquainted with the specific requirements in Missouri for certification of counselors on the elementary and secondary levels. Also, you are probably aware of the fact that although *you may take* graduate work in research and statistics, no work in these areas is actually required. It is possible, therefore, for a certified counselor in the State of Missouri to be completely ignorant of the subject matter covered in these areas. Just how effective and professional such a counselor could be is a moot question.

The situation is possibly worse in the certification standards for administrators in the State of Missouri. Although I did not obtain the latest requirements for the preparation of superintendents, the previous requirements did not even hint at the possibility of any preparatory work in research and/or statistics. Your present requirements for the certification of both elementary and secondary school principals also ignore these areas.⁴¹

The situation in Texas is very similar. Various references are made to research in Bulletin 574 of the Texas Education Agency, published under the title of *Standards for Teacher Education in Texas*. For example, in Standard III — Teaching Load, "it is strongly recommended that education classes which involve individual projects and research have no more than twenty-five students, and preferably fewer."⁴² And in Standard VII — Graduate Work, two references are made to research: 1) "All thesis work should be supervised by faculty members holding the doctor's degree with special preparation or experience in the field supervised;"⁴³ and 2) under "Faculty Load," the statement is made that "the essence of acceptable graduate work is in providing sufficient time for graduate instruction and research."⁴⁴ Nevertheless, we find no mention of specific requirements in research and/or statistics in the *preparation* of either school counselors or administrators.

I should add that the requirements for the preparation of administrators in Texas is under study at this time. Two groups, the Commission to Study the Preparation of School Administrators and the Board of Examiners, have planned the principal recommendations for the new 60 semester hour program. One of these groups, the Board of Examiners, recommends "Educational Research" as *one of*

the ten areas in which school administrators (including principals and superintendents) must take courses in at least *four areas* (12 to 18 semester hours).⁴⁵

A very logical question that any of you might ask is: "How much research is being done by the research departments, divisions or bureaus of the state departments of Education?" You will have to answer this question for Missouri or your own particular home state: I will limit my remarks to the state of Texas.

Except for a recent study of teacher education, required by our State Legislature, most of the reports that come across my desk deal with such topics as teacher supply and demand, student enrollments, expenditures, analysis of state-wide testing programs, and similar statistical (non-research) analyses.

My two recommendations relative to state departments of Education are self-evident:

1. A greater involvement in pure research of the personnel in these departments. Such research would not only be of great assistance to others in the profession, but also would stimulate administrators and counselors to inaugurate and conduct research projects in their own schools. These local projects are necessary if we are to solve some of the many problems we face each year.
2. A more definite encouragement, as specified in the certification requirements for administrators and counselors, for all graduate departments, divisions and schools of Education to offer, and even require, a more extensive preparation in the research area.

Some National Professional Organizations

Finally, in the last part of my paper, I will consider the role of two national professional organizations — the American Association of School Administrators and the American Personnel and Guidance Association — in the stimulation of research in Education.

In January, 1958, the Committee for the advancement of School Administration of the AASA published a booklet entitled *Something to Steer By*⁴⁶ which included some "35 proposals for better preparation of school administrators." Those proposals that have some bearing on research include the following:

Preparation for a career in school administration will require that a student devote at least one full-time, uninterrupted academic year to a planned, sequential program of preparation beyond the master's degree. (#12)

The school administrator is a practitioner, not a researcher, and the research required of him in professional training will recognize this distinction. (#17)

Adequate training programs mean vastly increased instructional costs (probably five times the amount now spent) in the area of educational administration — for field work, for teaching materials, for research bureaus, for small seminars conducted by teams of instructors and resource people. (#29)

On February 18, 1959, the AASA became the first national professional organization in Education to attach graduate study qualifications for membership. The official proposal, which was approved by a vote of 946 to 387, was worded as follows:

Beginning on January 1, 1964, all new members of the American Association of School Administrators shall submit evidence of successful completion of two (2) years of graduate study in university programs designed to prepare school administrators and approved by an accrediting body endorsed by the Executive Committee of AASA.⁴⁷

The accrediting body referred to above is NCATE. However, a review of NCATE's "Standards and Guide for Accreditation of Programs for the Preparation of School Superintendents and Principals" reveals no particular concern with the preparation of school administrators in the area of research. Standards V and VI, Curriculum and Laboratory Experiences, offer the following very general guideline: "The graduate curricula offered for superintendents and principals should be established to the extent necessary to assure competence for the positions involved."⁴⁸

In all fairness to NCATE, we should add that it is difficult to conceive that this accrediting body would approve a two-year program for the preparation of administrators if such a program did not include due emphasis on research.

The American Personnel and Guidance Association has issued several documents since the fall of 1961 relative to the need of a more extensive preparation of future counselors. The documents include:

1. "Standards for the Preparation of School Counselors" which appeared in the December, 1961, issue of *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*;
2. "Background Position Papers on Standards for Preparation of Secondary School Counselors" presented at the 1962 convention in Chicago for review and discussion;
3. The report of the Commission on Guidance in American Schools, authored by C. Gilbert Wrenn as *The Counselor in a Changing World* and published in 1962;
4. "A Statement of Policy — The Counselor: Professional Preparation and Role," a report of the Committee on Professional Preparation and Standards, published in the January, 1963, issue of *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*; and
5. "Working Paper on Standards for Counselor Education in the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors," a product of the ACES National Committee on Counselor Education Standards for the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors, prepared "For discussion in Local Committees and at the Boston Convention" in April, 1963.

Each of these documents makes some reference to the preparation required in the area of research (and related subject matter). The last-mentioned document prob-

ably gives the greatest emphasis when it includes a special Section V on Research and the following specific in Section II on Curriculum:

the curriculum provides opportunities for the development of understandings and competencies in . . . at least consumer knowledge of statistics and research methodology, with competency to conduct independent research which might be demanded of the practicing counselor; at least an introduction to data processing and programming techniques . . . ⁴⁹

It is a distinct possibility that APGA will approve the present recommendations of a two-year program for the preparation of secondary school counselors at its next convention in San Francisco in the spring of 1964. If such be the decision, there is no doubt that future counselors will receive sufficient preparation in the area of research and related topics.

In light of the above mentioned decisions and/or recommendations made by both the AASA and APGA, it is probably safe to say that our future administrators and counselors will receive much more preparation in the area of research than has been the typical pattern in preparation programs of the past.

Conclusion

If I may again recall the principal thesis of my paper, I stated that "THE PRINCIPAL OBSTACLE TO COUNSELING RESEARCH IS THE LACK OF A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF PROFESSIONALLY PREPARED LEADERS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION." It is my contention, and the implication of all the data that I presented in this paper, that the more *extensive* and *intensive* preparation of school administrators and counselors, as envisioned by AASA and APGA, will give us a much greater degree of assurance of the preparation of the dedicated, professional leaders that we need in the field of education, your profession and mine. Time is one of the important variables that will determine the validity of my thesis.

FOOTNOTES

1 James D. Koerner, "Teachers Get the Worst Education," *Saturday Evening Post*, June 1, 1963, p. 8.

2 *Ibid.*

3 George J. Mouly, *The Science of Educational Research* (New York: American Book Company, 1963), p. 399.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 400.

5 Tyrus Hillway, *Introduction to Research* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1956), p. 19.

6 *Ibid.*, pp. 24-26.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 23.

8 Mouly, 403.

- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 406. See also Stephen M. Corey, *Action Research to Improve School Practice* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953).
- 11 J. William Rioux, "New Dimensions in the Improvement of Education: Financial Support for Teacher Research," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, XLVI (December, 1962), 18-22.
- 12 John Hersey, *The Child Buyer* (New York: Bantam Books, 1960).
- 13 Martin L. Gross, *The Brain Watchers* (New York: Random House, 1962).
- 14 U. S., Congress, House, *Nonacademic Brainpicking Tests Constitute Unwarranted Invasion of Individual Privacy and Parent-Child Relations*, 87th Cong., 2d Sess., 1962, H. R. 10508.
- 15 C. Gilbert Wrenn, *The Counselor in a Changing World* (Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962), p. 118.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 194.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 195.
- 18 Harold B. Pepinsky and Pauline Nichols Pepinsky, *Counseling, Theory, and Practice* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1954), pp. 11-14.
- 19 E. L. Tolbert, *Introduction to Counseling* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959), p. 288.
- 20 *Ibid.*
- 21 Margaret Ruth Smith, "The College Student Personnel Worker as a Researcher," *The Journal of College Student Personnel*, I (October, 1959), 15.
- 22 A discussion of the types of action research possible for the counselor can be found in Ira J. Gordon, *The Teacher as Guidance Worker* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), pp. 331-332.
- 23 "The Fourth R." *Steelways*, September, 1962, p. 10.
- 24 Carter V. Good, *Introduction to Educational Research* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963), p. 386.
- 25 Julian C. Stanley, "Studying Status vs. Manipulating Variables," *Research Design and Analysis*, eds. Raymond O. Collier and Stanley M. Elam (Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa, 1961), p. 175.
- 26 Mouly, 392.
- 27 Mouly, 411. See also David G. Ryans, "Are Educational Research Offices Conducting Research?" *Journal of Education Research*, LI (November, 1957), 173-183.
- 28 Mildred Whitcomb. "From Winnetka to You: A Blueprint for Action Research," *The Nation's Schools*, LXX (November, 1962), 78-81. See also L. Weitz, "Developing a Favorable Attitude Toward Experimentation," *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, XLVII (February, 1963), 113-117.
- 29 Weitz, 115.
- 30 Mouly, 400-401.
- 31 Fred N. Kerlinger, "Mythology of Educational Research: The Methods Approach," *School and Society*, LXXXVII (March, 1960), 149-151, 363-364.
- 32 Alvin C. Furich, "New Dimensions in Educational Research," *A.E.R.A. Newsletter*, XII (April, 1962), 4-10.
- 33 William A. Brownell, "The Case for Educational Research," *Phi Delta Kappan*, XXXVII (February, 1956), 203-206.

- 34 Mouly, 398.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 402.
- 36 Paul MacMinn and Roland G. Ross, *Status of Preparation Programs for Guidance and Student Personnel Workers* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959), pp. 21, 23.
- 37 Brother Marion F. Belka, S.M., "Programs in Counselor Preparation in Catholic Colleges and Universities," Paper read at the Seventh Annual Meeting of Catholic Counselors, Denver, Colorado, March 26, 1961.
- 38 The author would be most happy to share some of his ideas relative to projects his students conducted in Adolescent Psychology and Guidance for Teachers.
- 39 Alexander A. Schneiders, "Publish What? Perish How?" *Catholic Educational Review*, LXI (February, 1963), 90-95.
- 40 R. H. Woodward, "College-Supported Faculty Research Programs," *School and Society*, XCI (March 9, 1963), 109, 115.
- 41 All of the above statements concerning the certification of administrators and counselors are based on documents received from the Missouri State Department of Education. Additional information found on pages 275-276 in the Thirty-Eighth Yearbook, 1960, of the AASA indicates that a special committee of Missouri's Association of School Administrators prepared a list of recommendations for the preparation of superintendents. This list, released in the summer of 1958, includes the recommendation that the "graduate training program of the applicant for the Superintendent's Certificate should be of such quality and scope as to indicate a satisfactory competency in . . . Research and Measurement."
- 42 *Standards for Teacher Education in Texas*, Bulletin 574 (Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1955), p. 8.
- 43 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- 44 *Ibid.*
- 45 *Report of the Commission and Recommendations of the State Board of Examiners on the Proposals for the Preparation of School Administrators* (Austin: Texas Education Agency, January, 1963), p. 7.
- 46 Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, *Something to Steer By* (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1958).
- 47 *Professional Administrators for America's Schools*, Thirty-Eighth Yearbook (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1960), p. 277.
- 48 *Standards and Guide for Accreditation of Programs for the Preparation of School Superintendents and Principals* (Washington: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1960), p. 9.
- 49 *Working Paper on Standards for Counselor Education in the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors*, A Report Prepared by ACES National Committee on Counselor Education Standards for the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors (Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1963), p. 5.