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## ABSTRACT
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## sUMmary or mindings

1. The most comepicuous development in graduate education at California's calleges and uaivarsitios during racant yearm tan bean che ahift of enrolimente to a tew fields with corranponding lonses in many otherw. In general, the rapidiy expandiag programe are in "applied" aubjacts; thome ahrinking is encollmate are in the tradicional liberal arty fields.

Amoas the changes withia individusl Riclds of study betwean 1978 and 1982 at the Callfornie state Duiversity and that Dadversity of Califordia, thase are motable:

- Prograns in foraign laguagen sustainod more coasistent and broadscale loases than those in any other diaciplisa. Of the 42 graduate prograna in Freach, German, and Spanieh offered by both eegmente, 37 lost caroliment; half of the programo lost more thas 20 percent of their studants durine the five-year period.
- Progyans in computer scienca onjoyed the mont consistent increases. All fat two of the 18 programs gained in majors, 13 of then more than doubling la sise.
- A majority of prograns in all branches of ongineering showed impresuive gaine, as encollmente in half of all prograna in the major apecialties fincraaced by more than 20 percent. At the aase time, however, one of
$\because$ overy throe prograns loat students, and fower doctorates were conferred in 1982 than in 1978.
- Graduate prograns in English on six State Uaiversity canpuses have lost more than one-third of thaif earollmants siace 1978. Enrollmente fell in 16 of the 19 programe in Ragiish, as they did in all ais program in linguiatica, and five of the six programs in philosophy.
- Among the metural sciance discipliaes, oniy progrtas in biology show appreciable losses. Of the 21 programe in gemaral biolosy, 18 lost enrollments. The declise in general biology has not resulted from a shift to the more specialised prograna in botany, biochenistry, microbiology, or zoology as graduate programe in 111 these subjects, eapecially in the state Univeraty, dropped sharply at well.
- Although fewer students carned master's degrees in education in 1982 than in 1978, degrees in this field still represent one-third of all graduate degrees conferred by the state Vaiversity and one-fifth of all master's degrees awarded in California in 1982.
- In view of the heavy earolimont declines in the social sciences nationally, the Vaiversity's-graduate programs in theae subjects have fared aurprisiagly well since 1978. Social science programs in the state laiveraity, howover, have suffered staggoring loasea. All nine program in anthropology and all 14 programs in history lost atudents,
ft did aight of the 10 prograna in geography, 10 of the 11 in political scieace, and eipht af ioe 10 in sociokogy. Three-fourthe of all progtana currently offered in thase disciplines lont at leant 20 perceat of their ancoilmante duriag the five-year period, and many lost more than that. Only two of the 63 prograns in the social science disciplines awarded more than 10 mater's degreen in 1982; most awarded fowes than five.
- Enrollments in business adininistration programs in the Uaiversity of Californis tncreased 95 percent in fiva years. Degrees in businens now eccount for 16 perceat of all master's degrees awarded by the Uaiversity and 14 percent by the State Univernity. Independent institutloss, howiver, conferred over 4,500 manter's degrees in businese in 1982, wore than twice as many an the University and state Univeraity combined.

2. A second important development is the growth of graduate enroliments in independent inatitutions. While graduate encollments in the Uniweraity of California and the Califoraia state Uaiveraity incrased slightly during the past decade (from 88,000 in 1973 to 91,000 in 1982) erarollments in independent univeraitien were up 62 percent. As a regule, 40 percent of all graduate students in the siate are now enrolled in independent institutions.

- Almost one-third of all master's degrean awarded by independent univernities in 1982 were in business administration.
- Independent institutions awarded 42 percent of all master's degrebs in eagineering and close to 40 percant of those in education in Califoraia in 1982.
- Califoraia's independent institutions conferred 574 doctoral degrees in paychology, one-fifth of all Ph.D.s in paychology in the country in 1982.

3. Another development, with inplications far the differenciation of function provisions of the Master Plan, concerns the proportion of graduate to undergraduate enrollments at the Univeraity of California and the California State University. Dapite the ateady demand for graduate education in public universities, graduate encollments as a proportion of total earollments bave declined in both the University of California and the California state UAiversity to 20 percent. Ten years earlier, graduite enrollmenta amounted to 30 percent of total enrollment in the University and 23 percent in the state University.
4. The percentages of women and men earolled in graduate education continue to change aigniftcantly.

- Between 1978 and 1982, women continued to increase their share of graduate degrees earned in most fields of study in California's public and independent universities. Tha number of manter's degrees
awarded to moinen increased 9 percent is the University, spercent in che scate thiversity, and 22 percent in independent insticutinat during this period. The number of doctorates earned by mpmen increased 30 percent in the University and 27 percent in independent universicies.
- In ali but one tield (educition), women increased their percentige of degrees awarded, deapite receiving fewer.degrees in mome subjects than five years ago. The muber of men earning degrees in those fields was decliaine even more rapidly.
- The number of wonen enchiag mascit's dogrees in business adminise tration and computer science has roore than doubled since 1978. Wemea received 28 percent of all master's degreen in business in 1982, and 21 parcent of the mater'm degrees in computer melence.
- Deapite a 24 percent drop in the mumer of manter's degrees in education earned by women, they still accounted for over 70 percent awarded in this field. Woman also received just over 50 percent of the doctorates in education in 1982.
- Almost one-fourth of the doctorates awarded to women were in the freld of psychology. Of these, 88 percent ( 269 of the $310 \mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D} . \mathrm{B}$ ) came from indapendent inatitutions.
- The number of men encolled in gradunte programin the State University has declinod wore than 10 percent during the last five years (from 30,712 to 27,564). Male anrollmente in the University of California incresaed by 7.5 percent duriag the same period.

5. As a group, the percentage of ethnic minority students enrolled and earning degrees has incressed at all levels in both segments siace 1978. The record for separate minority groups varies however.

- Asian students continue to increase their representation at the graduate, as well as the undergraduate levels. Asian students made up 10 percent of the sraduate encollment in the Univeraity and 8 percent in the State Universtity in 1982. In the 1980 Census, Asian Americans represented 4 percent of the 22-30 age group in the State's population as a whole ( 207,000 of $5,020,000$ ).
- Asian students concentrate teavily in engincering and computer science prugrams in both the University of Californta and the California State University. They represent 20 percent of all students in engineering in the Uaiversity and 30 percent in the State University.
- The percentage of Kispanic graduate students is up in both segments to ; percent in the University and 7.6 percent in the State Univernigher in both cases than the percentage of Hispanics receiving or's degrias in that segment. In the State's population as a Kispanics make up 21 percent of the $22-30$ age group (1,055,000 ( or $3,020,000$ ).
- Blick students as a percentage of total graduate enrollments fell berween 1978 and 1982 to under 4 percent in the University and just over 5 percent in the State Uaiversity. In the 1980 Census, Blacks made up 8 percent of those between 22 and 30 yesrs of age in California (4no: 000 of $5,020,000$ ).
- Both Black and Hispanic students represeat a small proportion of the enrollments in engineering, computer science, biological snd physical sciences, business administration, and ietters in both segments.

6. Ioreign atudents conatitute a significant portion of graduate enrollments in eaveral fields of study.

- In 1982, foreign studente received one-fourth of all doctorates and nne-fifth of all master's degrees awarded by the Univeraity of Califoraia. In computer science and sevaral eagineering fields, over half of the doctorates went to foreign atudents. The high proportion of graduafe degrees awarded to foreign studenth in these fields appears to have resulted not so much from increased numbers of such student: but from declining numbers of domestic students.

7. Job prasects for graduate atudents in many disciplines remain uncertain.

- In most of the liberal arts disciplines, prospects for academic employsent for new Ph.D.a appear highly unfevorable for at least 10 more years. Efforts to expand non-acadeanic opportunities for Ph.D.a in the humanities and social seiences have wet with quite limited success.
- In most of the liberal arts disciplines, the master's degree may have losi its value as a credential for employsent.


## INTRODUCTION

## RATIONALE AND SCOPE OF THE REPORT

Several purposes underlie most graduate-level education ana account for its significance to the social, fconomic, and intellectusl life of California and the nation at large:

- Graduate programs exist to educate and credential scientists, scholars, and other professionals in all fields of knowledge.
- In the procens, graduate prograns not only preserve and tranomit highly specialized knowledge but also produce new knowledge through research and refine existing mowle-ge through advanced scholazship.
- Graduate programe also establich standards for critical judgment, rational discourse, and intellectual performance across all fields of knowledge and yrofensional practice.

These functions result directly in technologicsl advances, economic development, and overall improvement is the quality of life of all Anericans and contribute to the mintenance of a hume society and civilized existence.

During the past few geary, these aims and functions of graduste education have been the subjest of extensive discussion. In 1980 , speakers addressed the "philosophy and future of graduate education" at a conference at the University of Michigan, and their papers were. subsequently published in a book under that title by the University of Michigan Press (Frankena, 1980). In Fall 1981, "Graduate Education: Prospects for the Future" by William G. Bowen, President of Princeton, appeared in the Educational Record. In December 1983, the National Comaission on Scudent Financisi Assistance issued "Signs of Trouble and Erosion: A Report on Graduate Education in America." Almost simultaseously, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published Scholarship and Its Survival: Questions on the Idea of Graduate Education by Jarosiav Pelikan, Sterling Professor of History and former Dean of the Graduate School at Yale. Other booke, articlas, and special reports continue to appear on the abject.

This widespread attention has been prompted by several conditions which, taken together, promise to alter the direction graduate education has been taking for the past two or, three decades and thus force a reconsideration of the assumptions that have shaped its developsent during this period:

- One condition is the current financial squeeze throughout higher education, which is especially acute at the graduate level where costs to both student and institution are proportionately highegt and where federal research and fellowship funds have dwindled in the face of soaring instructional and equipment costs.
- An even more important condition, particularly in liberal arts disciplines, has been the job market for new faculty members -- the traditional career expectation of graduate students in most of these fields. Except
in a few subjects, this market has been so depressed for the past ten years that graduate enrollments were bound to suffer. Prospects for the imsediate fature look no brighter. In contrast, enrollments in a few engineering and business fields have been booming, and efforts to meet this demand without wrenching the curriculum out of shape and distorting the overall mission of universities call for administrative judgments of the most demanding kind.

For these and other reasons, a review of recent developments in graduate education in California seems timely.

This report, based largely on information in the Comaission's files conceraing enrolleiencs and degrees awarded, presents astatistical record of California graduate education during the past six years and attempts to identify the major issues in graduate educaizion that have public policy implications for the State. While it presents some national statistics for the sake of perspective, it focuses on California issues; and while it includes some data from California's independent institutions, it deals primarily with graduate education in the Uaiversity of Califoraia and the California State University. Because the Comassion's bienpial reports on education in the health sciences cover issues of postbaccalaureate education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions, this report concentrates on academic master's and doctor's degrees rather than what are called "first professional degrees."

The Comaission's statistical information relating to enrollments and degrees awarded not only allows for a discussion of such program characteristics as growth or decline of enrollments, ratio of enrollments to degrees, degree production in relation to similar programs, but it also makes possible a description of atudent characteristics in relation to particular programs on individual caspuses. For example, the age, sex, and ethaicity of students receiving degrees in chenical engineering chroughout the University or State University can be compared over the past eight years. The present report, however, deals more extensively with progras characteristics than student characteristics, except for a discussion of ethnic winority and foreign students in Part Four.

Because of the heavy emphasis on numbers throughout the report, it might appear that the Comission views the size of programs and the number of degrees they award as the primary measure of their importance: 'that is, of course, not its intention, since some essential fields of study vill never attract large enrollments. Nevertheless, the size and changes in size of a program, especially in relation to other programs in the same field, are such basic consideration in program planning and review that careful attention to these facts needs no apology.

Admittedly, this report cannot deal in detail with all the issues that confront graduate education. Whether the substance and content of graduate programs are properly suited to present circumstances, whether there is too great an insistence on narrow original research at the expense of mastering broad areas of knowledge, whether pedagogical techniques receive too little attention in graduate programs for prospective teachers and faculty members, and whether graduate programs are evaluated by proper standards of quality by appropriate bodies -- all matters of great importance to the social,
intellectual, and economic future of the State and nation $-\infty$ are beyond the scope of this report. The report does, hot ver, attempt to provide a statistical foundation for informed discussion of these issues and for institutional decisions regarding thew, in the hope of strengthening graduate education throughout California.

## ONE

## HISTORY AND PROSPECTS OF GRADUATE STUDY

## GROWTH OF THE DOCTORATE NATIONALLY

Seen in relation to the 350 -year tradition of baccalaureate education in this country, graduate education has a relatively short bistory. Even though a few European miversities were awarding the doctorate as early as the fifteenth century, American colleges, based on the Eaclish model, resiricted themselves to undergraduate education until lale avarded the first Ph.D.s in this country in 1861 -- one in philosophy, one in physics, and one in clasaical languages. With a growing emphasis on professionalisa in a wide raage of occupetions after the Civil War and the founding in 1876 of Johns Hopkins University as the nation's first full-fledged graduate institution, the stage was set for the emergence of graduate study as a standard function of American universities. Still, there was no strong rush into the pursuit of the American doctorate. By 1910, only about 8,000 doctoral degrees had been conferred in this country (Mational Center for Education Statistics, 9982 , p. 131). Until 1917, many American students preferred to continue their graduate atudies in German uaiversities, and by then over 10,000 of them had returned to America with German Ph.D.s.

The German university tradition with its emphasis on broad examinations and a published dissertation came together with the credit-hour approach of American colleges to shape the doctorate as it became established in the United States. The move toward standardization of Ph.D. requirements was soon underway, with the Association of Aserican Universities being founded in 1900 largely for this purpose. Shortly thereafter, the National Aasociation of State Universities and the American Association of University Professors sought agreement on uniform degree standards; and by the end of World War I, residency, language, and dissertation requirements that would endure for over half a century had been established (Harris, Troutt, and Andrews, 1980, F. 5).

The emphasis in American doctoral programs from their earliest development has been on or ginal research suitable for publication, even though the most common career outlet for a majority of Ph.D. recipients has been teaching at the undergraduate level. Increadngly, the Ph.D. has become the necessary credential for membership in the professoriate. At the same time, the intensive specialization evident in all areas of knowledge has caused new disciplines to seek to award the Ph.D. as an indication that they have come of age. As the so-called "applied" fields sought recognition within the dcademic communty, they also pressed for their own degrees, with the result that by 1940 , Ph.D.s were being awarded in such fields as agriculture, business, education, engineering, home economics, library science, nursing, and social work (Eerelson, 1960, p. 27); and their recipients were taking jobs in government, industry, and other non-campus settings as well as in teaching.

These developments stirred conaiderable controversy among college and univeraity faculties, some of whom felt atrongly that the Ph.D. should remaia an acadenic degree awarded only to those comitted to lifeloag scholarahip in one of the traditional diseiplines. Meanwile, the nature and purpose of all doctoral degrees was being complicated as some professional fieldi began avoiding the "Doczor of Philosophy" label and issuing doctorates in their own subjecta -- replaciag the Ph.D. in Engineering, for example, with the Doctor of Engineering or "D.E." degree. Harvard had awarded the first Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in 1920, and thereafter the gate wis opened for a wave of new doctoral ticles, including such presentoday degrees as Doctor of Agriculture (D. Agri.), Doctor of Sacred Hanic (D.S.M.), Doctor of Science in Hygiene (D.S. Hyg.), and Doctor of Recreation (D. Rec.).

Despite-this proliferation of degree titles, the prestige of the Ph.D. has held firw, cauaing professional doctorntes in specialized fields to emulate the Ph.D. model. For example, the Ed.D. degree has for years differed from the Ph.D. in Education chiefly in haviag no foreign language requirement; and a 1971 survey of 113 institutions found oaly minor differences in the content and requirements of their Ed.D. and Ph.D. programe (Harris, Troutt, and Andrews, p. 11).

Even with the expanding number of doctoral titles, however, the number of doctoral degrees awarded did not increase greatly until the mid-1960s, as Figure 1 illustrates.

FIGURE 1 Earned Haster's and Doctor's Dogrees Conferred by American Institutions of Bigher Education, 1949-50 Through 1981-82


Source: National Center for Education Statistics, 1982, p. 130; and The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 11, 1984, p. 18.

Enrollments were then soaring at every academic level, of course, but doctoral programs were increasing more rapidly than undergraduate programs, as evidenced by the increased ratio of new doctorates to B.A.s. By 1970, the nation's colleges and universities were awarding one doctorste"for every 26 bachelor's degrees, compared to one for every 39 in 1960, and one for every 67 in 1950 (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982, p. 130, reproduced as Table 1 below).
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TABLE 1 Earned Degrees Conferred by American Institutions of Higher Education, by Level of Degree, 1869-70 Through 1979-80
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Source: National Center for Education Statistics, 1982 p. 130.

Several developments contributed to this dramatic increase in the number of doctorates awarded. The boom in undergraduate enrollments led to dire forecasts of an iapending shortage of college instructors in virtually all fields of study. This concern prompted the federal government to enrich its graduate-level financial aid prograns; it also inspired more institutions to expand into doctoral level work -- a course of action that usially met with little resistance, sinc- doctoral instruction wan not only an inducement for attracting new faculty but also a solid indication that the institution had arrived academically. Furthermore, the expansion of knowledge was acceleraring -- the term "knowledge explngion" came inco common use -- and graduate study, preferably at the doctoral level, was increasingly taken for granted as one measure of an individual's supericr intellectual competence.

These and other conditions reaulted in the number of doctoratea increasing from 9,829 in 1959-60 to 18,237 in 1965-66 and 29,866 in 1969-70. Basing their projections on this rate of acceleration, most forecapters, including the late Allan Cartter, were coafident that by 1980 the doctorates awarded annually would number between 50,000 and 70,000 (Mayhew, 1970, p. 1). Few forecasts have been further from the mark. The number of doctorates peaked in 1972-73 at 34,777 and hee slowly declined since then, slipping to 32,707 in 1981-82. Siace 1975, close to 8,000 or roughly one-fourth of all doctorates granted each year have been in education, a number which, combined with increases in a few fields, has kept the tota' relatively steady deapite significant declines in many of the liberal artic disciplines. Graduate enrollments in these disciplines have fallen off even more severely than the number of their doctorates avarded during the past decade, suggesting that the total decline in doctorates will continue for some time.

## THE DOCTORATE IN CALIFORNIA

The University of Califormia awarded its first doctorate in 1885 and Stanford granted its first in 1894. Berkeley and Stanford were the only doctorallevel inctitutions in Californis until the 1920s when they were joined in 1920 by the California Institute of Technology and in 1927 by the University of Southern California. The Claremont Graduate School awarded its first doctorate in 1937, and UCLA asoved into doctoral programs at approximately. the same time. Through the Master Plan of 1960, the State Colleges were authorized, under limited conditions, to award joint doctorates with campuses of the University of California. By 1982, doctorates were being awarded by all nine campuses of the University, three campuses of the State Uaiversity, 39 accredited independent institutions in California, and at least 70 unaccredited institutions.

As early as the 1920 s , Berkeley was awarding degrees in all ten of the broad disciplinary categories listed by the National Research Council, and by the 1950s it offered doctoral programs in 22 of the 24 categories. (National Research Council, 1963, p. 20; 1968, p. 16.) Since 1976, it has led all institutions in the country in the number of doctorates avarded.

As can be seen from Table 2 on page 10, over the entire decade of the 1970s, while Berkeley ranked first nationally in the number of doctorates granted, UCLA ranked twelfth, Stanford thirteenth, and USC sixteenth, respectively. The only other California university among, the nation's largest producers of doctorates duriag that decade was the Uaiversity of California at Davis, which ranked fifty-sixth. The number of doctorates awarded by each of these five Californis institutions over the past decade is depicted in Figure 2 below.

California's major institutions have achieved not only quantity but a reputation for quality as well, with Berkeley and Stanford scoriag at or near the top in overall nationil ratings of graduate programs since the 1960s, UCLA in the top ten, and Cal Tech aear the top in selected disciplines. What is particularly impressive about the showing of Berkeley, Stanford, and UCLA in these surveys is the brosd range of disciplines in which they have achieved a reputation for high quality.

As new campuses of the University of California were established after World War II, the issue arose of the extent to which each should be patterned on Berkeley and UCLA as major research and wide-ranging graduate-level institutions. In its 1967 Academic Plan the University confirmed the wishes of

FICURE 2 Earned Doctor's Degrees Conferred by Five Major Calífornia Universities, 1971-72 Through 1981-82


Source: Table 3, and National Center for Education Statastics, 1983, p. 134.
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## TABLE 2 Doctor's Degrees Conferred by sixty Large Institutions of Bigher Education, 1970 Through 1979-80



Source: National Center for Education Statistics, 1982, p. 134.
these new campuaes that all but San Francisco were to be•regarded as "general cempuses."

Although never precisely defined, this term was commonly interpreted to apply to the Berkeley-UCLA medel of education, whereby the campues were free to expand their range of graduate programs aore or less as local circumstances dictated. Spurted on by the national cowiern over an tapending shortage of Ph.D.s and the need to promise doctoral programs as a recruiting device for new faculty, the new campuses soon offered Ph.D. programs in most of che basic disciplines. As supply and demand conditions began to change in the 1970s, California found itself, as did many other atates; with excess capacity for producing doctorates in most fields of study. The issues posed by this condition will remain as high priority questions in statewide planaiag and coordination for the reminder of this decade.

## GROWTH OF THE MASTER'S DEGREE NATIONALLY

If doctoral programa in American universities have occasioned some questions and controveray, the nation's master's programs have remained even more unsettled and confused. Throughout much of its history, the master's degree has suffered from a lack of agreement on content and requirements. Only late in the $19 t h$ century did it begin to eatablish an identity after having previously been conferred upon those, as the U.S. Comissioner of Education put it in 1872, who "three years after graduation . . . are eagaged in literary or professional pursuits and who pay to their college a fee prescribed by its regulations" (Puraiss, 1973, p. 1772). These regulations typically could be sumarized as "keeping out of jail for three years and paying the five-dollar fee" (Mayville, 1972, p. 4).

Since then, the master's degree in some disciplines has acquired the reputation of being a consolation_prize for those unable to complete the doctorate; in others, such as the fint and performing arts, it has become a genuine terminal degree with high standards established and maintained by a national accrediting body. Like the doctorate, it has experienced an enormous proliferation of nomenclature, until today there are more than 150 different master's degrees offered in the United States. This vast array of degree programs, most of them in technical or occupational fields, contributes to the confusion of standards and thus to the uncertain academic significance of the degree at the present time.

One of the perennial issues concerning the master's degree during this century has been the extent to which it should be regarded as researchoriented degree. In most universities and many of the liberal arts disciplines, it came to be viewed as a steppingstone to the Ph.D., and its requirements reflected this concept by commonly including a reading knowledge of-at least one foreign laguage and the writing of a thesis based on original research. Another school of thought, however, has attempted to differentiate the master's from the doctorate, as the John Hopkins Board of Trustees did
early in this ceatury by declering that the master's was not an investigative dagree (Hayville, p. 3). The tension between these two points of view continues to characterize master's-degree prograns to the present day, as illuatrated by its status in ceacher preparation.

Before the master's vas adopted by a broad range of techaical and professional fields, it was primarily identified as a teacher's degree, since amority of its recipients have probably been school teachert and adninistratois. A 1939 survey indicated that three-fourths of all liberal arts mater's degrees then beiag carned in the United states were being avarded to public school teachers (Hayville, p. 3). By 1960, almont one-half of all the master's degrees avarded vere in the field of education, and each year since then it least one-third have been. Despite the recent surge of master's degrees in business, thay vere stili outmubered in 1982 by those in education -93,000 to 61,000 (Hationel Center for Education Statiatice, 1982, p. 130).

Growth in the numer of mater's degraes awarded in this country has pare alleled that of bacholor's and doctorel degrees, although by 1977 the master's had achieved ita haight of relative popularity. The number of master's degrees avardod that year peaked-at 317,164 , representing roughly one master's for every three bachelor'a degrees, compared to one for every seven in 1950, when 58,000 manter's degrees were awarded. By 1982, the number of manter's degrees awarded declined to 295,546 , and judging from current encollments, it is likely to drop oven further (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982, p. 130).

The future of the master's degree in a great many disciplines is highly uncertain. Damaged by the overall degree inflation of the past ten years, devalued by surplunes in some of its most popilar professional fields, lighty regarded in mogt academic circles, and serving primarily to certify supplemental training beyond what students receive as undergraduates but with little expectation that they will reach the frontieys of knowledge in that field or make significant contributions in the form of original research, the master's degree is in need of an across-the-hoard reexamination heretofore reserved oaly for the doctorate and, occassionally, the baccalaureate.

## THE MASTER'S DEGREE IN,THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Following a sequence -- but not necessarily a chronology -- similar to that in most states, the campuses of the now California State University evolved from normal schools to teacher's colleges in 1921 and then to state colleges in 1935. By the late 1940 s , several of them were primed to offer graduate degrees. Accepting the recommendations of the 1948 Strayer Committee Report that State Colleges be authorized to grant the master's degree, the Legislature granted that authority shortly thereafter. By 1955-56, the ten existing State College campuses were awarding over 1,200 master's degrees $\boldsymbol{p}$ year -15 percent of all the degrees they granted (Chancellor's Office, 1967, Section F, P. 2). Their number of master's degrees increased steadily into the 1970 s augnented by graduates of newly established campuses that moved alsost immediately into graduate-level instruction. The high point was reached in 1978, when the campuses awarded 10,146 mister's degrees, almost

19 percent of all their degrees. Since then, the number has dropped to between 9,500 and 9,700 a year, austained at that level largely by the pronounced rise in the number of degrees in business. Siailar to the aational pattern during the past two decaden, between 30 and 40 percent of all master's digrees granted by the State University have been in education, with the p :rcentage falling off slightly aince 1978.

In contrast to the Uaiversity of California, graduate enrollment in the State Uaiversity han always been overwhelaingly part time, varying from 85 percent in 1960 to 69 percent in 1970 and up to 78 percent in 1980 (Chancellor's Office, 1982, p. 110.1).

With a reduced demand for public school teachers and a general oversupply of Ph.D. $\mathrm{s}_{\text {in }}$ most fields, encoliments in man State University master's programs have declined draatically during the past five years. Statistical evidence of the decline appears throughout this report. What steps, if any, should be taken in response to this development constitutes one of the most important and difficult questiong in curreat statewide higher educatina planaing.

## THE FUTURE MARKET FOR GRADUATE DEGREE HOLDERS

Even though love of a subject and a desire for mastery still directs students to graduate study, recent economic realities have forced many beginaing graduate students to give the job market and career advancement primary consideration in their educational decisions. Certainly, graduate enrollments during the 1980s have been heavily influenced by perceptions of where the jobs are, or -- for those already employed -- by what further study is required for advancement. The grim prospects facing many graduate studenta who aspire to college-teachiag positions can be readily docuaented by the hundreds of applications subaitted for the few announced openings each year in English, for example, or history or sociology. Thus the condition of graduate education is directly tied to the job market, and any discussion of trends in graduate education must take employment prospects into account.

The future employment market for holders of graduate degrees has been notoriously difficult to forecast and job prospects can change significantly during the time it takes students to complete their program, depending as these prospects do on a whole range of uncertain circumstances. The nonacademic market for graduate degree recipients in the humanities and social sciences is especially difficult to measure. The size of the college student population, somewhat more predíctable than other determinants of academic employment prospects. is still subject to the uncertainties of college-going rates, recruitment of non-traditionsl students, student-aid policies, and other circumstances. In addition, the availability of research funds, itself a function of shifting federal priorities and the general health of the economy, has a major impact on employment opportunities, especially for graduates in the sciences.

Despite such conditions that make forecasting difficult, there is virtually unanimous agreement that the market for college teachers -- traditionally, the major market of new doctorates -- will remain depressed in all but a few
fields for at least another decade. According to William G. Bowen, President ofr-Priaceton Uaiveraity, "che ouklook for acadanic employment over the next fifteen yeors can only be deacribed an bleak" (1981, p. 20). "It is clear," Bowen arguep, "that at mo time durint this" period will the tocal demand for Ph.D.s in acndeme come clone to matching the correaponding aupply of Ph.Ds" (p. 23). And in a antional study of hmanities dectorates by Dprothy Earrison, Eraest May, and Lewis Solmon, they eatimated that "all jobs in Eaglish, including those in Commaity Colloges, during the 1980s could be filled by the Ph.D. $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$ that will ianue frion 15 inatitutions. All jobs in philosophy could be tilled by the products of ten iastitutions; all jobs is history by the products of eis inatitutions: Columbia, Wiscomsin, Basvard, Berkeley, Chicago, and Yale, leaving no jobs for Ph.D.e Erom Michigan, Senaford, Penn, Prisecton, Cormeli, Duke, Johns Blophime, etc." (Frankenn, 1900, p. 196).

One of the best meanures of current job proapecta is the amual sucvey of Ph.D. recipienta by the Mational Rascarch Coumeil. which ask the aployment status of graduates at the tine of completing their dagrees.'

Since 1976, the percentage of new Ph.D.s in all fields still serking appointment.s at gradustion has averaged about 25 percent. In sone ficids, however, the perceatage is much highar -m as of 1982, 40 parcant in anthropology, 34 percent in hietory, 32 percent in both foreign languages and Engilimh, and 29 percent in philosophy, compared to only about 10 percent in those fields 15 yeara earlier (Iational Research Council, 1982a pp. 16-21). Amons Ché 1982 Pb.D.s whose fibld of atudy was reported, the similest percent still secking appointeente at graduation were those in chemistry ( 16 percent) and econonica ( 15 persent). Although not reportad, the percentage of -those in buaineas administration and computer sciences vas probably smeller still.

The Matiqual Resencich Council survey is also valuable as an indication of how ilternatives to college teaching have been developiag during the past ten years. Thie aumber of Ph.D.fy finding employmen's in busimess and induatry has almost doubled in the last decade -.. Erom 1 ,896 in 1972 to 3,467 in 1982, ilthough this lattèr aumber repreneated only 11 percent of all Ph.D. recipients in 1982. As might be expected, opportunities in busisens and industry are greatest for graduates in engineering and the physical sciences. Roughly one-third of all 1982 Ph.D.s in engineering and chenistry found eniployment in private induatry. The proportion of new Fh.D. in taking jobs in the government has remained relatively stable for che past 25 yeara, averaging between 5 and 7 percent of all degree recipieats (pp. 8-10).

Despitefefforts to extend employment opportunities beyond the campus for doctorates in the humanities, graduates in these disciplines remain heavily dependent on academic appointments for employment. In 1981, 83 percent of the 68,000 humagitien ,Ph.D.a chen employed were at work in colleges and universities. Faced with a dearth of acadenic positions, arowiag number of recent humanities Ph.D.s are employed in nonaacademic setting. Of those who received degrees between 1977-1980, 25 percent were so employed, whereas only 6 percent of the 1960-64 group held other than acadeaic positions. But a majority of the recent graduates indicate that they took these non-icademic jobs because they vere unauccessful in finding college teaching positions (National Resenrch Council, 1983, pp. 60-61). Unless the content of doctoral programs in the humanigtic disciplines is drasticaliy altered --'and even this will not guarantee emplqyability -- it seems unlikely that the demand for graduates of these programs will improve soon.

The mont conapicuous tread in the career patterns of wew doctorates in the sciences is toward poatdoctoral intuly and research. In biochemistry, for example, 63 percent of the 1982 Ph.D.s had definite plans for postdoctoral study; in the other biological sciences, 49 percent; and in physici and chemiatry, 33 percent. Conversely, the percentage of new Ph.D.s in these fields planning to move directly into college teaching is surprising low -5 perceat in biochemiatry, 12 percent in the other biological sciences, 9 percent in physics, and 7 percent in chemistry.

In most disciplines, howper, postdoctoral study is not a viable option. Less than 1 percent of the $1902 \mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D} . \mathrm{s}$ in English, for exmaple, indicated such plans. Graduntes in the other humanitios and social science disciplines are oilly slighty more likely to engage in portdoctoral research -- an inportant reacon being that properiy remuerative grant opportuaifies are simply not available to them.

Doctoral recipienta in education have a career outlet considered only as a last resort by those in mast other fields: elementary and secondary schicols. Roughly 20 percent of all doctorates in education have been employed at the elementary or secondary level since 1960, although the percentage has been slightly lover during the past few years. Of the 1982 doctorates in education, only 32 percent found positions in colleges and universities, down from 50 percent in 1970 (Mational Research Council, 1982, p. 21).

In general, therefore, the experience of recent Ph.D. recipiente offers little hope that a significant non-acadeanc demand for doctorates, except in engineering and a few scieaces, can be developed. That few Ph:D.s are literally unemployed cannot obscure the fact that the doctoral progran as currently structured is designed to train scholars and research specialiats in 芦 $n$ academic discipline and the most suitable career outlet remains a. college or university appointment in that discipline. If compelled by circunstances to take a job in another field or in a setting outside the college or univeraity, some Ph.D.s have adjusted with notable success, but the assigment is seldom in complete harwony with the graduates's primary professional interests or with the mature of preparation provided by the program. Even with the recent declines in graduate earollments in a broad range of disciplines, supply and demand in the Ph.D. labor market promises to remain abnormally out of balance for the next five to ten years.

## RECENT TRENDS IN GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS AND DEGREES

## GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS DURING THE PAST DECADE $\rightarrow$

Not counting firat-profesional-degree students in such fields as medicine, dentiaty, and law, graduate enrollmenta in American colleges and uaiversities jeaked in Fall 1980 at $1,344,073$, having gromn by 19.6 percent in the seven yeara since 1973. Aí of Fall 1982, these national earollments had fallen off by 1.6 percent to $1,322,293$ students - leaving an overall increase over the ten-year period of 17.7 percent.

As can be seen in Figure 3 on pare 18, graduate enrollments in the nation's public collegen and univeraities , eaked in 1976 and have remaned relatively stable since then. In contrast, graduate enrollments in America's private or independent institutions continued to grow until the last year of the period -- increasing 39.6 percent during the decade, in comperison to only 8.1 percent at public inatitutions. As a reault, the proportion of graduate students enrolled in public institutions has declined from 71.1 percent of the total in Fall 1973 to 65.8 percent by the Fall 1982.

During the same ten years, graduate enrollments in Califorma's accredited institutions continued to grow, as Figure 4 shows: from 121,796 in Fall 1973 to 150,834 in Fall 1982. Deapite slight declines in 1976 and again in 1979, Califoraia's graduate encollments increased 23.8 percent over the period.

Graduate enrollments in the California State University peaked in 1977, while those at che University of California have remained relatively stable and increased slightly. Conbined graduate earollments in the University and the State University totaled 88,265 in 1973 and 90,834 in 1982 -- an increase of 2.9 percent. But their proportion of California's total graduate enrollments dropped from 69.5 percent to 60.2 percent over the period, since graduate earollments in California's indepeadent colleges and universities increased by 61.5 percent, due in part to the creation of new graduate-level independent institutions and in part to the expansion of existing programs. The additional institutions accounted for a relatively amall portion of this increase. Of the 27 institutions newly accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges sir-e 1973, only 12 offer graduate degrees -- all in a quite limited range of fields, several in theology alone. Among the reasons for the dramatic growth of independent graduate school enrollaents are the following:

- They make it possible to purgue the doctorate part time, and many of the甲 tailor the scheduling of all their graduate offerings to the convenience

FICURF 3 Graduate Sarollments in American Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1973 Fhrough Fall 1982


Source: Mational Center for Education Statistics, 1983, p. 93.

FICURE 4 Graduate Enrollmenis in Accredited California Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1983 Through Fall 1982

vote: California State University enrollments include both.master's and postbaccalaureate students. University of California enrollments through 1981 do not include interns and residents. Data on independent institutions are from 86 in 1973, 91 in 1974, 99 in 1975, 87 in 1976, 92 in 1977, 102 in 1978, 106 in 1979, 118 in 1980, 117 in 1981, and 118 in 1982.
Source: California Postsecondary Education Comission.
of we students. Enrollments at these institutions have thus become incressingly part tine.

- Some independent institutions make far more aggressive use of the media for recruitneit than any public aniversity.
- Sone -- by no means all -- have less demanding standsrds for admission an retention than public institutions.
- And many restrict their offerings to highly limited range of programs, often in such popular fields of stndy as business, education, and paycholegy. (Over one-fifth of all Ph.Ds in peychology auarded nationaliy in 1982 were griated by independent inetitutions in California.)

Whatever the causes for the increasing share of graduate earollments in independeat collegen and universities, it is a development that must be taken into account in statewide planning.

Despite the steady demand for gradunte educstion in the public ingtitutions, graduste enroilments as proportion of total public enrollments have'gradually declined in both the University and State Uiviversity since the early 1980s (Table-3, page 20). In the University of California, the percentage of graduate students dropped from mearly 30 percent in 1962 to sbout 20 percent in 1982, while in the state University the change was less severe, from 23 percent to just over 20 percent. In both cases, the saraller proportion of graduate teudents has resulted prinarily from increases in undergraduate enrollments, although reduced demand for graduate study in a number of liberal arts disciplincs has also had sone effect.

While neither segment has ever announced a desired ratio of undergraduste to graduate enrollments, the unexpectedly heavy demand for undergraduate admissions to the University of California during the past three or four years has raise a question about the appropriate distribution of effort in a segment wisse primery mission is graduate education and research. In its most recent graduate enrollment plan issued in October 1983, the University recognized the declining propartion of graduate students among its total enrollment and requested State fuading for ani additional 800 graduste students over a three-year period. Since these poaitions are to be distributed for the most part to the maller campuses, the situation at Berkeley and UCLA where undergraduate demand is heaviest will not be affected by any graduate student increases authorized in the 1984-85 budget.

While total graduate enrollments in the California State University have remained relatively stable during the past tea years, they have been more volatile-An theif diatribution-anoug discipitnes and have involved more pronounced changes in student characteristics than those in the University of Californis. These conditions will be discussed in more detail later in this report. Here it is worth notiag the significant decline in the enrollment of men ia state Uaiversity graduate programs over the past decade -from 33,436 to 27,564 , compared to a somewhat greater increase in the number of women -- from 30,067 to 37,113 . A stmilar pattern is evident in the
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TABEE 3 Enrollmants at Accredited California Colleges and Universities by Level, Sex, and Full-Time and PartTime status of Students, Fall 1973, Fall 1978, and Fall 1982

 1978 date oa 97; and the 1982 occ 118.
inurfe. California Postsecoodary Education Comisition.

University of Califorais and the independent institutions, but in neither of these segments is the reduction in actusl numbers of male graduate students so apparent.

The other notable difference between graduate enrollments in the two public segments, as illustrated in Table 3, is in the full-time, part-time category. The University has maintained a consistent full-time enrollment of between

93 and 94 percent among its graduate students aided partly by counting many doctoral students at the diasertation atage as full time. The State University's graduate encollments have always been predaminately part time, ranging from 73 to 78 percent duriag the past decade.

## GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE PAST HALF-DECADE

Hore important for most purpases than total earollmeats is the distribution of those enrollments among disciplines. The most reliable indication of how encollments have been divided among the varioum fields of atudy is a record of actual degrees awarded. This section of the report eraninea the relative diatribution of graduate degrees awarded during 1977-78 and 1981-82, first antionally and then in California, in 21 major diaciplianry categories.

These categories constitute 21 of the 24 used until recently by the National Center for Education Statistics of the U. S. Department of Education to classify acadenic subdivisions of knowledge and training. (Not included are the three categorien of law, ailitary iciences, and theology.) The 21, are characterized as follows (Iational Center for Education Statistics, 1970, pp. 7-10.)

- Agriculture and Matural Reapurces, including fields auch as agriculture, agronomy, animal science, horticuiture, agricultural economics, forestry, and runge mangement, hapiag to do with the production of food and management of natural fiber, plant, forest, and wildife resources.
- Architecture and Eaviromental Design, including interior design, landscape architecture, city and regional plananing, and other programs preparing students for a profession in designing buildings, communities, parks, or other aspects of the environsent.
- Area Studies in such fields as American, African, Asian, Buropean, Islamic, Latin American, and Slavic studies that are designed to study cultures iudigenous to specific geographic regions.
- Biological Sciences, iacluding bacteriology, general biology, general botany, ecology, genetics, microbiology, and physiology having to do with the science of the origin, growth, reproduction, and structure of life forms.
- Business and Management, including accounting, banking and finance, business "management and administration, marketing and purchasing, real estate, and transportation, related to the admialstration, control, operation and organization of public and private organizations.
- Commications, including advertising, journalism, and radio/television, involving the collection, preparation, and presentation of ideas and information through mass media.
- Computer and Information Sciences, including data processing, computer programing, syatem amslysis, and information sciences and systens dealing with data storage, manipulation, and computation.
- Education, including elementiary, secondary, higher, adult, and special education; the methodology and theory of teaching various fields, and other programs related to the administration and control of educational organizations and to instructionsl services within and outside of educational institutions.
- Engimeeriag, including aerospace, agricultural, biomedicil, chemical, civil, electrical, mechaical, nuclear, naval, and textile eagineering relatod to the design, production, and operation of syitems for using and controlling the aatural enoironment.
- Fine and Applied Arts, including applied design, art (painting, drawing, and sculpture), art history, cinematography, dance, dramatic arts, and music involving the creation and appreciation of stylized visual and nonvisual representations and symbols.
- Foreign Languages, including Latin and Classical Greek.
- Health Professions, includiris hospital and health care adainistration and all specialities having to do with the maintenance and restoration of physical and mental health, (expect in this report for first-professionsl degree program in dentistry, medicine, osteopathic medicine, podiatry, and veterinary merlicine)
- Home Economics, including clothing and textiles, consumer economics, child development, fanily relations, foods and nutrition, and institutional food mangement, including the science of foods and child, family, and home care.
- Letters, ranging from English through couparative literature, creative writing, linguistics, apeech, philosophy, and the teaching of English as a foreign language, iavolving literature and value systems related to ancient and modern cultures.. .
- Library Science, involving preparation for professional work in libraries and related agencies.
- Mathematics, including applied mathematics and statistics having. to do with the science of numbers and space configurations.
- Physical Sciences, ranging from astronony and astrophysics through chemistry, geology, geophysics, metallurgy, oceanography, paleontology, and physics, related to the basic nature of matter, energy, and assoc̣iated phenomena.
- Psychology, including counseling and social psychology dealing with behavioral and mental processes.
- Public Affairs and Services; including comanity services, law enforcewent and correcti as, public administration, and social work related to the managemeat and operation of gevernment agencies.
- Social Sciences, ranging from anthropology and archaeology through economics, geography, history, political science and government, and sociology, dealing with the past and present activities, interaction, and organization of human beings.
- Interdisciplinary Studies, involving more than one major discipline without primery concentration in any one area.


## Master's Degrees Awarded by Major Field of Study in the United States

Not only has the total number of master's degrees awarded in the United States declined each year since 1977-78, but the distribution of these degrees among fields of study has shown surprisingly pronounced changes during the relatively brief period between 1977-78 and 1981-82. Table 4 on pages 24-25 indicaten the number of master's degrees and the yercentage of the total conferred in the major discipline categories for these years, the number and percentage of degrees to men and women, and the change between the two years for each major field of atudy. Figure 5 on page 26 shows the change in numbers-for these fields over these five years.

Differences Among Fields: It is common knowledge that students in large numbers have recently been moving into certain fields of study and out of others. Still, the magaitude of the changes in the numbers of master's degrees awarded in variour diaciplines -- as one indication of these enrollment ehifts -- reasins impresive. The right-hand columi in Table 4, "Percent Change Between 1977-78 and 1981-82," reveals that in ten or amost half of all diacipline caregories, gains or losses df more than 15 percent in the number of degrees granted have occured since 1977-78. That degrees in a currently popular field such as computer science should increase by 62 percent is of course significant but not eapecially surprising since the base was relatively small. It is the level of change in some of the traditional, longer-established disciplines that attracts attention.

In sheer numbers, the gain of 27 percent in master's degrees in business and the decline of 32 perceat in education are conspicuous. While the largest share of all master's degrees conferred in the country is still in education, the portion in business has been steadily gaining. More than half of all master's degrees awarded in 1982 were in these two fields.

The declining number of degrees in the humanities and social sciences -much publicized at the baccalaureate level -- is equally apparent at the master's level, although not quite so extreme. The field of letters, consisting of English, philosophy, comparacive literature, and classics, among others, continued in a decline that began in the early 1970s. The number of master's degrees in these disciplines fell another 18 percent between 1978 and 1982, until only 2.3 percent of all mast $r$ 's degrees are in these subjects.

Even more dramatic losses have been suffered by the social sciences, including anthropology, economics, history, geography, political science, sociology, urban studies, and the various ethnic studies programs. While all these disciplines have not fallen off equally, as a group of core subjects in the curriculum their combined losses are especially significant. After reaching

TABLE 4 Master's Degrees Awarded in the United states by General field of study and Sex, 1977-78 and 1981-82

| Field | 1977-78 |  |  | 1981-82 |  |  | Percent <br> Change <br> Between <br> $1977-78$ <br> and $1981-82$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Earned | Percent Men and Women | Percent of Total | Number Earned | Percent Men and Women | Percent of Total |  |
| Agriculture and Natural Resources Hen Nomen | $\begin{array}{r} 4,023 \\ 3,268 \\ 755 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.3 \% \\ & 18.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 4,163 \\ & 3,114 \\ & 1,049 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74.8 \% \\ & 25.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.4\% | +3.5\% |
| Architecture and Environmental Design <br> Men <br> Women | $\begin{array}{r} 3,115 \\ 2,304 \\ 483 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84.5 \% \\ & 15.5 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & 3,327 \\ & \\ & 2,242 \\ & 1,085 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67.4 \% \\ & 32.6 \% \end{aligned}$ | $1.1 \%$ | +6.8\% |
| Area Studies Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 925 \\ \times 483 \\ 442 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.2 \% \\ & 47.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 750 \\ & 380 \\ & 370 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.7 \% \\ & 49.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0.2\% | -18,9\% |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 6,806 \\ & 4,400 \\ & 2,406 \end{aligned}$ | 64.7\% 35.3\% | 2.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 5,874 \\ & 3,426 \\ & 2,448 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.3 \% \\ & 41.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.9\% | -13.7\% |
| Business and Management Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 48,484 \\ 40,301 \\ 8,183 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83.2 \% \\ & 16.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | 15.5\% | $\begin{aligned} & 61,428 \\ & 44,359 \\ & 17,069 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{7 2 . 2 \%} \\ & 27.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | 20.8\% | +26.7\% |
| Communications <br> Men <br> Women | $\begin{aligned} & 3,296 \\ & 1,673 \\ & 1,623 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.8 \% \\ & 49.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.0\% | $\begin{aligned} & 3,327 \\ & 1,578 \\ & 1,749 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47.5\% } \\ & \text { 52.5\% } \end{aligned}$ | 1.1\% | +0.9\% |
| Computer and Info Sciences Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} \text { rmation } \\ 3,038 \\ 2,471 \\ 567 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.4 \% \\ & 18.6 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0.9\% | $\begin{aligned} & 4,935 \\ & 3,625 \\ & 1,310 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{7 3 . 5 \%} \\ & \mathbf{2 6 . 5 \%} \end{aligned}$ | 1.6\% | +62.4\% |
| Education :len womels | $\begin{array}{r} 118,582 \\ 38,281 \\ 80,301 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.3 \% \\ & 67.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 38.0\% | $\begin{aligned} & 93,104 \\ & 25,771 \\ & 67,333 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.7 \% \\ & 72.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | 31.5\% | -21.5\% |
| f.llsineering :1en vomen | $\begin{array}{r} 16,398 \\ 15,533 \\ 865 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 94.7 \% \\ 5.3 \% \end{array}$ | 5.3\% | $\begin{array}{r} 17,939 \\ 16,311 \\ 1,625 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 91.0 \% \\ 9.0 \% \end{array}$ | 6.0\% | +9.4\% |
| fine and <br> Splied Arts Men Women | $\begin{aligned} & 9,036 \\ & 4,327 \\ & 4,709 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47.9 \% \\ & 52.1 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2.9\% | $\begin{array}{r} 8,746 \\ 3,866 \\ 4,880 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.2 \% \\ & 55.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2.9\% | -3.2\% |

## $-24-35$ <br> BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE (continued)
BEST COFY AVAILABLE

| Field | 1977-78 |  |  | 1981-82 |  |  | Percent Charige Between 1977-78 <br> 1981-82 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number <br> Earned | Percent Men and Women | Percent of Total | Number <br> Earned | Percent Men and Women | Percent of Total |  |
| Foreign Languages Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 2,726 \\ 795 \\ 1,931 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.2 \% \\ & 70.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0.8\% | $\begin{array}{r} 2,008 \\ 609 \\ 1,399 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.3 \% \\ & 69.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 0.6\% | -26.3\% |
| Health Professions Hen Women | $\begin{array}{r} 14,325 \\ 4,265 \\ 10,060 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.8 \% \\ & 70.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 4.6\% | $\begin{array}{r} 16,503 \\ 4,006 \\ 12,497 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.3 \% \\ & 75.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 5.6\% | +15.2\% |
| Home Economics Hen yomen | $\begin{array}{r} 2,613 \\ 212 \\ 2,401 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.2 \% \\ 91.8 \% \end{array}$ | 0.8\% | $\begin{array}{r} 2,355 \\ 201 \\ 2,154 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8.6 \% \\ 91.4 \% \end{array}$ |  | $+9.9 \%$ |
| Letters Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 10,011 \\ 3,830 \\ 6,181 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.3 \% \\ & 61.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 3.2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 8,226 \\ & 3,126 \\ & 5,100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.0 \% \\ & 62.0 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2.8\% | -17.8\% |
| Library Science Men Women | $\begin{aligned} & 6,914 \\ & 1,384 \\ & 5,530 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.0 \% \\ & 80.0 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2.2\% | $\begin{array}{r} 4,506 \\ 799 \\ 3,707 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.8 \% \\ & 82.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.5\% | -34.8\% |
| Mathematics Men Women | $\begin{aligned} & 3,373 \\ & 2,228 \\ & 1,145 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66.1 \% \\ & 33.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.0\% | $\begin{array}{r} 2,727 \\ 1,821 \\ 906 \end{array}$ | 66.8\% $\mathbf{3 3 . 2 \%}$ | 0.9\% | -19.1\% |
| Physical 'iciences Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 5,561 \\ 4,620 \\ 941 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83.1 \% \\ & 16.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.8\% | $\begin{aligned} & 5,514 \\ & 4,318 \\ & 1,196 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78.3 \% \\ & 21.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.8\% | +0.8\% |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Psychology } \\ & \text { Men } \\ & \text { Women } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8,160 \\ & 3,919 \\ & 4,241 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.1 \% \\ & 51.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 7,791 \\ & 3,209 \\ & 4,513 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.1 \% \\ & 57.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 2.6\% | +4.5\% |
| Public Affairs and Services Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 19,953 \\ 10,445 \\ 9,508 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.4 \% \\ & 47.6 \% \end{aligned}$ | 6.4\% | $\begin{array}{r} 19,388 \\ 8,285 \\ 11,103 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.8 \% \\ & 57.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 6.5\% | -2.8\% |
| Social Sciences. Men Women | $\begin{array}{r} 14,634 \\ 9,784 \\ \because 4,850 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66.9 \% \\ & 33.1 \% \end{aligned}$ | 4.7\% | $\begin{array}{r} 11,951 \\ 7,438 \\ 4,513 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.3 \% \\ & 37.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 4.0\% | -18.3\% |
| ```Interdisciplimary Studies Men Women``` | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 4,487 \\ & 2,806 \\ & 1,681 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.6 \% \\ & 37.4 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1.4\% | $\begin{aligned} & 4,978 \\ & 2,840 \\ & 2,138 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.1 \% \\ & 42.9 \% \end{aligned}$ | 1.7\% | +10.4\% |
| total Men Women | $\begin{aligned} & 311,620 \\ & 161,212 \\ & 150,408 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.8 \% \\ & 48.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 100.0\% | $\begin{array}{\|l} 295,546 \\ 145,532 \\ 150,014 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.3 \% \\ & 50.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | 100.0\% | -5.2\% |

Source: National Center for Educatiom Statistics.

FICURE 5 Oractuate Degrees Amardod in the United states by Coneral Fiold of study, 1977-78 Through 1981-82


Source: California Postsecondary Education Conission.
a peak of 17,318 master's segrees in all the social meiences in 1973, their number has dropped each year since then to $11,951 \mathrm{in} 1982$-m a decline of over 30 percent in ten years. Master's degrees in history have declined wore than 50 percent durias the anme period and those in sociology by close to 40 percent (National Center for Education Statistics, 1982, pp. 128-129).

The field showing the greatest percentage loss in nubber of master's degrees since 1978 is library science -o the only applied field to lose gröund except public affairs and services, which had a modest decline. The foreign languages contfined a decade-long decline at all degreé levels, with 26 percent fewer master's degrees in 1982 than in 1978 . The auber of angter's degrees in mathontics also dropped noticeably, is large part because this discipline lost some of its students to computer and information sciences. Sigaificantly fewer master's degrees were awarded in the biological sciences, despice the fact that interest in theae gubjects remains strong at the baccalaureate and doctoral levels.

The sreatest percentage increase, after conputer science and business, gccurred in the health professions, attributable in large measure to the growing number of master's degrees in nurging. Master's desrees in engincering increased by 9.4 percent, while agriculture and srchitecture also increased their share of the cotal slightly.

Mascer's Degrees Awarded to Men and Momen: ${ }^{\circ}$ In 1981-82, for the first time more women than men earned master's degrees in the United Scates. This happened not becaase of any major increase in the number of women receiving master's degrees during the past few years -o there was actuslly a slight drop from 1977-78 -- but because the mumer of male degree recipients has fallen off so severely in the past five years.

Nevertheless, the gains made by women at the master's level, as at the baccalaureate and doctoral levels, are not to be discounted. Women increased their shate of master's degrees in all but three of the discipline categories, and in these three they essentially held their own. The number of women earning master' degrees in architecture, busineas and computer science more than doubled in five years, and almont doubled in eagineering. Women made strong gains in agricuiture and nataral resources, in the bealth professions, and in public affairs and services. The most impressive increase was in the field of business where women' share of master's degrees rose from 17 percent to 28 percent while the aumber of men earning these degrees was increasing substantially as well.

Fields in which the number of degrees earned by women declined significantly were in education, foreign langu'ages, library science, and mathematics.

In contrast, the number of men earning master's degrees decreased in all but three fields -- business, computer science, and engineering -- reflecting the sharply downward trend in male master's degree recipients overall since 1977-78.

Doctor's Degrees Awarded by Major Field of Study in the United States
Differences fmone Fields: Degrees at the doctorsl level -- up slightly since 1977-78 -9 have been momethat less subject than master's degrees to extreme increases or decreases in any field (Table 5, pages 29-30, and Figure 5). In general, however, the disciplines gaining or declining in the number of master's degrees are showing the same tendencies at the doctoral level -- with a few notable exceptions:

- The aumber of doctorates amarded in education has increased since 1977-78, in contrast to che large drop in master's degrees in this subject.
- Conversely, alighty fewer doctorates were awarded in business, compared to the heavy increase in master's degrees.
- Doctorates in the biological sciences were up 13 percent over the number five yeara earlier, moving this field into a distant eecond place behind education for the most doctorates conferred; at the master's level, on the other hand, degrees in biological aciences declined 13 percent.

Other fiolds in which the number of degrees at the two levels were moving in opposite directiona were paychology, library science, and public affairs and services, all dow at the master's level but u'v in the number of doctorates.

Subjects in which fewer degrees were awarded at both the doctoral and manter's levels included many of the traditional liberal arts disciplines -- letters, foreign languages, mathematica, and social sciences. Showing solid gains at both degree levels were engineering and the health professions.

Doctorates Awarded to Men and Women: One trend that is quite similar at both the master's and doctoral levela nationally is the steady increase in the proportion of degrees being earned by women in most disciplines. The gap between the number of men and women receiving doctorstde, while still pronounced, has been closing steadily since 1972, as each year fewer men and more women have been awarded the degree.

In a pattern identical at both degree levels, women gained in relation to men in all but three disciplinary categories, even, ibouich in letters and the sucial sciences, the gain occurred because the deciline in male recipients was more extreme than that for women. Women made imyressive gaing in actual numbers of degrees in education, biological sciences, and psychology. One conspicuous decline was in mathematics, a loss net compensated for by a proportionate increase in degreés in computer science.

In only a few fieldro- biological geiences, computer science, engineering, and the health professions, among them -- did the number of doctorates awarded to mén increase slightly or remain stable. The decade-long decline in the number of men earning the doctorate has as many fmportant social and cultural implications, of course, as the concomitant incresse in women receiving the degree. Some of the possible consequences of this development are touched on in Part Four of this report.

FABLE 5 Doctor's Degrees Awarded in the United states by Coneral field of study and Sax, 1977-78 and 1981-82

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1977-78} \& \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1981-82} \& Percent <br>
\hline Field \& Number Earned \& Percent Men and Women \& Percent of Total \& Number Earned \& Percent Men and Women \& Parcent of Total \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Between } \\
& \text { 1977-78 } \\
& \text { and 1981-82 } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$ <br>
\hline Agriculture and. Nitural Resources Hen Women \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
971 \\
909 \\
62
\end{array}
$$ \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
93.2 \% \\
6.4 \%
\end{array}
$$ \& 3.2\% \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
1,619 \\
925 \\
154
\end{array}
$$ \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 85.7 \% \\
& 14.3 \%
\end{aligned}
$$ \& $$
3.3 \%^{5}
$$ \& $$
+11.1 \%
$$ <br>
\hline Architecture and Enviromental Design Hen Women \& $$
\begin{gathered}
73 \\
\\
57 \\
16
\end{gathered}
$$ \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 78.1 \% \\
& 21.9 \%
\end{aligned}
$$ \& $0.2 \%$ \& 80

58

22 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 72.5 \% \\
& 27.5 \%
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 0.2\% \&  <br>

\hline | Area Studies |
| :---: |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Men } \\ \text { Women }\end{array}$ | \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
145 \\
100 \\
45
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 69.0 \% \\
& 31.0 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& $0.4 \%$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 98 \\
& 55 \\
& 43
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& { }^{{ }_{56} .2 \%} \\
& 43.8 \%
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& 0.3\% \& -32.4\% <br>

\hline $$
\begin{gathered}
\hline \text { Biologicat } \\
\text { Sciences } \\
\text { Hen } \\
\text { Homen } \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
3,309 \\
2,511 \\
\hdashline 798
\end{array}
$$
\] \& 75.9\%

24.1\% \& 10.3\% \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3,743 \\
& 2,654 \\
& 1,089
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
71.0 \% \\
.29 .0 \%
\end{array}
$$
\] \& $11.4 \%$ \& +13.1\% <br>

\hline Business and Management Men Women \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
867 \\
795 \\
72
\end{array}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
91.7 \% \\
8.3 \%
\end{array}
$$

\] \& 2.6\% \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 857 \\
& 705 \\
& 152
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 82.3 \% \\
& 17.7 \%
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& 2.6\% \& -1.1\% <br>

\hline | Communications |
| :--- |
| Men |
| Women | \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
191 \\
\quad 138 \\
\quad 53
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 72.3 \% \\
& 27.7 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& +0.5\% \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
200 \\
136 \\
64
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 68.0 \% \\
& 32.0 \%
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& +0.6\% \& +4.7\% <br>

\hline Computer and Info Sciences Men Women \& mation
196
181

15 \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
92.4 \% \\
-7.6 \%
\end{array}
$$ \& 0.6\% \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
251 \\
230 \\
21
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
91.7 \% \\
8.3 \%
\end{array}
$$
\] \& $0.7 \%$ \& +28.0\% <br>

\hline Education Men Women \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 7,586 \\
& 4,630 \\
& 2,956
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 61.1 \% \\
& 38.9 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& -23.6\% \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 7,676 \\
& 3,949 \\
& 3,727
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\% \\
51.5 \% \\
48.5 \%
\end{array}
$$

\] \& 23.5\% \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
+1.2 \% \\
1.2 \%
\end{array}
$$
\] <br>

\hline Engineering Men Women \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
2,440 \\
2,383 \\
57
\end{array}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
97.7 \% \\
2.3 \%
\end{array}
$$

\] \& 7.6\% \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
2,636 \\
2,496 \\
140
\end{array}
$$
\] \& 5.3\% \& 8.0\% \& . $+8.0 \%$ <br>

\hline ```
Fine\mp@code{and}
Applied Arts
Men
Women

``` & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 708 \\
& 448 \\
& 260
\end{aligned}
\] & \(63.3 \%\)
\(36.7 \%\) & 2.2\% & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 670 \\
& 380 \\
& 290
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 56.7 \% \\
& 43.3 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & - 2.0\% & -5.4\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline TARES 5 (cont & ed) & 1977-78 & DOCTORS & & 1981-82 & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{```
    Percent
    Change
    Between
    1977-78
and 1981-82
```} \\
\hline Field & \begin{tabular}{l}
Number \\
Earned
\end{tabular} & Percent Men and Nomen & Percent of Total & \begin{tabular}{l}
Number \\
Earned
\end{tabular} & Percent Men and
\(\qquad\) & Percent of Total & \\
\hline Foreign Languages & 649 & & 2.0\% & 536 & & \(1.6 \%\) & 17.4\% \\
\hline Hen : & 294 & 45.3\% & & 242 & 45.5\% & & \\
\hline Women & 355 & 54.7\% & & 292 & 54.5\% & & 8 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Health } \\
& \text { Professions }
\end{aligned}
\] & 654 & & 2.0\% & 925 & & 2.8\% & 41.4\% \\
\hline Men & 402 & 62.7\% & & 503 & 54.4\% & & \\
\hline Women & 252 & 37.3\% & & 422 & 45.6\% & & \\
\hline Home Economics & 203 & & 0.6\% & 247 & & \(0.7 \%\) & +21.6\% \\
\hline Men & & 28.6\% & & 73 & 29.6\% & & \\
\hline Womer & \% 145 & 71.48 & & 174 & 70.48 & & \\
\hline Letters & 2,069 & & \(6.4 \%\) & 1,681 & & 5.1\% & -18.7\% \\
\hline Men & 1,261 & 61.0\% & & 951 & 54.5\% & & \\
\hline Women & - 808 & \(39.0 \%\) & & 766 & 45.5\% & & \\
\hline Library Science & 67 & & \(0.2 \%\) & 84 & & \(0.2 \%\) & +25.3\% \\
\hline Hen & 43 & 64.2\% & & 31 & 37.0\% & & . \\
\hline Women & 24 & 35.8\% & & 53 & 63.0\% & & \\
\hline Ha thematics & 805 & & 2.5\% & 681 & & 2.0\% & -15.4\% \\
\hline Men & 681 & 84.6\% & & 587 & 86.2\% & & \\
\hline Women & 124 & 15.4\% & & 94 & 13.8\% & & \\
\hline Physical Sciences & & & \(9.7 \%\) & 3,286 & & 10.0\% & +4.8\% \\
\hline Men & \[
2,821
\] & 90.1\% & & 2,835 & 86.3\% & & \\
\hline Women & 321 & 9.9\% & & 451 & 13.7\% & & \\
\hline Psy=bology & 2,587 & & 8.0\% & 2,780 & & 8.5\% & +7.4\% \\
\hline Men & 1,621 & 62.7\% & & 1,518 & 54.6\% & & \\
\hline Women & , 966 & 37.3\% & & 1,262 & 45.5\% & & \\
\hline Public Affairs and Services & & & 1.2\% & 429 & & 1.3\% & +8.6\% \\
\hline Men & 267 & 67.6\% & & 245 & 57.1\% & & \\
\hline Vomen & 128 & 32.4\% & & 184 & 42.9\% & & \\
\hline Social Sciences Men & 3,583
2,713 & 75.8\% & 11.1\% & 3,065
2,240 & 73.1\% & 9.4\% & -14.5\% \\
\hline Women & ,870 & 24.2\% & & 825 & 26.9\% & & \\
\hline Interdisciplinary Studies & 301 & & 0.9\% & 393 & & 1.2\% & +30.5\% \\
\hline Studies & 205 & 68.1\% & & 242 & 61.6\% & & \\
\hline Women & 96 & 31.9\% & & 151 & 38.4\% & & \\
\hline TOTAL & 32,131 & & 100.0\% & 32,707 & & 100.0\% & +1.8\% \\
\hline Men & 23,658 & 73.7\% & & 22,224 & 68.0\% & & \\
\hline Women & 8,473 & 26.3\% & & 10,483 & 32.0\% & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: National Center for Education Statistics.

\section*{Graduate Degrees Awarded by Major Field of Study in California}

While it is informative to examine changes in the number of degrees awarded by California Lastitutions in each discipline over a five-year period, such \(^{\text {a }}\) a review take on another dimension when set againat similar national statistics Table 6 shows the percentage change in the number of graduate degrees in the 21 major ficids of atudy between 1977-78 and 1381-82 in the United - States and in California. Figures 5 and 6 on pages 26 and 32 portrays these changes geographically.

TABLE 6 Perrentage Change in the Nmbers of Graduate Degirees Avarded in the United states and in California, by General Field of Studys Between 1977-78 and-1981-82
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Discipline} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Masters} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Doctors} \\
\hline & U.S. & Calif. & U.S. & Calff. \\
\hline Agriculture and Natural Resources & +3.5\% & +25.5\% & +11.1\% & +2.48 \\
\hline Architecture and Environmental Design & +6.8 & +23.6 & +9.6 & +40.0 \\
\hline Biological Sctences & -13.7 & -12.3 & +13.1 & +5.6 \\
\hline Business and Management & +26.7 & +18.6 & - 1.1 & +5.8 \\
\hline Communications & +0.9 & -22.9 & +4.7 & -66.6 \\
\hline Computer and Information Sciences & +62.4 & +52.6 & +28.0 & +24.2 \\
\hline Education & -21.5 & -19.9 & +1.2 & - 2.2 \\
\hline Engineering & +9.4 & +2.0 & +8.0 & - 3.9 \\
\hline Fine and Appiied Arts & - 3.2 & - 7.8 & - 5.4 & -38.5 \\
\hline Foreign Languages & -26.3 & -18.7 & -17.4 & -48.4 \\
\hline Health Professions & +15.2 & +8.9 & +41.4 & +42.0 \\
\hline Home Economics & +9.9 & +15.6 & +21.6 & -100.0 \\
\hline Letters & -17.8 & -15.6 & -18.7 & -27.0 \\
\hline Library Science & -34.8 & -66.9 & +25.3 & -54.5 \\
\hline Mathematics & -19.1 & -11.4 & -15.4 & +2.2 \\
\hline Physical Sciences & +0.8 & - 2.1 & +4.8 & +4.1 \\
\hline Psychology & +4.5 & +29.9 & +7.4 & +81.3 \\
\hline Public Affairs and Services & - 2.8 & -36.7 & +8.6 & -32.1 \\
\hline Social Sciences & -18.3 & -44.8 & -14.5 & -17.5 \\
\hline Interdisciplinary Studies & +10.9 & N/A & 30.5 & N/A \\
\hline TOTALS & - 5.2\% & +0.5\% & +1.8\% & +2.3\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Comission.

FIGURE 6 Grackute Degrees Awarded by Accredited California Institutions of Eighes Ecucation, 1977-78 Through 1981-82
MASTER'S DEGREES


Surce: Callforqia Postsecondary Education Commission.

The percentage changes listed in Table 6 for California are affected somewhat by the fact that the University rf Southern California failed to report degrees awarded by discipline in 1981-82, submitting only the total number of master's and doctor's degrees conferred that year. Nonetheless, national and Califormia tendencien in most disciplines are siailar. Decreases in the number of manter's degrees in biological sciences, education, and letters, and in doctorstes in social sciences are approximately the same as are increases at both dagree levels in computer sciences and in doctorates in health professions and physisal sciences.

Great disparities are evident, however, at the master's level, where percentage increases in degrees in agriculture, architecture, home economic, and paychology avarded by Califoraia institutions far erceeded those nationally, as did doctorates in architecture and paychology. The number of master's degrees in engineering grew at a lower rate in California than in the country as whole and actually declined at the doctoral level in the State while increasing 8 percent nationally. The most striking differences in percentage declines at one or both degree levels were in communications, foreign languages, public affairs, and social sciences.

Accounting for all of these differences would require a more extended analyais than is appropriate in this report, if, indeed, explanstions are possible in any cases. Alchough close correspondence aight be expected between the figures for California -- which awards more than 10 percent of all graduate degrees in the United States -- and those for the nation as a whole, only speculation is possible on the reasons for these differences. Since some of the percentages are based on relatidely samall numbers, it would be inadvisable to attach undue significance to these comparisons. Instead, they are useful primarily in providing context by which to look more closely at developments in individual disciplines in California institutions.

\section*{GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED BY SEGMENT IN CALIFORNIA}

Table 7 on pages 34-40 lists for each of the fields discussed thus far the number of master's degrees awarded during 1977-78 and 1981-82 in California and by the University of California, the Califoraia State University, and California's accredited independent colleges and universities. Table 8 on pages 41-47 contaips similar information on doctor's degrees. Figures 7 through 9 on pages \(\mathbf{4 8 - 5 0}\) portray much of these data in graphic form.
University of California
In 1981-82, the University awarded close to 20 percent of all master's degrees in the State and 45 percent of all doctorates, a slight increase at both levels since 1977-78.

The pattern of graduate degrees awarded by the University of California during the past five years shows a more even distribution than that of
(text continues on page 51)

TABLE 7 Mastor's Degrees Amarded by Accredited California Institutions. by General field of Study, Segmeat, and Sex, 1977-78 and 19di-82


TABLE 7 (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & 1977- & & & 1981-82 & & Percent \\
\hline Field and Segment & Number Earned & Percent Men and Women &  & Number Earned & Percent Men and Men/Momen & Percent of State/ Syster Total & \begin{tabular}{l}
Change \\
Between \\
1977-78
and 1981-82
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Business and} \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Management} \\
\hline All Total & \[
5,715
\] & & 18.6\% & 6,782 & & 22.2\% & +18.6\% \\
\hline Male & \[
4,864
\] & 83.4\% & & \[
4,873
\] & 71.9\% & - & \\
\hline Female & 951 & \(16.6 \%\) & & 1,909 & 28.1\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 770 & & \(13.7 \%\) & 936 & & 15.6\% & +21.5\% \\
\hline … Male - - - & 558 & \(72.5 \%\) & & . 610 & 65.2\% & & \\
\hline - Female & 212 & 27.5\% & & 326 & 34.8\% & & \\
\hline csu Total & 1,029 & & 10.1\% & & & 13.5\% & +28.0\% \\
\hline Male & 803 & \(78.0 \%\) & & 903 & 68.5\% & & \\
\hline Fenale & 226 & 22.0\% & & 415 & \(31.5 \%\) & & \\
\hline Ind Total & 3,916 & & 26.2\% & 4,528 & & 30.6\% & +15.6\% \\
\hline Male & 3,403 & 86.9\% & & 3,360 & 74.2\% & & \\
\hline Female & 513 & 13.1\% & & 1,468 & 25.8\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Communications} \\
\hline All Totsl & 226 & & 0.7\% & 172 & & \(0.5 \%\) & -23.9\% \\
\hline Male & 115 & 50.9\% & & 83 & 48.3\% & & \\
\hline Female & 111 & \(49.1 \%\) & & 89 & 51.7\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 16 & & \(0.2 \%\) & 10 & & \(0.1 \%\) & -37.5\% \\
\hline Male & 8 & 50.0\% & & 4 & 40.0\% & & \\
\hline Female & 8 & 50.0\% & & 6 & 60.0\% & & \\
\hline CSU Total & 73 & & \(0.7 \%\) & 87 & & 0.8\% & +19.1\% \\
\hline Male & 29 & 39.7\% & & 38. & 43.7\% & & \\
\hline Female & 44 & 60.3\% & & 49 & 56.3\% & & , \\
\hline Ind Total & 137 & & 0.9\% & 75 & & 0.5\% & -45.2\% \\
\hline Male & 78 & 56.9\% & & 41 & 54.7\% & & \\
\hline Female & 59 & \(43.1 \%\) & & 34 & 45.3\% & & " \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Information} \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Sciences} \\
\hline All Total & 363 & & 1.1\% & 554 & & 1.8\% & +52.6\% \\
\hline Male & 307 & 84.6\% & & 436 & 78.7\% & & \\
\hline Female & 56 & 15.4\% & & 118 & 21.3\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 85 & & 1.5\% & 157 & & 2.6\% & +84.7\% \\
\hline Male & 73 & 85.9\% & & 132 & 84.1\% & & \\
\hline Fenale & 12 & 14.1\% & & 25 & 15.9\% & & \\
\hline CSU Total & 85 & & 0.8\% & 160 & & 1.6\% & +88.0\% \\
\hline Male & 65 & 76.5\% & & 111 & 69.4\% & & \\
\hline Female & 20 & 23.5\% & & 49 & 30.6\% & & \\
\hline Ind Total & 193 & & 1.3\% & 237 & & 1.6\% & +22.8\% \\
\hline Male & 169 & 87.6\% & & 193 & 81.4\% & & \\
\hline Fersale & 24 & 12.4\% & & 44 & 18.6\% & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE 7 (continued)


TABLE 7 (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Field and Segment} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1977-78} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1981-82} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent Change Between 1977-78 nd 1981-82} \\
\hline & Number Earned & Percent Men and Women & Percent of State or System
\(\qquad\) Total & Number Earned & Percent Men and Men/Women & Percent of State/ Systew Total & \\
\hline Foreign Languages & & I & &  & & & \\
\hline All Total Male Female & \[
\begin{array}{r}
283 \\
78 \\
205
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 27.6 \% \\
& 72.4 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
0.9 \%
\] & 230 & & \(0.7 \%\) & -18.7\% \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
UC Total Male \\
Feanle
\end{tabular} & 141
44
97 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
31.2 \% \\
-68.8 \%
\end{array}
\] & 2.5\% & 93 & & 1.5\% & \[
-34.0 \%
\] \\
\hline CSU Total Male Pemple & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 93 \\
& 23 \\
& 70
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 24.7 \% \\
& 75.3 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.9\% & 89 & & \(0.9 \%\) & \[
-4.3 \%
\] \\
\hline Ind Total Male Female & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 49 \\
& 11 \\
& 38
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 22.4 \% \\
& 77.6 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & \(0.3 \%\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 48 \\
& 14 \\
& 34
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 29.2 \% \\
& 70.8 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3\% & -2.0\% \\
\hline Health Professions & & & & & & & - \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
All Total Male \\
Female
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,657 \\
521 \\
1,136
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 31.5 \% \\
& 68.5 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 5.4\% & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1,805 \\
498 \\
1,307
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
27.6 \% \\
72.4 \%
\end{array}
\] & 5.9\% & +8.9\% \\
\hline UC Total Male Female & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 748 \\
& 247 \\
& 501
\end{aligned}
\] & \(33.0 \%\)
\(67.0 \%\) & -13.3\% & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 641 \\
& 183 \\
& 458
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
-28.5 \% \\
\mathbf{7 1 . 5 \%}
\end{array}
\] & 10.7\% & -14.3\% \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { CSU Total } \\
& \text { Male } \\
& \text { Female }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 558 \\
& 133 \\
& 425
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 23.8 \% \\
& 76.2 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 5.5\% & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 677 \\
& 110 \\
& 567
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 16.2 \% \\
& 83.8 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 6.9\% & +21.3\% \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Ind Total \\
Male \\
Female
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 351 \\
& 141 \\
& 210
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 40.2 \% \\
& 59.8 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 2.3\% & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 487 \\
& 205 \\
& 282
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
42.1 \% \\
.57 .9 \%
\end{array}
\] & 3.3\% & +38.7\% \\
\hline Home Economics & & & & & & & \\
\hline All Total Male Female & \[
\begin{array}{r}
154 \\
34 \\
120
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 22.1 \% \\
& 77.9 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.5\% & \[
\begin{array}{r}
178 \\
26 \\
152
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 14.6 \% \\
& 85.4 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.6\% & +15.6\% \\
\hline UC Total Male Female & 31
11
20 & \(35.5 \%\)
\(64.5 \%\) & . 0.5\% & 9
2
7 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 22.2 \% \\
& 77.8 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.1\% & -70.9\% \\
\hline CSU Total Male Female: & 117
4
113 & \(3.5 \%\)
\(\mathbf{9 6 . 5 \%}\) & 1.1\% & 154
22
132 & \(14.3 \%\)
\(85.7 \%\) & 1.6\% & +31.6\% \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Ind Total Male \\
Female
\end{tabular} & 6
4
2 & \(66.7 \%\)
\(33.3 \%\) & & 15
2
13 & \(13.3 \%\)
\(86.7 \%\) & \(0.1 \%\) & +150.0\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE 7 (sontinued)
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\footnotetext{
Source: Califormis Postsecondary Education Commission.
}

TABLE 8 Doctor's Degrees Awarded by Accredited California Institutions, by Ceneral field of study,. Segment, and Sex, 1977-78 and 1981-82
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1977-78} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1981-82} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Percent \\
Change \\
Between \\
\(1977-78\) \\
and 1981-82 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline Field and Serment & Number Earned & Percent Men and Vomen & Percent of State or System Total & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { umber } \\
\text { Earned }
\end{array} \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & Percent Men and Homen & Percent Of Statel System Total & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Agriculture and} \\
\hline All Total Male & 42
39 & 92.97 & \(0.9 \%\) & 43 & \(86.1 \%\) & 0.9\% & +2.2\% \\
\hline Female & 3 & 7.1\% & & 6 & 13.9\% & & \\
\hline UC Total Rale Female. & \[
\begin{array}{r}
33 \\
32 \\
1
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
97.0 \% \\
13.0 \%
\end{array}
\] & \(1.7 \%\) & 35
.30
5 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 85.7 \% \\
& 14.3 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & \(1.7 \%\) & +6.0 \\
\hline Ind Total Male Feale & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9 \\
& 7 \\
& 2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 77.8 \% \\
& 22.2 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3\% & 8
7
1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 87.5 \% \\
& 12.5 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.3\% & -11.1\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Architecture and} \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Environmental} \\
\hline All Total & 15 & & 0.3\% & 21 & & 0.4\% & +40.0\% \\
\hline Miale & 13 & 87.0\% & & 16 & 76.2\% & & \\
\hline Female & 2 & 13.0\% & & 5 & 23.8\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 15 & & 0.7\% & 21 & & 1.0\% & +40.0\% \\
\hline Male & 13 & 86.7\% & & 16 & 76.2\% & & \\
\hline Female & 2 & 13.3\% & & 5 & 23.8\% & & \\
\hline Ind Total & & & 0.0\% & & & 0.0\% & 0.0\% \\
\hline Male & 0 & 0.0\% & & 0 & 0.0\% & & \\
\hline Female & 0 & 0.0\% & & 0 & 0.0\% & & \\
\hline & & & & & & 8 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Biological Sciences} \\
\hline All Total & 446 & & 10.3\% & 471 & & 10.7\% & +5.6\% \\
\hline Male & 346 & 77.6\% & & 333 & 70.8\% & & \\
\hline Female & 100 & 22.4\% & 20.1\% & 138 & 29.2\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 381 & & . & 412 & & 20.8\% & +8.1\% \\
\hline Male & 298 & 78.2\% & & 290 & 70.4\% & & \\
\hline Female & 83 & 21.8\% & & 122 & 29.6\% & & \\
\hline csu Total & 0 & & 0.0\% & 1 & & 16.6\% & * \\
\hline Male & 0 & 0.0\% & & 1 & 100.0\% & & \\
\hline Female & 0 & 0.08 & & \(\cdots\) & 0.0\% & & \\
\hline Ind Total & 65 & & 2.7\% & 59 & & 2.4\% & -9.2\% \\
\hline Male & 48 & 73.8\% & & 43 & 72.9\% & & \\
\hline Female & 17 & 26.2\% & & 16 & 27.1\% & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
* Percentage increase cannot be calculated because the zero divisor is an undefined operation.
}
fABLE 8 (continued)


TABLE 8 (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Field and Segment} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1977-78} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1981-82} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Percent } \\
\text { Change } \\
\text { Between } \\
1977-78 \\
\text { and } 1981-82 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\]} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
Number \\
Earned
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Parcent \\
- Men and
\(\qquad\)
\end{tabular} & Percent of .State or System Total & Number Earned & Percent Men and Men/Women & Parcent of State/ System Total & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Education \(\quad\) : \(\ldots\)} \\
\hline All Total & 403 & & 9.37 & 394 & & \(8.9 \%\) & -2.2\% \\
\hline Male & 217 & 52.4\% & & 192 & 49.5\% & & \\
\hline Female & 192 & 47.6\% & & 199 & 50.5\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 109 & & \(5.7 \%\) & 142 & & \(7.1 \%\) & +30.3\% \\
\hline - Male & 50 & \(45.9 \%\) & & 76 & \(53.5 \%\) & & \\
\hline \(\because\) Feanle & 59, & \(54.1 \%\) & & 66 & 46.5\% & ' & \\
\hline csU Total Male Feanle & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4 \\
& 1 \\
& 3
\end{aligned}
\] & 25.08
75.08 & 100.08 & 3
0
3 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
0.02 \\
100.02
\end{array}
\] & 50.0\% & -25.0\% \\
\hline Ind Total & 300 & & 12.6\% & 249 & & 10.3\% & -17.0\% \\
\hline Male & 167 & \(55.7 \%\) & & 116 & \(46.6 \%\) & & \\
\hline Femele & 133 & 44.3\% & & 133 & 53.4\% & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Engineering} \\
\hline All Total & 433 & & 10.0\% & 416 & & 9.4\% & -3.9\% \\
\hline Male & 422 & 97.5\% \({ }^{\circ}\) & & 390 & 93.8\% & & \\
\hline Female & 11 & 2.5\% & & 26 & 6.2\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 228 & - & 12.0\% & 245 & & 12.3\% & +7.4\% \\
\hline Male & 223 & 97.8\% & & 232 & 94.7\% & & \\
\hline Female & 5 & 2.2\% & & 13 & 5.3\% & & \\
\hline Ind Total & 205 & & 8.5\% & 171 & & 7.0\% & -16.6\% \\
\hline Male & 199 & \(97.1 \%\) & & 158 & 92.4\% & & \\
\hline Female & 6 & 2.9\% & & 13 & 7.6\% & & \\
\hline Fine and: & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Applied Árts} \\
\hline All Total & 83 & & 1.9\% & 51 & & 1.1\% & -38.6\% \\
\hline Male & 43 & 51.8\% & & 28 & 60.8\% & & \\
\hline Female & 40 & 48.2\% & & 20 & 39.2\% & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{UC Total \(\begin{gathered}\text { Male }\end{gathered}\)} & 45 & & 2.4\% & 35 & & 1.7\% & -22.2\% \\
\hline & 19 & 42.2\% & & 19 & 54.3\% & & \\
\hline Female & 26 & 57.8\% & & 16 & 45.7\% & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Ind Total
Maie
Female} & 38 & & 1.6\% & 16 & & 0.6\% & -5.9\% \\
\hline & 44 & 63.2\% & & 9 & 56.2\% & & \\
\hline & 14 & 36.8\% & - & 7 & 43.8\% & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TABLE 8 (continued)

* Includes 148 Ph.D.s in chiropractic awarded by the Los Angeles College of Chiropractic.


TABLE 8 (continued)

* Percentage inctasse cannot be calculated because the zero divisar is an undefined operation.

TABLE 8 (continued)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Field and Seqment} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1977-78} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1981-82} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent Change Setween 1977-78 and 1981-82} \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
Number \\
Earned
\end{tabular} & Percent Men and Homen & Percent of State or System Total & Number Earned & Percent Men and Women & Percent of State/ System Total & \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|l|}{Social Sciences} \\
\hline All Total & 457 & & 10.6\% & 377 & & 8.5\% & -17.5\% \\
\hline Male & 332 & 72.7\% & & 280 & 74.3\% & & \\
\hline Female & 125 & 27.3\% & . & 97 & 25.7\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 276 & & 14.6\% & 255 & & 12.8\% & -7.6\% \\
\hline Male & 203 & 73.6\% & & 185 & 72.5\% & & \\
\hline Female & 73 & 26.4\% & & 70 & 27.5\% & & \\
\hline Ind Total & 181 & & 7.5\% & 122 & & 5.0\% & -32,6\% \\
\hline Male & 129 & 71.3\% & & -95 & 77.9\% & & \\
\hline Fewale & 52 & \(28.7 \%\) & & 27 & 27.1\% & & \\
\hline all total & 4,306 & & & 4,407 & & & +2.3\% \\
\hline Male & 3,289 & 76.4\% & & 3,105 & 70.5\% & & \\
\hline Female & 1,017 & 23.6\% & & 1,302 & 29.5\% & & \\
\hline UC Total & 1,890 & & 43.9\% & 1,983 & & 45.0\% & +4.9\% \\
\hline Male & 1,480 & 78.3\% & & 1,451 & 73.2\% & & \\
\hline Female & 410 & 21.7\% & & 532 & 26.8\% & & \\
\hline CSU Total & 4 & & 0.17 & 6 & & 0.1\% & +50.0\% \\
\hline Male & 1 & 25.0\% & & 6 & 50.0\% & & \\
\hline Female & 3 & 75.0\% & & 0 & 50.0\% & & \\
\hline Ind Total & 2,412 & & 56.0\% & 2,418 & & 54.9\% & +0.2\% \\
\hline Male & 1,808 & 75.0\% & & 1,648 & 68.2\% & & \\
\hline Female & & 604 & 25.0\% & 770 & 31.8\% & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Comission.

FIGURE 7 Orachate Dagrees Amarded by the Oniversity of California, 1977-78 Through 1981-82


Source: Cal if omia Postsec ondary Education Comission.

FIGURE 8 Graduate Degrees Awarded by the Califormia State University, 1977-78, Fhrough 1981-82
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Surce: Calfornia Postsecondary Education Commission.

FIGURE 9 Oradeate Dagrees Amarded by Accredited-Independent Califormia Universities, 1977-78 Through 1981-82
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Source: Californa Postsecondary Education Coamisaion.
either the State Univeraity or Californis's independent inatitutions and also than that of national averages. For exmaple, no more than 17 perceat of the University's mester's degrees are in one disciplinary area (engincering), whereas in each of the other two segments, 30 percent or more are in one field. At the doctoral level, the University leans somewat more heavily toward a few disciplines (for example, the biological and physical sciences and engineering account for half of all its doctoral degrees), but at the same time, doctorates in letters and the social sciences constitute a higher percentage of its total than do these degrees antionally.

In addition, shifte among diaciplines over a five-year period tend to be less extreme in the Univeraity than either in the other segments or nationally (Figures 7 through 9 and Figure 5). While percentage changes in the Uaiversity's degrees in some disciplinen are high, a relative atability is evident in most of the basic academic aubjects. Over a 10 or 15 year period, of course, degreen is may of the huanities and social science disciplines have ahown general declins, but during the past five years, the number of its master's degrees in letters and social sciences and of Ph.Ds in letters actually increased.

The relative percentages of men and women earning graduate degrees also changed less within the University of California than in the other two segments or nationally. In aarked contrast to the mational trend, more men received master's degrees from the University in 1982 than five years earlier, and only alightly fewer men earned doctorates. Women gained at both degree devels, but at a slightly lower rate than in the other scgments and nationally.

\section*{The California State University}

Since the peak year of 1977-78, when the State University awarded 10,146 master's degrees, its total has fallen off slightly but \(s=i l l\) amounts to almost one-third of all master's degrees in California. The State University has also conferred a small number of doctorates during the past decade through the joint doctoral program (Figure 8).

As indicated in Tables 7 and 8, increases or decreases of 20 percent or more in the number of degrees by discipline are not uncommon across the State University currisulum, with just about the same number of fields gaining as declining. With the exception of the physical scieaces, however, the ten fields awarding wore mas̀ter's degrees in 1981-82 than in 1977-78 have been the so-called applied fields -- agriculture, business, computer science, engineering, and the health professions, amang others. In the traditional liberal arts subjects of the blological sciences, letters, mathematics, and the social sciences, significantly fewer master's degrees were conferred, continuing a trend that in most cases began some years before. The prolonged erosion of graduate enrollments in some of these basic academic disciplines has reached debilitating proportions on several campuses. Combined with the reverse pattern of vigorous growth in a few fields, some campuses are being faced with adjustments that pronise to alter the essential character of their curriculum and eventually at the institution itself. A more detailed examination of these trends on individual campuses appears in the following section of this report.

The declining numbers of State Uaiversity degrees in some of the humanities and social sciences is directly due to their being deserted by men. In the biological sciences, fine arts, mathematics, and psychology, the number of women receiviag master's degrees in the State University increased slighty aince 1977-78. In letters and social sciences, hovever, reductions in the number of women earning degrees were proportionately heavy. The same was true in education, a field which atill avarded one-third of all master's degrees in the system. Women also failed to increase their numbers in engineering over the five-year period, earaing only 18 master's degrees in that field in 1981-82. In genernl, however, women continued their advances in graduate education in the state Vaiveraity, with significantly higher numbers of master's degrees in architecture, business, computer science, health professions, home economics, and public affairs. In all fields, women enrned 56 percent of the master's degrees avarded by the Califoraia State University in 1982, and judging from current enrollment patterns are likely to extend that margin duriag the next few years.

\section*{Accredited Independent Colleges and Universities}

Almost half of the master's degrees and more than half of the doctorates in California are being conferred by the atate's accredited independent colleges and universities. Although these institutions awarded slighṭly fewer master's degrees in 1981-82 than in 1977-78, their number of degrees at both graduate levels remained quite consistent over che five-year period.

At the master's level, a heavy concentration of degrees is evident in business and management. The \(\mathbf{4 , 5 2 8}\) degrees in this field in \(1981-82\) represented over 30 percent of all master's degrees avarded by independent colleges and universities and two-thirds of all master's degrees in business in California. As in the two public segments, women earning degrees in business accounted for a sharply increased percentage of the total. Perhaps coincidentally, the number of women receiving master's degrees in business from independent institutions increased by almost the same amount as their decline in education. Overall, the number of women earning master's degrees from independent institutions increased 22 percent in five yesrs, while the number of men declined 12 percent -- a trend similar to that in the California State University. Unlike the pattern in the State Universicy, however, male master's degree recipients in the independent institutions still outnumber women by a 60 - 1040 -percent margin.

In addition to awarding a major portion of the master's degrees in business in California, independent institutions also awarded 42 percent of all master's degrees in engineering' and almost 40 percent of those in education. These colleges and universities, however, account for a disproportionately small percentage of graduste degrees in most of the liberal arts fields -the biological sciences, letters, mathematics, and the physical and social sciences.

At the doctoral level, the most striking statistic for California's independent institutions is the 574 Ph .Ds awarded in psychology during 1981-82 -representing almost one of every four doctorates conferred by this group of institutions that year, and as noted earlier, one-fifth of all Ph.Ds in psychology in the country. In only three other fields is the production of
|doctorates by California's independent institutions noteworthy: In 1981, they awarded 69 percent of all doctorates in business in California, 63 percent of the doctorates in education, and 81 percent of those in the health professions. They also awarded a respectable 41 percent of the doctorates in engineering.

In most other fields, independent institutions accounted for considerably fewer doctorates than the University of California, despite awarding 22 percent more doctoral degrees overal than the University. Thus while California's independent ingtitutions as a group have developed a significant capacity for fraduate instruction in a few fields, their across-the-board curriculun strength does not compere with that of public universities as a group.

\section*{THREE}

\section*{RECENT ENROLLMENT AND DEGREE TRENDS ON INDIVIDUAL CAMPUSES OF CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UINIVERSITIES}

The impact of shifting patterns of graduate enrollments becomes forcefully apparent in atatistics for specific degsee programs on individual campuses. Aggregate mational, state, segmental, and major field totala can suggest broad movemeats and overall trends, but encollments and degrees for specific programs on specific campusen -- for the enater's degree in general biology at Chico state, for example, or in business adainistration at Sacramento State, or in sociology at San Diego State -- illuatrate how these trends manifest themelves as hard realities on the individual campuas.

The 39 displays in Appendix A on pages 75-115 below present a statistical record of graduate enrollment: and degreen avarded in a range of degree prograns on individual campuses of the University of California and the California State Uaiversity in 1977-78 and 1981-82. For the most part, the subjects included here are those in which at least five campuses within the two segments offer gradunte degrees. Similar atatistics are available for all degree programa, but fields such as agriculture and natural resources, only a few with degree programs in 18 different specialized areas, are excluded from the following displays in the interest of space.

Most academic departments must expect some fluctuation in the numbers of graduate students they enroll over a five-year period. The larger departments, however, do not expect to lose half or more of their students in that short a time nor to double or triple their number. In a broad range of programs, increases or decreases of this magitude have occurred since 1977-78. Many departments, accustomed to planning for sizable increases each year during the expansive 1960s and early 1970s, can deal relatively easily with increased numbers of applicants; if nothing else, they can simply restrict admissions. It is che recent, loss of students in such numbers that is unprecedented and that complicates all areas of academic planning and administration, not only on each campus but systemwide as well.

The numbers in the displays of Appendix A testify to the dimenstons of the problem. They are presented not to call attention to any particular campus or program but to document the significant redistribution of enrollments in the graduate schools of California's public universities during the past few years and to illustrate that in'addition to trends that have attracted wide attention -- the growth of business and computer science and the declining popularity of the social sciences, for example -- other less publicized shifts in interest have been occuring that may prove to be equally significant.

Depending on one's particular interest, it would be possible to draw a variety of conclusions froin the tables and figures of Appendix A. Without sttempting to be comprehensive, the following observations point to several significant trends for individual programs among the various campuses:
- Biolony: Graduate entollments in gemeral biology (Display 1) aroded on a broad scale. Of the 21 programs offered in both segents, 18 lost enrollments, 13 by 20 percent or more. All but two of the 17 programs in the State University suffered declines, and four of these programs awarded only five degrees each in 1981-82. The losses in general biology do not appear to have reaulted from atudents moving into more apecialized program in botany, biochenistry, microbiolosy, or soology. Especially in the State Univeraity, graduate eacollments in all these programs dropped sharply as well. Among all the natural science disciplines, only programs in biology have experienced appraciable lonses in enrollment aince 1977-78.
 burinean edniniatration and mangemant (Diaplay 5), it is intereating to find that only 15 of the 22 manter's programs gained in earollments and that the other cevan declinod, one large progran by more than 25 percent over the five-year period. It would be preanture to interpret these figuree as signs that demand for the bBA degree is leveling off. In all, three program in the seate Univeraity declined by more than 20 percent, while ten othern increased by at least that much. Three of the University's four programe showed achid gains.
- Computer and Information Sciencen: Programs ia general computer and iaformation sciences (Eisplay.6) enjoyed the most consistent overall increases with 16 of 18 programs gaiaing in majors. Eleven of the 13 programs ia the state Ugiversity increased by more than 50 percent, while two of the four Universfity program more than doubled in size.
- Education: More griduate programs in education gained than lost students 12 showing increases and seven declining -- they fared unevenly during the past five yeara from campus to campus (Diaplay 7). Among the specialized programs in education, those in physical education were especially hard hit (Display 8). Thirteen of 18 lost enrollment. Seven graduate programs in physical education within the State University declined in enrollment by more than 20 percent. Overall enrollments in the University, with a much maller total, gained slighty.
- Engineering: As expected, a majority of programs in all branches of engineering showed impressive gains, as half of all programs in the major specialties lacreased by more than 20 percent (Displays 9 through 13). Wichin the state Uaiversity, civil electronic, mechanical, and four of the general engineering programs showed strength. Although one-third of all programs in genersl engineering and the engineering specialities listed here lost enrollmenty, there is no indication that demand for engineering programs is on the wane.
- Fine and Performing Arts: In general, enrollments in the University's graduate programs in the arts of painting, drawing, and zculpture held firm in the face of overall declines in these subjects nationally and in other California institutions (Display 14). Eight of ten University programs in drama and muaic eajoyed healthy increases (Displays 15 and 16), and the five programs in art remained intact. In the State University, on the other hand, 25 of the 31 programs in these subjects were down in earollment, 18 by more than 20 percent. (Professional programs in
music leadiag to the Master of Muaic degree, with fewer students than the liberal arts programs, increased in both megments.)
- Forcign Lamqugea: In no other discipline did programs sumeain as consisteat and broadscale losses as it the foreign languges (Diaplays 17, 18, and 19). Of the 42 graduate programs in Freach, German, and Spanish offered by both megments, 37 loat earollmente; half of all prograse in these languages loat more than 20 percent of their studente between Fall 1978 and Fall 1982. Turthermore, theae programs averaged fewer degrees per progran than in any other besic disciplinary category. Three-fourths of the prograns awarded five or fever master's degrees in 1981-82, and only one of the 13 prograns in French and German on Uaiveraity campusea coaferred more than three doctoraten.
- Letters: Prograna in those disciplines grouped under Lètters -- English, comparative literature, clasaics, apeech, philosophy, asd linguistics, which taken togethar conatitute the man core of the humaities -- dia not fare well in the period batween 1978 and 1982 (Displays 21 through 26). Although combiaed enrollments in Bease aubjects vas virtuelly unchanged ip the Univeraity, twice as many individual programs lost as gained students. In Raglish and and philosoghy, however, the number of programs that grew in anroliment equaled those that declined, which - compared to conditiona elsewhere can be viewed as positive developaent. The state University prograns in-ethese subjects suffered serious losses. Enrollment: in 16 of 19 master's programs in Eaglish and five of six programs in philosophy declined, as did those in all aix programs in linguistics. No progran in philosophy and only four of the ten programs in speech awarded more than five marter's degrees in 1982. Six of the State University's graduate programs in English have lost more than one-third of their earollsents aince 1978.
- Mathematics: Even thou more than half of all graduate programs in mathemetics (Displsy 27) and che physical sciences (Displays 28, 29, and 30) had fewer studeate in Fall 1982 than in Fall 1978, enrollments overall in these diaciplines remained scable in both public segments over the five-year period. It if noteworthy, however, that a majority of the State University program in mathematics, chemistry, and physics awarded five or fewer master's degrees in 1981-82.
- Psycholosy: Graduate enrollmenta in most of the State University's psychology programs dropped sharply between Fall 1978 and Fall 1982, with 12 of the 16 programs showing losses (Display 31). This mey point to a reversal of an upward trend in popularity that this field has enjoyed since the early 1970s. Gradiate enrollments in psychology were also off in the University, although less severely. The number of graduate degrees awarded by the University was still up slightly from five years earlier.
- Public Administration: A curious disparity is apparent among programs in public administration within the State University (Display 32). Several of the recently established programs seep to be doing reasonably well, while most of the older programs sustaine major losses -- one losing 60 percent and another half of its enrollment siace 1978. More than in any other discipline, of course, enrollmefts in public administration
programs ceflect the prevailing job market in local, atate, and federal government.
- Social Sciancean: In no other disciplimary group is there as great a contrast between the five-year records of graduate prograns in the University and State Uaisersity as in the social sciencen (Diaplays 34 through 39). Bucking trends throughout the country, graduate eirollments in the University's programs in anchropology, geography, and political scieace actually increaged during the lagt. five years, while those in economics, history, and sociology decreased slifhtly. The experience of individual programa was nore in kiepping with the national tread as more prograns lost than gained students in four of the diaciplines, but even in these cases tho declines tended to be moderate. The State laivegsity's graduate programe in the mocial sciences, however, present a pattern of devastating lossas. All nine programs in anthropology and all 14 prograns it history loat earollment, as did eifint of the ten programs in geography, ten of the eleven in political acience, and eight of the ten in sociology. Only program in econonics were apared, although even here where five of the nine programs ahowed slight gains, one program. lost 60 percent of its students between Fall 1978 and Fall 1982.

In addition to the aumber of these social science prograns losing earollment, it is the magnitude of their lossep that is alarming: Three-fourths of all programs currently offered in these diaciplines-lost at least 20 percent of their encollment in the past five years: and many lost far more. Losses of 40 and 50 percent were not uncommon. . The pumber of degrees awarded ia another indication of the frail statua of most of these prograns. Only two of the 63 programs in the social science disciplines awarded more than ten master's degreea in 1981-82; while a liarge majority avaryed fewer than five.

Although a comptehensive listing of the enrollments and degrees conferted by individual programs provides one basis for assessing the relative'vitality of different fields of study, it is important to recognize che limitations of statistics presented in this form. In the first place, the number for any one year may be anomalous -- alwas a possibility when using Eive-year intervals, aince the record for the preceding or following year might lead to a quite different conclusion. Furthermore, some prograns that lost enrollment may have been overpopulated, and a reduction in the uumber of their students could enhorice their oitality and effectiveness. And programis with similar titles may vary markedly in emphasis and appronch, each one valuable for its contrimition to the goal of diversity in the offerings of public colleges and univer:-ities in the State.

All these conditions notwithstanding, these displays allow for a detailed and reasonably accurate impression of the tendencies in graduate enrollments during the past five years in California's public universities. They also constitute a necessary piece of background information that along with other considerations must enter into planning and policy decisions from the indi: vidual department to the systemwide and statewide levels.

\section*{ETHNIC MINORITY AND FOREIGN STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES}

\begin{abstract}
Any discussion of ethaic minority or foreign enrollments must be prefaced with retain qualifications concerning the accuracy of the statistics on which it is based. As an earlier Comission report stated, "of all the information developed, collected, and reported by a campus in the course of an academic year, atudent ethaicity data undoubtedly present the most difficult challenges" (Californie Postsecondary Education Comaission, 15,32, p. ix). Briefly, the major difficulties associated with data on student ethnicity or non-resident alien status arise from having to depend on individual students declaring cheir ethnic identification and resident status on a more or less voluntary basis at the tiae of registration, while institutions have neither the means to verify the accuracy of each student's response nor the authority to require responses from all studencs. In addition, changes by the federal government in ceporting categories have made year-to-year comparisons difficult. Despite these and other problems attendant upon gathering ethnic and non-resident alien data, the figures presented in this section represent responses of between 80 and 90 percent of all students in the University of California and the California State University and are as reliable as any available.
\end{abstract}

\section*{MINORITY STUDENTS AND DEGREE RECIPIENTS}

Minority students are those who identify themselves as either Black NonHispanic, Hispanic, Asian (including Pacific Islanders and Filipino), Native American, or other non-white. As Table 9 shows, students in these ethnic groups increased as a percentage of total enrollment and degree recipients at all levels in both the University and State University during the past five years.

TABLE 9 Minority Students and Degree Recioients as a Percent of the Total in the University of California and the California State University, 1978 and 1982

University of
California
Level of Enrollment or Degree
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Lower Division Students & \(24.6 \%\) & \(29.5 \%\) \\
Upper Division Students & 20.4 & 24.4 \\
All Undergraduate Students & 22.5 & 26.9 \\
Bachelor's Degree Recipients & 17.7 & 20.9 \\
Graduate Students & 15.3 & 18.5 \\
Master's Degree Recipients & 17.4 & 20.9 \\
Doctoral Degree Recipients & 16.6 & 23.2
\end{tabular}

The Californta State University \(1978 \quad 1982\) 30.9\% 31.7\% \(25.6 \quad 28.2\) \(28.2 \quad 29.9\) \(19.6 \quad 23.8\) \(22.1 \quad 24.1\)
20.3
22.5

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

It is also apparent from Table 9 that the percentage of minority graduate students and degree recipienta has been keepiag pace with that of undergraduates and bachelor's degree recipients. In the State University, the graduate level actually exceeded the percentage earning the baccalaureate both in 1978 and 1982. Particularly impresnive has been the growth in the percentage of minority studenta anong those receiving the doctorate at the Univeraity of California \(-=\) from 16.6 perchat in 1978 to 23.2 percent in 1982. This latter percentage was higher than that for either bachelor's anster': dagree recipiants at the Univereity that year. Even if these percentages for 1982 turn out to be somentht abnoranl, if persistence rates hold up, the hointhy increascs in minority earollmate since 1978 will be reflected in gefna among degree recipienth received as well.

Overall, the figures in Appendix A on pages 75-115 also present a posicive picture of the participation of minority groupe, taken as a whole, in graduate education at both the thiversity and Sthte Univeraity at the present time.

\section*{Enrollments and Degree Reciplents Among Specific Minority Grcups}

Data on the participation of specific minority groups, analyzed individuslly, lead to a different impression for home groups from that of minosity students as a whole. Just as certain ethaic groups are "under" or "over" represented at the undergraduate level compared to their percentage of Cflifornia's general population, so too are they at the graduate level, both in overall enrollments and in various fields of study. Sable 10 presents atitistics reiating to the participation of California's three largest minority groups -Asian, Black, and Hispanic Americang -- in graduate education in the University of California and the California State University as of 1978 and 1982. It reveals that the percentage of Asian and Hiapanic students and degree recipients increased at all levels in both segments since 1978 , while the percentage of Black students and degree recipients fell in aine of the ten categories -- the one exception being bachelor's degree recipients at the State Uaiversity. Trailing Blacke in the percentage of graduate degrees earned in 1978, Hispanic students have overtaken and surpassed them since then at both the University and State University. In the University, Asian. students recepive a higher percentage of aster's and doctor's degrees than Black and Hispanic students combined. In the State Univeraity, hovever, the pattern differs: There the combined percentage of Black and Hispanic atwdents and degree recipients surpasses that of Asian students, with the percentage of Hispanic students almost equallying the Asian student percentage.

Comparing the participation of undergraduates and graduate students in each ethnic group, the percentage of Black and Hispanic students among the University's graduate students exceeds their percentage of its bachelor's degree recipients, although the percentage for Asian students is lower. In the State Universicy, all three ethnic groups represent a higher percentage of those enrolled in graduate programs than of those who receive bachelor's degrees.

The decline between 1978 and 1982 in the percentage of Black students enrolled in gíaduate programs and earning graduate degrees at both the University and State University is notable. At the undergraduate level, the

TABLE 10 Selected Ethnic Minority Group Students and Degree Recipients as a Percent of the Total in the University of California and the California State University, 1978 and 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Minority Group and & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{University of California} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{The California State University} \\
\hline Level of Enrollment or Degree & 1978 & \(\underline{1982}\) & 1976 & 1982 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{ASIAN} \\
\hline Undergraduate Sturdents & 10.8\% & 13.9\% & 7.2\% & 9.2\% \\
\hline Bachelor's Degree Recipients & 9.0 & 11.2 & 6.0 & 7.7 \\
\hline Graduate Students & 7.0 & 9.6 & 6.7 & 7.8 \\
\hline Master's Degree Recipients & 6.2 & 7.7 & 5.4 & 6.2 \\
\hline Doctoral Degree Recipients & 4.1 & 6.4 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{BLACK} \\
\hline Undergraduate Students & 3.9 & 3.9 & 7.8 & 6.6 \\
\hline Bachelor's Degree Recipients & 3.0 & 2.4 & 4.7 & 4.9 \\
\hline Graduate Students : & 3.9 & 3.7 & 5.6 & 5.1 \\
\hline Master's Degree Recipients & 3.7 & 2.7 & 5.4 & 5.0 \\
\hline Doctoral Degree Recipients & 2.6 & 2.2 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{HISPANIC} \\
\hline Undergraduate Students & 5.6 & 6.0 & 8.7 & 9.3 \\
\hline Bachelor's Degree Recipients & 3.4 & 4.4 & 6.1 & 7.2 \\
\hline Gradate Students & 5.2 & 6.0 & 6.5 & 7.6 \\
\hline Mastis's Degred Recipients & 2.7 & 4.3 & 4.7 & 5.7 \\
\hline Doctoral Degree Recipients & 1.9 & 2.9 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.
pattern is mixed. There, Black enrollments, although down from 7.8 to 6.6 percent in the State University, held steady at 3.9 percent in the University. The trend in bachelor's degrees earned by Black students was reversed, however: ahead in the State University and off considerably in the University. The decline of Black student participation in graduate education at both institutions cannot be attributed entirely, therefore, to trends at the baccalaureate level. The causes for this decline need to be explored further, because the po. i-baccalaureate advances of Black students during recent decades seem to be slipping away.

Distribution of Ethnic Minority Students Among Fields of Study

The specific academic programs most frequently chosen or avoided. by various. minority groups are as significant as their overall earollment percentages. Table 11 on page 63 shows the most and least popular University and State

University graduate programs for Asian, Black, and Mispanic students in 1982, based on their representation in that field being above or below their representation among all graduate encollments by 20 percent or more. This table is drawn from the data in Appendix \(B\) on pages 117-122, which indicate the enrollment percentage of all ethnic groups, including whites, for all discipline categories in 1978 as well as 1982.

Table 11 is not meant to muggest that minority students should distribute themselves equally among programs in the curriculum or that their distribution across all fields should approximate that of the majority white student population. Nor is it intended to imply that certain programe are preferable, eithar as to intellectual attaiment or to career advantage. But the fact that atudenta from certain minority groups concentrate heavily in a few prograns and not in others is inportint for institutional planing and a variety of other educational purposes.

Asian Students: Asian graduate students show atrong concentration in mathemetics at both the University of California and the California State University and in che aciences at the State Univeraity, but the most distinctive element of their earollment pattern is their high concentration at both segments in engineering and computer science. An Table 11 shows, they constitute 20.4 percent of all graduate engineering students at the Uaiversity and 30.5 percent of those at the State University, and they account for 14.8 percent of computer science program in both segments. Their percent of all engincering students at the University is 17 times higher than that of Blacks and 12 times higher than that of Hispanics -- 1.2 percent and 1.7 percent of the total, respectively. The disparity in State Oniversity engineering programs is almost as dramatic. Horeover, this gap has been widening as the percentage of engineering students who were Asians grew in both segments between 1978 and 1982, while the percentage that were Black and Hispanic dropped.

Asian students as a group are less drawn to the humanities and social sciences than to the physical sciences, although even in most of these disciplines they are relatively well represented. Thus, their pattern of enrollments, after allowing for their extraordinaily high concentration in engineering and computer science, is reasonably even across the curriculum.

Black Students: For Blacks, this enrollment pattern is different. No field of study attracts an exceptionally heavy concentration of them, while many of the traditional arts and sciences disciplines enroll a much smaller percentage than wight be expected. For example, they wake up less than 2 percent of the University's graduate students in mathematics, biological sciences, physical sciences, and foreign languages, and just over 2 percent in the disciplines classified as letters. They represeat an equally small portion of the enrollments in these fields at the St.te University as well.

Moreover, Black students are not well represented in computer science or engineering programs in either segment, although they have made some definite gains in computer science programs since 1978, especially at the University, where their representation increased from' 0.6 to 2.3 percent. Their highest concemtrations are in public affairs and services and in education, witha

TABLE 11: Popular and Onpopular Fields of Study for Asian, Black, and Bispanic Graduate Students in the University of California and the California State University, Fall 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Ethnic Group & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{University of California} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{California State University} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{ASIAN High:} & Eagineering & 20.4\% & Engineering & 30.5\% \\
\hline & Computer Science & 14.\% & Ca puter Scieace & 23.9 \\
\hline & & & Mathematics & 15.5 \\
\hline & & & Business & 11.4 \\
\hline & & & Biological Sciences & 9.4 \\
\hline Average: & & 9.6 & & 7.8 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{11}{*}{Low:} & Public Affairs & 7.7 & Library Science & 6.0 \\
\hline & Home Economics & 7.2 & Public Affairs & 4.7 \\
\hline & Agriculture & 5.7 & Social Sciences & 4.3 \\
\hline & Fine Arts & 5.5 & Education & 4.1 \\
\hline & Social Sciences & 4.8 & Psychology & 3.8 \\
\hline & Letters & 4.6 & Agriculture & 3.5 \\
\hline & Education & 4.4 & Communications & 3.2 \\
\hline & Psychology & 4.4 & Letters & 2.8 \\
\hline & Foreign Languages & 4.3 & & \\
\hline & Library Science & 3.2 & & \\
\hline & Communications & 1.5 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{BLACK High:} & Public Alfairs & 6.8 & Public Affairs & 10.1 \\
\hline & Education & 6.2 & Psychology & 6.1 \\
\hline & Architecture & 5.4 & & \\
\hline Average: & & 3.7 & & 5.1 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{9}{*}{Low:} & Business & 3.5 & Fine Arts & 3.4 \\
\hline & Communications & 2.9 & Biological Sciences & 3.2 \\
\hline & Computer Science & 2.3 & Letters & 3.0 \\
\hline & Letters & 2.1 & Computer Science & 2.9 \\
\hline & Mathematics & 1.9 & Businfes & 2.6 \\
\hline & Library Science & 1.8 & Foreign Languages & 2.6 \\
\hline & Agriculture & 1.5 & Library Science & 2.4 \\
\hline & Biological Sciences & 1.4 & Physical Sciences & 2.2 \\
\hline & Engineering & 1.2 & Engineering & 2.2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{1} & Foreign Languages & 1.0 & Architecture & 1.9 \\
\hline & Physical Sciences & 0.8 & Agriculture & 0.6 \\
\hline & Home Economics & 0.0 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{HISPANIC High:} & Foreign Languages & & Foreign Languages & 27.2 \\
\hline & Public Affairs & 11.4 & Social Sciences & 10.8 \\
\hline & Education & 8.3 & Public Affairs & 10.5 \\
\hline & Library Science & 7.4 & Education & 9.9 \\
\hline & Architecture & 7.3 & & \\
\hline & Psychology & 7.2 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Ethnic Group & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{University of California} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{California State University} \\
\hline Average: & & 6.0 & & 7.6 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{12}{*}{Low:} & Fine Arts & 4.6 & Mathematics & 5.8 \\
\hline & Letters & 3.3 & Letters & 5.3 \\
\hline & Biological Sciences & 3.2 & Health Professions & 5.0 \\
\hline & Communications & 2.9 & Biological Sciences & 4.6 \\
\hline & Physical Sciences & 2.7 & Engineering & 4.2 \\
\hline & Agriculture & 2.4 & Communications & 3.8 \\
\hline & Computer Science & 2.9 & Physical Sciences & 3.3 \\
\hline & Engineering & 1.7 & Business & 3.3 \\
\hline & Home Economics & 0.0 & Computer Science & 3.1 \\
\hline & & & Home Economics & 3.0 \\
\hline & & & Agriculture & 2.6 \\
\hline & & & Library Science & 1.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Comission staff calculations of fields in which minority student enrollments are 20 percent higher or lower than their overall percentages reported in Table 10.
strong showing also in architecture and environmental design at the University, and in psychology at the State University. Between 1978 and 1982, they showed solid gains in business at the University, but fell back in the State University.

Thus despite favorable signs in a few fields, the trend in Black student enrollments during the past five years has not been overly encouraging.

Hispanic Students: The record of Hispanic students since 1978 is more impressive, showing gains in a majority of disciplines at both segments. With a heavy concentration in Spanish, they are also highly represented in education and in public affairs and services. Unlike Black students, Hispanics increased their percentages in mathematics and the biological, physical, and social sciences at both the University and State University since 1978. Hispanics more than doubled their representation in computer science at the State University and almost doubled it at the Universíty. Only in engineéring at both segments did their percentage drop noticeably.

Despite these advances of Hispanic students across a broad front, however, Table 11 shows that in a variety of basic disciplines their percentage, as is the case with Black students, falls considerably below their overall average. As noted earlier, much of this uneven distribution is not necessarily a cause for alarm, since the distribution of students from all ethnic groups among all fields of study cannot be expected to be the same. Nonetheless, the widespread participation by all ethnic groups across the broad range of academic disciplines at an advanced level of scholarship and research remains more a hope and a goal than a likelihood for the foreseeable future. That this goal is currently complicated by poor employment prospects in many of the basic disciplines -- a problem discussed earlier in this report -should not result in any less effort directed toward its eventual realization.

\section*{FOREIGN STUDENTS AND DEGREE RECIPIENTS}

Data on the citizenship of students in this section probably understate the number of non-resident aliens enrolled in the University of Califoraia and the California State University. Only those students who declare themselves to be non-resident aliens are regarded as foreign students in this report. Resident aliens are not included; and those students who "decline to state" are assumed to be residents of the United States.

Table 12 below shows the percent of foreign undergraduates and graduate students at the University and the State University during 1977-78 and 1982-83 as well as the percentage of degrees awarded to foreign students in 1978 and 1982. As can be seen, these percentages have remained relatively constant between the two years with only two exceptions, both of them involving degree recipients at the, State University: (1) Foreign students received only 3.8 percent \(\subset \mathcal{E}\) its bachelor's'degrees in 1978 but 7.2 percent in 1982; and (2) they earned only 6.4 percent of its master's degrees in 1978, compared to 15.3 percent in' 1982 .

Table 12 also shows that while foreign students coustitute only about 3 percent of undergraduates in both segments and only 5.0 percent of graduate students in the State University, they make uf 17 percent of graduate enrollments at the University and in 1982 received 20.4 percent of its master's degrees and 24.8 percent of its doctorates. Overall, of the 17,727 graduate degrees awarded by the University and State University during that year, 3,202 were earned by non-resident aliens -- or almost one out of every five.

TABLE 12 Foreign Students and Degree Recipients as a Percent of the Total in the University of California and the California State University, 1978 and 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Lever of Enroll- \\
ment or Degree \\
University of California
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{The Califurnia State University} \\
\hline & 1978 & 1982 & 1978 & 1982 \\
\hline Lower Division Students & 2.1\% & 2.1\% & 2.5\% & 2.6\% \\
\hline Upper Division Students & 2.9 & 3.4 & 3.3 & 3.6 \\
\hline All Undergraduate Students & - & & & \\
\hline Bachelor's Degrees & 3.1 & 3.4 & 3.8 & 7.2 \\
\hline Graduate Students & 17.6 & 17.2 & 4.3 & 5.0 \\
\hline Master's Degree Recipients & 17.8 & 20.4 & 6.4 & 15.3 \\
\hline Doctoral Degree Recipients & 23.4 & 24.8 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Conmission.

The disparity between the percentage of foreign student enrollments and cheir percentage of degree recipients is particularly evident in the State University -- as of 1982 , t three-fold difference of 5.0 percent compared to 15.3. For any given year, earculment and degree recipients figures may vary berause of fluctuations in the aumer ef foreign students admitted during preceding years. But the significantly higher percentage of the State University's foreign student graduate degree recipjents than its graduate earollments in 1982 do not seem to result from a higher than usual percentage having been adiaitted in 1979 or 1980. Some of the discrepancy probably stems from the fact that more foreign than domestic students are enrolled full time; also many domestic students are lured away by industry before completing -- if not before even beginaing -- a graduate program. But other possible causes should be explored, however, eapecially when in several of the so-called "high tech" fielda over 40 percent of the master's degrees conferred by the University and State Uaiversity in 1982 and over half of the doctorates awarded by the Univeraity went to foreign students.

Table 13 on the next page lists the fields of study encolling the highest and lowest : -centages of foreign students at the University and State University, c mpared to their average enrollment of 17.2 percent at the Uaiversity and 5.0 percent at the State University.

As might be expected, foreign student enrollment distributes itself in a highly uneven pattern among the disciplines, reaching surprising high levels of engineering, and computer science, while remaining negligible in others.

As Table 13 shows, well iver 40 percent of all graduate degrees awarded by the University and State University in three engineering specialties in 1982 went to foreign students. In other fields of engineering, as well as in mathematics, computer science, and physics, foreign students also earned degrees at a rate far out of proportion to their numbers in the student body as a whole.

Other fields attracting a higher than average percentage of foreign students include economics, linguistics, and German at both the University and State University and French at the State University although it shourd be noted that in fields in which few American students enroll, a relatively small number of foreign students can amount to a sizable percentage. Conversely, the percentage of business administration students who are from other countries is unimpressive -- only 12.4 percent at the University and 6.7 percent at the State University -- even though their actual numbers surpass those in most other disciplines.

Just as many of the same graduate programs in both segments attract high numbers of foreign students, so there is a high correspondence in the two segments between fields with negligible foreign student enrollment. These fields include the "helping professions" of nursing, education, social work. and psychology, the biological sciences, and understandably, English and speech.
If the enrollment of foreign students was more evenly spread across the curriculum, it would neither call attention to itself nor present any serious planning or policy issues. Heavily concentrated in a few fields however, it raises questions signifiçant at both the State and national levels.

TABLE 13 University of California and California State University Programs Enrolling the Highest and Lowest Percentage of Foreign Graduate Students in Fall 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Institution and Progran & Percent of foreign Students & Percent of Master's Degree Recipients & Percent of Doctoral Degree Recipients \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA} \\
\hline Civil Eagineering & - \(46.1 \%\) & 48.1\% & 43.8\% \\
\hline Hechanical Engineering & 39.6 & 31.8 & 52.2 \\
\hline Electrical Engineering & 37.6 & 41.8 & 57.5 \\
\hline General Engineering & 32.2 & 32.8 & 40.9 \\
\hline Economics & 31.3 & 28.3 & 20.0 \\
\hline Mathematics & 27.9 & 25.5 & 34.0 \\
\hline Physics & 26.8 & 31.4 & 21.6 \\
\hline German & 26.2 & 25.0 & - 0.0 \\
\hline Computer Science & 25.6 & 18.2 & 52.6 \\
\hline Philosophy & 25.0 & 20.0 & 11.1 \\
\hline Linguistics & 24.6 & 28.6 & 16.7 \\
\hline average & 17.2 & 20.4 & 24.8 \\
\hline Spanish & 9.9 & 14.3 & 16.7 \\
\hline History & 9.8 - & 14.7 & 0.0 \\
\hline Art & 9.5 & 8.6 & 0.0 \\
\hline Speech & 9.1 & 25.0 & 0.0 \\
\hline Biology & 8.0. & 5.0 & 11.5 \\
\hline Psychology & 6.5 & 11.5 & 0.0 \\
\hline Education & 6.4 & 11.6 & 12.0 \\
\hline English & 5.7 & 9.1 & 0.0 \\
\hline Nursing & 4.7 & 2.7 & < 0.0 \\
\hline Social Work & 2.1 & 2.4 & 9.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
\begin{tabular}{lrr} 
Comparative Literature & 27.3 & 0.0 \\
Economirs & 24.1 & \(5 . .8\) \\
Mechanical Engineering & 23.0 & 48.1 \\
French & 21.1 & 43.8 \\
Civil Engineering & 20.6 & 43.8 \\
Electrical Enginerering & 18.8 & 41.9 \\
Linguistics & 18.4 & 26.2 \\
Chemistry & 17.7 & 30.6 \\
Microbiology & 17.3 & 10.0 \\
Computer Science & 16.5 & 37.8 \\
Political Science & 13.6 & 37.5 \\
German & 13.3 & 44.4 \\
Sociology & 12.9 & 0.0 \\
General Engineering & 12.7 & 34.4 \\
Chemical Engineering & 12.5 & 14.3 \\
Biochemistry & 11.1 & 50.0 \\
Mathematics & 11.1 & 32.3
\end{tabular}

TABLE 13 (continued)
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\cline { 2 - 3 } & \(\underline{5.0}\) & \(\underline{15.3}\) \\
AVERAGE & \(\mathbf{3 . 2}\) & 20.6 \\
Biology & 3.1 & 19.7 \\
Physical Education & 2.1 & 6.8 \\
Education & 2.1 & 13.9 \\
Psychology & 1.7 & 6.2 \\
Social Work & 0.9 & 5.0 \\
Nursing & 0.0 & 0.0 \\
Botany & 0.0 & 0.0
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Comission.

\section*{CONCLUSIONS}

This report has assembled a variety of statistical information related to graduate educatioa in California, presented tables and charts for displaying and updating chis information, and ideatified certain issuee -- especially those involving program planning and review -- that emerge from the data or are affected by it.

Recognizing that the nature and present condition of gra luate education can never be captured by numbers alone, the report neverthiless assumes that such figures are essential for an infomed conaideration of the issues and that it is useful, if only ia some cases for future reference, to condense as much numerical information into as brief a space as possible. The previous chapters, resulting from such an approach, have been cramed with enrollment and degree statistics, but this han seemed unavoidable given the purpose of the report. Even so, they have not contained still other kiads of statistical information that would be valuable for a variety of analytical purposes. A thorough statistical analysis will require, in addition:
- Data in all categories from the accredited independent universities in Califoraia.
- Data on the ratios of applications to acceptances in all programs. This ratio is as revealing of the health of a program as the number actually enrolled. Presumably one indication of a prograg's quality is its selectivity in admitting students.
- A more complete description of student characteristics, including sources of financial aid and the level of indebtedness, the number employed full time, age, time to degree, and the placement experience of recent graduates.
- Information on the relative costs of individual programs and of the enterprise as a whole. It would be a great convenience in planning and review to be able to assume that a graduate program, for example, in music or engineering generally costs twice as much as one in history or business, but the process of computing costs of degree programs remains too complex and controversial for that to be a realistic expectation. But the overall costs of graduate education, including the State's contribution to it, can be estimated and displayed in a variety of formats.

When assembled, these additional pieces of information will help complete the profile of graduste education in the State and allow for a more thorough analysis of its condition.

In the meantime, a number of conclusions can be drawn from the material jucluded in this report. Some of the conclusions translate directly into issues or chey relate to perennial issues associated with-ppublic higher education. Because graduate education in the public insplutions is a State-supported activity, wost of the issues surrounding ic have public policy implications. The following seven conclusions relate to conditions . that, in the Commission's judgment, require immediate attention:
1. IN SEvERAL DISCIPLINES, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORAIA OFFERS MORE dOctoral procrais than recessary to accohmodate student dehaid OR THE NEEDS OF SOCIETY FOR DOCIORATES IN THOSE DISCIPLINES.

The importance to the State and nation of disciplined intelligence, whatever its field of special competence, is inestimable. Advanced education cannot be regarded merely as an article of comserce. The need for highly educated persons cannot be mensured as would the need for so many consumer goods. Who is to alay how many philosophers or literary critios a society needs? No formula applies here.

Still, it is mereasary \(c o\) question the offering of six Ph.D. programs in a subject when three could not only accommodate all qualified students interested in doctoral study in the subject, but prepare more than enough graduates to fill available openiags. That is no longer a question to come only from cost-censcious bureaucrats insensitive to the finer purposes of advanced scholarship. It is dictated by the reality of present circuastances. There are too few students choosing to pursue graduate study in certain subjects and not enough jobs for those who do. Nor is there hope that a change is imainent. As noted earlier in this report, the prospects of a renewed demand for Ph.Ds in may of the humanities and social acience disciplines occurring soon are "bleak." By the mid-aineties, when the size of the college-age population is expected to approach earlier levels and a large portion of present faculty members reach retirement age, the demand for doctorates in most disciplines may again pick up. Few, however, foresee a marketplace as favorable to applicants for faculty positions as existed in the 1960s.
2. APART FROH CONSIDERATIONS OF STUDENT DEMAND AND THE IDEMTIFIABLE needs of society, sone doctoral prograil have produced so few graduates dURING the past five years that their viability is questionable.

Most efforts to assess the qualicy of graduate programs -- however controvertible, the process remains -- include size of programs as one of the criteria. The assumption is not that the bigger the program the better, but that an effective program requires a certain minimum number of faculty and students -a "critical mass" -- to interact, stimulate, challenge, and reinforce. While the number necessary for critical mass undoubtedly varies with circumstances, a program that awards only two or three doctorates over a five-year period probably lacks it. No degree programs should be condemned on the basis of quantative measures alone. Some small programs, because of an exceptionally capable individual or group of individuals, are influential out of all proportion to their size. Other programs without impressive numbers may contribute in e. sential ways to the environment for scholarstip on a given campus. Some may have special importance to undergraduate education. But a program producing no more than one or two graduates in five years must at least. expect to show why, if it is graduating this few students, it should continue to be supported.

Thus in the interest of quality as well as economy of means, a consolidation of doctoral programs in several disciplines seems in order. Such a move should have little effect on the number of doctorates being trained in these
disciplines. It could very well enhance the richness and breadth of their training. Among the disciplines in which consolidation of doctoral programs should be considered are foreign languages, comparative literature, philosophy, paychology, history, geography, political science, and sociology. (See Displays 1 through 39 in Appendix A.)-
3. graduate prograis in most of the liberal arts disciplines on caipuses OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY ARE SUFFERING FROM ERROLINENT LOSSES OF dEBILITATING PROPORTIONS. UNLESS RECENT TREMDS CAN bE arrested soom, many prograis will be unagte to sustain tieniselves.

Several forces are affecting graduate programs in the State University. Those in the socisl sciences and humanities are victims of the pronounced shift of interest to business and technical fields evident throughout the countxy. Consequently, those in applied fields, such as business, engineering, comptater science, nursing, and socísl work, are currently thriving. In the job market, holders of master's degrees are likely to be squeezed out in those fields with a surplus of Ph.D.s. While some Commanity Colleges are said to find those with master's degrees more suitable than doctorates for their instructional staffs, these institutions have not been hiring enough full-time faculty to take up the slack. Thus the market value of the master's degree in a number of subjects has declined, and because of rhe quantity of degrees awarded duriag the past 20 fears, so has its prestige.

It must be noted that while many graduate programs in the State University have experienced enrollment. Losses of between 30 percent to 50 percent since 1978, some few programs in even the hardest hit disciplines seem to be holding up reasonably well. Examples of both conditions can be found in the displays of Appendix A.

As noted above, one key indicator of the health of a degree program is the annual record of degrees it awards. None of the State University graduate programs in mathematics, speech, philosophy, political science, sociology, geography, economics, physics, French, or German awarded more than ten degrees in 1982, and many did dot award five. The ten master's degree programs in sociology confetred a total of 34 degrees, while the six programs in philosophy awarded only eight degrees altogether.

Again, programs are not to be judged by numbers alone. Moreover, the "service area" concept within the State University argues for making a number of programs available primarily as a service to citizens of the region. But the statistical evidence of a broad-scale erosion of interest in many of these programs cannot be ignored, and the comp ehensive curriculum recommended by the service-area approach applies less at the graduate than at the undergraduate level.

The Chancellors Office of the State University is, of course, aware of and concerned about these developments in its graduate programs. The decision, it seems, is whether to do nothing out of the ordinary -- to allow the large number of graduate programs losing enrollments and awarding few degrees to limp along until some of them expire altogether -- or to confront the situation directly by sorting out the strong from the weak programs in each discipline and then, by various means, reinforcing and revitalizing those
which might atill achieve or maintain distinction. Some may have to be phased out. The argument here is that it is in the public interest to support three or four vigorous graduate programs in a discipline rather than twice as many anemic ones.

\section*{4. better information on the job placenimit OF MASTER'S DEGREE RECIPIEETS IS URGENTLY MEEDED.}

Much can be done to inaure the availability of certain kinds of evidence about the mater's degree not only for prospective students but for all. those reaponsible for academic planaing and policy formation. As a start, campumes should maintain, as standard procedure, records of the employment statis of all master'a degree recipients. Many departments have routinely collected chis information. In fact, for achool or department not to strive for an accurate account of the job placement experience of its graduates seem: inexcusable. Yet there is no atagle convenient source for composite information of this kind, for learring how recent recipients of Master of Public Adainistration degrees from California institutions, for example, have fared in their search for employment.

The goal should be to establish a file of information for master's degree recipients similar to that which exists nationally for doctorates as a result of the National Research Council's annual surveys. For many reasons, it is important to know how many of those earning master's degrees in any field are still aceking employment, how many are already employed, in what sector they are employed, whether they are in a job closely related to their academic preparation, and how many plan to pursue the doctorate.

Because of the broad range of questions suri ounding the master's degree, establishing a procedure for compiling placement records for chose receiving the degree can be vieved as a matter of some urgency. Such information ane could not be counted on to answer all questions, but it could certainly throw light on issues that are or soon will be facing every department offering a master's degree. For example, there are growing sigas of an M.B.A. "glut" which if it were to materialize would profoundly affect not only departments of business and management but the entire graduate school on many campuses. In some fields, a temporary oversupply may give way to renewed demand brcause of sustained periods of low enrollments -- Library science and social work are possible examples. In others, demand may not pick up for years. In still ochers, such as the humanities and social science subjects with a surplus of Ph.D.s, the master's degree may never recover its market value.

Collecting first-hand information on their employment experience from all receut graduates will add to the data-gathering burden of the system, but a reliable record of this kind seems well worth the effort. it could provide invaluable clues to developments in the marketplace that will influence the condition of groduate education. .

\section*{5. AN INTENSIVE ACROSS-THE-BOARD REVIEW OF THE MASTER'S DEGREE as an academic avard is needed.}

At least two distinct tendencies currently exist regardiag the master's degree. In fields of study not directly linked to specific career outiets .-
disciplines commonly thought of an constituting the liberal arts -- the degree has lost much of its value both as an icinowledgemeat of academic achievement and as a credential for employment. In many technical or applied fields, on the other hand, the degree has increased in value in the sense that it has becone required credential for many positions, or that it is accepted as the terninfi degree as in business, architecture, and the fine and performing arts, frir example.

In a few career Sields, such as computer science, the master's degree has established nr clear niche for itself; in others, especially in areas where industry is setting up its own training programs, the role of the degree has become somerant ambiguous.

In the face of such diversity and confugion, a clarification of the meaning and purpose of the master's degree in a wide range of fields is called for.

In the humanities and social sciences, the master's progran as a small-scale doctoral progransenms outmoded. In the applied fields, the changing require-\(\therefore\)-nts of employers may dictate revisions in the master's degree program. Within the businese comunity, there are signs of a growing dissatisfaction Wieh the graduates of H.B.A. programs (Special Reports on Key Business Topics, 1984, pp. 166-167). Therefore, the general public as well as prospective students would also benefit from a clearer understanding of what knowledge and skills the master's degree attests to.

Over a decade ago, a study committee of the 1971 All-University Faculty Conference concluded that "The M.A. and M.S. degrees have been so debased by their use as escape hatches from Ph.D: programs that they probably cannot be made useful once morc for. academic purposes. . . . It is pzobably more prudent to recognize this and attempt to shape the master's degree into one whicn can provide either a degree of specialization for those heading toward the lower ranks of a profession or alternatively to provide an additional level of breadth and integration for whose need is education in a general sense rather than preparation for competence ir sone specialty" (University of California, 1971, p. 30).

Since this observation was made, no formsl review of the nature and purpose of the master's degree has been undertaken. It now should be. The Comission will initiate discussions, with the segments concerning procedures for such a review.
6. HIGHER PERCENTAGES OF WOKEN ARE EARNING DEGREES IN MOST FIELDS OF STUDY -- A TREND IN EVIDENCE FOR ALMOST TWO DECADES.
IN GONTRAST, THE PATTERN OF' ETHNIC MINORITY PARTICIPATION IN GRADUATE STUDY IS MIYED. ASIAN STUJENTS REPRESENT A GROWING PROPORTION OF GKADUATE STUDENTS IN BOTH THF UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORMIA AND THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY. BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS, HOWEVER, ARE POORLY REYRES'A IEN IN MANY FIELDS, DESPITE PERCENTAGE INCREASES IN HES'AN! ENROLLMEATS ANO DEGRES EARNED.

The percentage of womer siraing master's and.doctor's degrees in almost all disciplinen has increased significantly in the State and nationally virtually
without interruption zince the early 1960s. In 1982, women earned 56 percent of all mater's degreem awarded by the California State Univeraity ‥ an increase of over 5 percentage points since 1978. The percentage gains of women in graduate degrees avarded by the University of Califoraia over the same period have been less pronounced, but here as well, women have continued to advance in most fields of study (Appendix C, pages 123-126).

4mong ethaic minority groups, the record of Asian students is most impressive, but Hispanica have also shown solid gains in most graduate programs in both segments siace 1978.' The percentages of Blacks enrolled in graduate education and earaing graduate degrees, however, appear to have dropped off elightly during the past five yests. It is fuportant to account for this decline, and with all minority groups, to continue to monitor closely their participation in formal education at the graduate level.

\section*{7. THE heavy comcenitration or foreicm graduate studrats in a fen disciplines baisgs policy guestions that require aitempions.}

In computer acience and seversl of the major fields of engineering, more than half of the 1982 foctorates avarded by the Uaiversity and roughly 40 percent of the mater's degrees conferred by the State University went to non-resident aliens. This condition is by no means confined to institutions in California, although they enroll almost 20,000 more foreign students than are enrolled in any other state. Throughout the country the proportion of foreign itudents has increased steadily in every major science and engineering field aince 1975. (National Science Foundation, 1984, p. 4).

In a recent study of foreign students and institutional policy, the American Council on Education noted that "ultimately . . . this nation's posture coward foreign students is going to be the aggregate of actions taken by the several state aystems of higher education and the individual institutions. Given the potential increase in foreign applicants, it is imperative that the governing bodies of these systems and institutions . . . address what they will do with reapect to foreign students and develop appropriate policies and procedures." (1982, p. 50).

Among other questions associated with these policies are the following:
- How are applications from foreign student dealt with 值ing the adr-ssions prucess?
- Are any qualified domestic students being deaied admission to high-cost, high-demand graduate programs because of foreign student enrollments?
- How many foreign students remain in the Staie and nation after receiving graduate degrees here?
- What are che fiscal implications of a high percentage of foreignrstudents in certain programs?

Such questions suggest the need for a more thorough investigation of the subject than has been possible in this report.

\section*{APPENDIX A}

Graduote Enrollments and Degrees Awarded in Selected Fields of Study at California's Public Universities, 1978-1982
1. Biological Sciences: General Biology ..... 77
2. Biological Sciences: Biochenistry ..... 78
3. Biological Sciences: Botany ..... 79
4. Biological Sciences: Microbiology ..... 80
S. Business and Management: Business and Administration ..... 81
6. Computer and Information Sciences, Gemeral ..... 82
7. Education, General ..... 83
8. Education: Physical Education ..... 84
9. Engincering, General ..... 85
10. Engineering: Chemical Engineering ..... 86
11. Engineering: Civil, Construction, and Transportation Engineering ..... 87
12. Engineering: Electrical, Electronics, and Communications Engineering ..... 88
13. Engineering: Mechanical Engineering ..... 89
14. Fine and Applied Arta: Art (Painting, Drawing, and Sculpture) ..... 90
15. Fine and Applied Arts: Dramatic Arts ..... 91
16. Fine and Applied Arts: Music (Liberal Arts Programs) ..... 92
17. Foreign Languages: French ..... 93
18. Foreign Languages: German ..... 94
19. Foreign Langueges: 'panish ..... 95
20. Health Professions: Nursing ..... 96
21. Letters: Classics ..... 97
22. Letters: Comparative Literature ..... 98
23. Letters: English ..... 99
24. Letters: Linguistics ..... 100
25. Letters: Speech, Debate, and Forensic Science ..... 101
26. Letters: Philosophy ..... 102
27. Mathenatics, General ..... 103
28. Physical Sciences: Chemistry, Generg1 ..... 104
29. Physical Sciences: Geology ..... 105
30. Physical Sciences: Physics, General ..... 106
31. Fsychology, Gencral ..... 107
32. Public Affairg and Services: Public Administration ..... 108
33. Public Affairs and Services: Social Work and Helping Services ..... 109
34. Social Sciences: Anthropology ..... 110
35. Social Sciences: Economics ..... 111
36. Social Sciences: Geograpbiy ..... 112
37. Social Sciences: History ..... 113
38. Social Sciences: Political Science and Government ..... 114
39. Sociai Sciences: Sociology ..... 115

NOTE: Asterisks in these displays indicate that percentage increases cannot be calculated because the zero divisor is an undefined operation.
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\section*{SECMENTAL INFORMATION}


CAMPUS INFORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Graturt Fnmolinemes}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Cramyen Derres} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Misters} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Doctors} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7511 \\
& 3978
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fil } \\
& 1922
\end{aligned}
\] & Pemcent Chano & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977= \\
7!
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
7981- \\
8 ? \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Brevent Chyse & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977- \\
7 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19810 \\
82
\end{array}
\] & poreane Chare \\
\hline Sefrant and Cxmpy & 9 & 18 & - & & & & & & \\
\hline Jesversact of Califorma Bermeley & 76 & 69 & -6.7\% & 4 & 2 & - 50.06 & 15 & 12 & -20.06
-7500 \\
\hline - Davis & 70 & 66 & - \(8.5 \%\) & 5 & 3 & - 6.06 & 12 & 3 & - 75.07 \\
\hline ios Angeles & 35 & 65 & - 18.8 & 13 & 7 & - 46.18 & : & \(\begin{array}{r}7 \\ \hline\end{array}\) & \(+250.08\) \\
\hline 3icerside. & 50 & 53 & - IC.0\% & - & 6 & \(-16.2 \%\)
\(0.0 \%\) & 6 & \(\because\) & +83.36
+200.05 \\
\hline jan Fruncisco & 19 & 19 & J.0\% & : & : & 0.06 & 2 & 6 & +200.00 \\
\hline -i: : forcha SEare Uarversaty bons. jeaca & 26 & 20 & - \(16.6 \%\) & - & : & - \(50.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{

}

\section*{DISPLAY 3 Biological Sciences: Botany}

SECMENTAL INFORMATION


EAMPUS INFORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Segrent and exmous} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Gratule Enrollmants}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gracunte Despens} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Masera} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Soctors} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Fah } \\
2978 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FII } \\
& 1982
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { percent } \\
& \text { chanome }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { T977 } \\
\hline 78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
191^{1-} \\
68 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Percant } \\
& \text { cmane }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 197" } \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { \$61- } \\
\hline 82
\end{gathered}
\] & sereene EManct \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Ondrersiey of Ealiformia} \\
\hline Berkeiey & 39 & 39 & \(=3.1 \%\) & 0 & 2 & * & 8 & 5 & 0.56 \\
\hline Lev:s & 48 & 45 & - 6.28 & 7 & - & \(0.0 \%\) & 0 & 6 & 00 \\
\hline Riverside & io & 63 & +168.7\% & 3 & 2 & - \(33.3 \%\) & 1 & - & +60c.00 \\
\hline janta lerbara & - & : & - \(75.0 \%\) & 3 & 1 & - \(06.6 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Edilsorala Scate Jaiversity iEsec & 8 & : & - \(37.5 \%\) & 2 & : & 2.0\% & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Eaisfortie Postsocosdery Edurakion Comagsion.

\section*{BEST COPY AVAILABLE}


CRMPUS IMFORUATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Earman and Camus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Grume Enrellmonts}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Cramate Daven} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{mettr} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{- boctors} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Falf } \\
& 1978
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7814 \\
& x 90
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Percent } \\
& \text { Chunow }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1977{ }^{\circ} \\
78
\end{gathered}
\] & \(1881=\) 82 & Percent Erame & \[
\begin{gathered}
1377 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1981= \\
92
\end{gathered}
\] & Percent Enays \\
\hline Lazorestey of Ealafornas Bermiey & 21 & 27 & + \(28.5 \%\) & 0 & : & * & 1 & 9 & -800.0\% \\
\hline Davis & 86 & 65 & - 24.48 & 13 & 5 & - 61.5\% & 7 & . & 0.07 \\
\hline Invese & 13 & 19 & + 26.68 & 0 & 0 & 0.08 & 0 & 2 & - \\
\hline Los Amplas & 31 & 32 & - \(3.2 \%\) & 2 & 1 & - 50.08 & 10 & 2 & -80.0\% \\
\hline Sas Frascisco & 9 & 8 & - \(11.7 \%\) & 0 & 0 & 0.05 & 0 & - & - \\
\hline -ainformia Exate Unırersa=y & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Fsmano & 16 & 10 & \(0.0 \%\) & \(\cdots\) & 0 & -600.0\% & & & \\
\hline Cosp Beaca & 10¢ & 53 & - \(+0 \%\) & 8 & 10 & - 25.04 & & & \\
\hline -us maredes & 36 & 32 & - \(35.0 \%\) & 3 & 3 & 0.00\% & & & \\
\hline 5an Daego & 35 & 26 & - 34.8\% & * & 2 & - 50.0 & & & \\
\hline Sin Erancisco & 23 & \(: 3\) & - 0.6 & 2 & 2 & 6. \({ }^{\circ}\) & & & \\
\hline jes lase & \(\bullet\) & 1 & - \(23.0 \%\) & 4 & 26 & -350.0\% & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Calıforma Posrmecondery Educstion Comension.


\section*{CAMPUS INFORMATION}

sgernaral mironmation


CANTUS INFORMATION

!: \(\because\) 保
-82- 91

SECMENTAL INTORMATIOR


CMIPUS INFOMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Seppent and Campus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Gracunte Enrollmats}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Gradente Dorrees}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{poctors} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fal } \\
& 1978 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7811 \\
& 1982
\end{aligned}
\] & porcent Chenge & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1981- \\
82 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Pemcent Chance & \[
\begin{gathered}
79770 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & 1987 82 & Percent \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{iniverincy of Califorale - - - - -} \\
\hline Bericley & 452 & 385 & - \(14.8 \%\) & 47 & 56 & - 19.1\% & 33 & 46 & - 45.48 \\
\hline Davis \(r\) & 39 & 116 & +192.35 & 15 & 11 & - 26.68 & 3 & 0 & - 5.46 \\
\hline Trvine & 165 & 36 & - 78.07 & 1 & 0 & 0.0 & & & \\
\hline Las Ameles & 574 & 671 & + 16.98 & 86 & 59 & - 29.78 & 52 & 65 & - 35.85 \\
\hline Riversice & .95 & 224 & +135.7\% & 22 & 29 & - \(31.8 \%\) & 7 & \% & 0.50 \\
\hline Sanca Berbara & 228 & 348 & + 32.6\% & 69 & 84 & - \(21.7 \%\) & 13 & 20 & - \(53.8 \%\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{-aisforns Scate inıversity} \\
\hline Bakersfreid & 368 & 532 & - 52.85 & 128 & 90 & - 23.78 & & - & \\
\hline Chace & 107 & 110 & - 2.85 & 34 & 21 & - 38.28 & & - & \\
\hline Jomanguex H:ils & 140 & 161 & - 13.38 & 67 & 42 & - \(37.3 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Fresso & 105 & 81 & - \(22.8 \%\) & 36 & 32 & - 11.1\% & & & \\
\hline Fuilerton & 0 & \(\bigcirc\) & 0.28 & 210 & 286 & - 12.36 & & & \\
\hline Hagherd
Humooide & 270 & 227 & - \(16.5 \%\) & :27 & 81 & + \(36.2 \%\) & & & \\
\hline -ucf seacn & -48 & 6: & \(\because .5\) & \({ }^{7}\) & 26 & -188.8\% & & & \\
\hline -us tageies & 979 & 360 & - : 2.8 & 376 & 329 & - 33.50 & & & \\
\hline Vorchricipe & 0 & 0 & \(0.0 \%\) & 375 & 209 & - 28.20 & & & \\
\hline ? omona & \(\because\) & :7: & - 46.18 & -5 & T & - 15.30 & & & \\
\hline Sacramarie & : & -5: & - \(99.6 \%\) & 69 & :58 & -128.9\% & & & \\
\hline San Sernaraido & :91 & i & 0.94 & 153 & Log & - 85 & & & \\
\hline San \(\mathrm{Drang}_{\text {co }}\) & 810 & 018 & - 24.20 & 234 & 392 & - 88.38 & & & \\
\hline Sar Frame:sce & 0 & 0 & \(0.0 \%\) & +05 & 250 & - \(30 .-\) & & & \\
\hline sac jose & 0 & S & \(0.0 \%\) & 202 & -39 & - 3.28 & & & \\
\hline Sen inls Obispo & -21 & 354 & - 21.6 & 135 & \%์ & - & & & \\
\hline 3000matas & 0 & 0 & \(0.0 \%\) & \(-3\) & -1 & - \(4 . \mathrm{ot}^{\text {¢ }}\) & & & \\
\hline Stanisiaub & 19 & 29 & - 52.6\% & 20 & 24 & - 20.00 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{SECHENTAL MFORHATION}


CAMPUS INFORMATION


in: \(\because:\)-84-
93

\section*{DISPLAY 9 Engineering, General}

SSCMENTAL LEFORMATION

campus laromation
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sersmentand Gompe} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Grgdeve Enrollmants}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gracures Degrees} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Mrintin Eryon} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{becters} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{array}{r}
781 \\
1978 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FAl } \\
& 1982
\end{aligned}
\] & Parcemt Chang & \[
\begin{array}{r}
1977 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
1981= \\
82
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fercent } \\
& \text { Ennar. }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
7776 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
197= \\
89 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Preent Chinge \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{-inversity of callforma} \\
\hline - Davis & 179 & 480 & - \(56.9 \%\) & \({ }_{76}^{0}\) & 32
105 & 0.07
-38.15 & 21 & 9 & 0.08
9.38 \\
\hline irvine & 79 & 0 & -100.0\% & 22 & 31 & +158.0\% & 3 & \(\%\) & +133.3\% \\
\hline Sos Angeles & 586 & 727 & - \(26.0 \%\) & 165 & 159 & - \(3.6 \%\) & So & 58 & + \(20.0 \%\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Eaistorala Stace Universicy} \\
\hline Esesso & \(\stackrel{-}{-}\) & \(\because\) & -200.0\% & 5 & 6 & - \(20.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Eudierion & 163 & 300 & - \(84.0 \%\) & \(2 \%\) & 34 & - 25.98 & & & \\
\hline conge Seacn & -9 & 36 & - \(26.5 \%\) & 5 & 8 & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline Las Angeles & 90 & : 29 & -84.2\% & - & 0 & \(0.2 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Sorcaridge & :1- & 355 & - \(32.8 \%\) & \(1{ }^{10}\) & 3: & -121.-\% & & & \\
\hline Somoma & . 50 & 135 & - \(0.0 .0 \%\) & 36 & 68 & +88.8\% & & & \\
\hline Secramanco & 30 & : & - 81.5\% & & 3 & -200.0\% & & & \\
\hline Sat inxs Joisdo & 29 & : & - \(+1.3 \%\) & 5 & \(\underline{ }\) & \(\cdots+\infty\) & & & \\
\hline \(\therefore\) : & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Csb:forma Passecondary Edncacios Comasisaot.

SECHENTAL INFORMATON

\(\pi\)

CAMPUS INFORMATION


SonEce: Esilforma Posesecondery zducarion Eomesssion.
BEST COPY AVAILABLE
\(-86-95\)

SECMENTAL INFORACATION


CAMPUS INFORMATION



\section*{DISPLAY 12 Engineering: Electrical, Electronics, and Consmications Engineeriag}

GECMANTAL BITORMATION


CADES miFORMATION


-88-

\section*{DISPLAY 13 Enginmertag: mechanical Engineering}



CAMPUS INFORMTION


Source: Califorase Poseonemanry Idncikion Comarision. -89
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

\section*{}


\section*{CMAPUS ImPOMATIEN}



gecmintar miromention


Chorus mipommations


sicentrrat mionuation


CNMPUS mITORMATION



\section*{DISPLAY 18 Foreign Ļanguages: Germen}

\section*{}


0
CAMPUS INFORTATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Sernt ang Cumpr} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Fraute Enmollmat} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{merat prater} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{array}{r}
6 \pi \\
17 \%
\end{array}
\] & Ealy & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pratal } \\
& \text { Finent }
\end{aligned}
\] & T97\% 78 &  & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Wrent } \\
& \text { Ghases }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
19770 \\
70 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & 2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PrGint } \\
& \text { Chner }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{} \\
\hline 2evis & 16 & 29 & - 86.27 & 3 & 1 & -66.48 & 0 & 1 & \\
\hline isvine & 14 & 12 & - 16.2\% & 1 & 2 & - 100.0\% & 1 & 0 & -100.0\% \\
\hline Los Angeles & 15 & 18 & - 20.57 & 3 & 1 & -63.68 & \(\dot{0}\) & 0 & -100.06 \\
\hline Riverside & 5 & 2 & - \(60.0 \%\) & 0 & 1 & + & 0 & 0 & \(0.0 \%\) \\
\hline San Drege & 10 & 12 & - 21.48 & 2 & 1 & -100.9\% & 0 & 2 & * \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Fuilercon & 01 & - & - 36.38 & 3 & 3 & - 60.06 & & & \\
\hline -ang Beocn & 8 & 0 & - 33.08 & 0 & 0 & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline Sacramaro & - & 8 & - 12.58 & 3 & * & - 32.3\% & & & \\
\hline Ser. Diage & 5 & 6 & - 20.06 & 2 & 2 & \(0.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline San Franessco & 12 & 8 & - 33.3\% & 0 & 3 & * & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Source: Califermia Poatrocogenty Edmeacion Commsaios.
}

\section*{DISPLAY 19 Foreign Languages: Spanish}

SFROPNTNL INTORMATTON
\(*\)


CNMPUS INFORMTION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sermunt and Exous} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Frasuta frmollants}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Praduta Prane:} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7 \pi 11 \\
& 1970
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fait } \\
& \text { 1es }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Frene } \\
& \text { Mranes }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
1577^{\circ}
\] &  & Freant & \[
1977
\]
\[
70
\] & & \[
\operatorname{mont}
\] \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Uesversafy of Calsformia} \\
\hline Eertalay & 36 & 13 & -62.7\% & 6 & 4 & - 33.3\% & 0 & 0 & 0.68 \\
\hline Davas & 19 & 43 & - 21.08 & 5 & 7 & + 60.08 & 0 & 1 & - \\
\hline isvife & 33 & 42 & - \(27.2 \%\) & 10 & 3 & - 70.08 & 0 & 6 & + \\
\hline Los Amgles & 25 & 21 & - \(2 . .3 \%\) & 11 & 7 & - 36.48 & 0 & 0 & 0.05 \\
\hline Riverside & 12 & 16 & - 45.48 & 6 & 1 & - 75.98 & 0 & 0 & 0.08 \\
\hline Sas Diego \(\quad\) \% & 31 & 23 & - 19.35 & 4 & 6 & - 50.08 & 0 & 0 & 0.6 \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Eainforma Erace limiversisy} \\
\hline Eresao & 26 & 7 & - \(70.8 \%\) & 6 & 0 & -100.0\% & & & \\
\hline Fsdiercrn & 25 & 16 & - 30.0\% & 3 & - & -133.3\% & & & \\
\hline jong 3asch & il & \(\because\) & -70.78 & 0 & 3 & 133.3 & & . & \\
\hline Los Asshies & 6 & 57 & - 10.98 & 10 & 4 & - 80.00 & & & \\
\hline Vortiridee & 30 & 22 & - \(26.6 \%\) & 3 & - & - 0.68 & & & \\
\hline Sterameses & 21 & 28 & -9.6\% & 6 & 3 & - 25.00 & & & \\
\hline San Drego & 63 & 45 & - 5.80 & 23 & : & - 15.4 & & & \\
\hline Sac Erasenseo & 33 & is & - 5\%.5\% & 0 & - & - 16.78 & & & \\
\hline San igat 110 & 26 & \(: 9\) & - 20.96 & - 2 & 5 & -60.6\% & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
display 20 Realth Professions: Mursing
seciental mipomeation


CAMPUS INFORXATION


-96-

\section*{BEST COPY AVAILABLE}
DISPLAY 21 Letters: Classics


CAMPUS INFORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Soreant ant Comat} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Fratuste Enrplimats} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Grantite Pruct} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{array}{r}
61 \\
7978 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Fan \\
Yata \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 11.ants } \\
& \text { (xineent }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
7876 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
18!
\] &  & \begin{tabular}{l}
Fiste \\
78
\end{tabular} & & Prsint \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Liez versitey of Coliforma} \\
\hline Berkilay & 32 & 17 & - \(22.9 \%\) & 0 & 1 & - & 1 & 1 & 0.08 \\
\hline ITvies & 5 & 6 & . \(+20.0 \%\) & 2 & 0 & -100.06 & 0 & 0 & 2.06 \\
\hline Los Anpules & 19 & 13 & - 31.68 & 2 & 0 & -100.08 & 1 & 1 & 0.98 \\
\hline Samed Aestart & 15 & 11 & - 26.76 & 9 & 13 & - \(85.7 \%\) & 0 & 0 & \(0.0 \%\) \\
\hline Ea:sformas State hanversicy san fraesisco & 0 & - & * & \(c\) & 0 & 0.00 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source Galiforms: Posesecondery Equeszion Cominsian.
\[
\because \because!j+75 i
\]

BEST COPY AVALLABLE


CNMUS DTFORCNTION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Stunt axa Crax & \[
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{Fr} \\
\mathrm{FI} \\
\hline 1
\end{gathered}
\] & Fent &  & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} & \(1777^{2}\)
78 & 12 &  \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Vasversty of calisorasa 0.16 .71} \\
\hline Earwasy & 0 & 11 & 12.48 & 0 & 0 & \(0.0 \%\) & 0 & 0 & 0.08 \\
\hline Isurem & 21 & 18 & - 24.27 & 0 & 1 & & 0 & 2 & - se.6 \\
\hline Los Aspelet & 40 & 38 & - 5.07 & 5 & 5 & - 0.08 & 2 & 1 & - 50.10 \\
\hline Raversiote & 23 & 23 & - 0.08 & 6 & 4 & - 33.36 & 1 & 2 & -100.06 \\
\hline Sas Dsepe & 23 & 3 & - 17.35 & 3
3 & 3 & - 0.6 .7 & 0 & 0 & . 0.05 \\
\hline Samea Rorbars & 5 & 3 & 0.06 & 3 & & - 0.7 & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{} & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Fullerton \\
:An Frasersco
\end{tabular} & 24 & 15 & - 37.58 & 0 & & - 26.4 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Souref iabiforaza Poscepcomant Educabion Lemisestos.
i

EECMENTAL DNOMMTION

mscorntal miformation


\section*{CAMPUS LMTORMATON}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Sereme and farus} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Gramate fomillants}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gramata Parcma} \\
\hline & & & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
1578 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\]} & ETtim & 7 mecer & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Hactorn} \\
\hline & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
TIT \\
197
\end{tabular}} & aty &  & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Kio } \\
88
\end{gathered}
\] & Jercent chane & \[
\begin{gathered}
1977 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
7810 \\
88 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\] & Prent \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Uaxvarsity of Califoraia & & & & & 13 & +62.5\% & & & \\
\hline Sermeley & & 50
10 & + 6.80 & 5 & 2 & - 60.08 & 0 & 0 & 0.06
-50.08 \\
\hline Davis & 58 & 49 & - 25.58 & 9 & 6 & - 33.35 & 4 & 8 & + \(50.0 \%\) \\
\hline Los Amples & 58 & 39 & - 28.7 & , & 6 & -200.0\% & - & 8 & \\
\hline Sec Diogo & 48 & 39 & - 38.1 & & & & & & \\
\hline Eastorase gcaze Uaiverasty & & & & & ; & - \(20.2 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Freano & 52 & 29 & -0.60 & 8 & 8 & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline Fuilerzou & 31 & 46 & - .88 & 10 & 9 & - \({ }^{23.78}\) & & & \\
\hline cous geack & 32 & 31 & - 3.18 & 7 & 3 & - 57.10 & & & \\
\hline Scrthridge & 46 & 39 & - 25.25 & - & 10 & \(\begin{array}{r}\text { + } \\ + \\ \hline\end{array} 3.38\) & & & \\
\hline Sas Diego & 0 & 36 & - 43.7 & 1. & 20 & - 38.68 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\[
\text { isfalme } 1705 \text { Tesa }
\]
\[
-100
\]

\section*{DISPLAY. 25 Lettars: speech, Debate, and forensic science}

\section*{SECPTHTM INTOTMTYON}


CAMPUS INFORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{4}{*}{Sempne ang Cmens} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Gridute Enrollmant}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gratuate Dopentat} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{nistary} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{- - yocrem} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fall } \\
& 1978
\end{aligned}
\] & Fin
1982 & Prreent & \[
\begin{gathered}
19777^{2} \\
78
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1981- \\
& 82
\end{aligned}
\] & porcant shang & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Y81- } \\
82
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Parcent } \\
& \text { Change }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Unareressy of Cellforeda & 20 & 20 & + 30.08 & 8 & 4 & - 30.0\% & 1 & 2 & +100.0\% \\
\hline Davis & 3 & 13 & +266.6\% & 0 & 1 & * & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline Freseo & 13 & 11 & - 15.48 & 11 & 2 & - 81.85 & & & \\
\hline Fullertor & 39 & 10 & - 76.38 & 21 & 2 & - \(90.4 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Hayvart & 6 & \% & - 10.78 & 8 & 1 & - 50.58 & & & \(\cdots\) \\
\hline Rupoolde & 8 & 3 & - 02.38 & 2 & 3 & - 50.6 & & & \\
\hline Lang seaca & 32 & 28 & - 12.38 & \(\stackrel{+}{+}\) & - & - -8. \(0^{6}\) & & & \\
\hline Los mageles & 29 & 15 & - 48.80 & 9 & - & - 22.2 & & & \\
\hline Northridet & 3 & 21 & - 60.08 & 3 & 8 & - 60. & & & \\
\hline Sacramato & 00 & 71 & - 18.38 & \% & 8 & +100.0\% & & & \\
\hline Saa Dreyo & 18 & 24 & - 33.35 & 6 & \(\bigcirc\) & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline Sae Erascisco & 36 & 30
-3 & - \(51.6 \%\) & 15 & 5 & - -0.08 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{sxcmartar hiforunitow}


CAMOS BTFORMTION


Goures idilformie Potcopcondery Educasson Comisazon.

\section*{BEST COPY AVALLABLE}

SEGMSNTAL TNTORMTION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Drapra Charestarintis & 1978 & 18.9 & Purcent or Peremitage Polat chanse & \\
\hline switus of anduate mocions Vasveraicy of collfornas Eallformia scale thaseraiey & 8
8 & \[
13
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0.08 \\
& 0.08
\end{aligned}
\] & Fell 1978 Through Fall 1982 \\
\hline  & & & & \\
\hline Hiasveraity of California & 603 & 567 & - 5.9\% & \\
\hline Ferceat Man & 8.15 & 12.20 & - 1.98 & \\
\hline Parceac mimericy & 12.15 & 17.46 & - 5.38 & \\
\hline Peremen Parehas & 21.18 & 27.96 & -6.88 & \\
\hline Califormia Stete Daivernity Paremal ham & \[
{ }^{412} 69.58
\] & 468 & \(+12.2 \%\)
\(+\quad 2.58\) & 4,000 \\
\hline Parceas meozity & 23.58 & 29.68 & +5.7\% & \\
\hline Pereane Foreliga & 10.27 & 11.28 & -0.9\% & \\
\hline gensunt premets & & & & \\
\hline Univeraticy of Cellfornia Maters & 103 & 102 & -0.9\% & Universtity of Callfornis \\
\hline Peremat mes & 79.68 & 80.05 & - 0.88 & 500 \\
\hline Parsent mioertiy & 10.27 & 16.08 & + 5.88 & \\
\hline Farceat Tocoifm & 12.88 & 25.58 & + 6.7\% & - \\
\hline Doctors & 36 & 51 & - 5.5\% & Califormia Srate University \\
\hline Pereme gea & 87.06 & 83.08 & -1.0\% & \\
\hline Percme Hivority & 11.88 & 28.68 & +16.88 & \\
\hline Pareset Forniga & 21.28 & 34.08 & - \(12.8 \%\) & \(\cdots\) \\
\hline celiforate seate Vasveráry Master: & 66 & & & Fall Fall Fal Fall Fall \\
\hline Ferceat \(\square\) 5 & 72.38 & 62.58 & \[
-9.02
\] & 19781979 198i \(2981 \quad 1982\) \\
\hline Percme Misority & 28.68 & 50.08 & \[
+21.42
\] & \[
N
\] \\
\hline Pereme Porniga & 12.58 & 32.38 & - 15.88 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

CAMPUS INFORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Serment ang C-usus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Gramete Enrollmata}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Crmanta Derrest} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{hrimers} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{- bactori} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 77 n \\
& 1978
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fal } \\
& 1982
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ferent } \\
& \text { cimere }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977^{\circ} \\
7
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
18.15 \\
80
\end{gathered}
\] & Wreant crand & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977= \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & TYA-
\[
82
\] & Prtent Chand \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Uasverasty of Califorma} \\
\hline Dapis & 37 & 32 & - 13.58 & 10 & 7 & - \(30.0 \%\) & 3 & 1 & - 66.76 \\
\hline Irvire & 36 & 36 & - 5.58 & 1 & 9 & +800.07 & 0 & 6 & * \\
\hline Eos Asgales & 136 & 118 & - 23.24 & 29 & 32 & -10.3\% & 10 & 8 & -200.08 \\
\hline Miverside & 32 & 31 & - 3.18 & 6 & - 7 & - 16.78 & 7 & 2 & 0.08 \\
\hline San Diepo & 63 & 52 & - 19.05 & 18 & 5 & - 72.27 & ; & 8 & +100.08 \\
\hline Same Rartara & 49 & 56 & -10.2\% & 7 & 10 & + \(42.8 \%\) & 2 & 5 & +150.0\% \\
\hline Sasta Crwi & 17 & 26 & +52.9\% & 1 & 3 & +200.0* & 0 & 1 & + \\
\hline Eainforaia Scaee Dasvarsícy & & & & & & & \(\cdots\) & & \\
\hline Eranmo & 15 & 19 & 0.08 & 0 & 1 & * & & & \\
\hline Fudlercos & 20 & 39 & - 95.08 & - & 8 & - 16.37 & & & \\
\hline Hayward & 16 & 31 & -93.88 & 4 & \(\pm\) & - \(50.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Lent batas & -0 & -: & + \(17.5 \%\) & \% & 3 & - 57.8\% & & & \\
\hline ios Aapelas & 7- & 76 & - 2.7 & 9 & - & - 55.5\% & & & \\
\hline Northrsege & 39 & 26 & - \(33.3 \%\) & 1 & 8 & -706.0\% & & & \\
\hline Pomeas & 10 & 23 & -43.7\% & 2 & 5 & +300.0\% & & & \\
\hline Sacramaneo & 3i & 10 & - \(67.7 \%\) & \(\vdots\) & : & \(0.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Sap Diego & 30 & 28 & - \(35.8{ }^{\text {cex }}\) & - & 3 & - \(30.0{ }^{\circ}\) & & & \\
\hline Sac Fracesseo & -2 & 12 & - 71.48 & 6 & 2 & - 66.7* & & & \\
\hline Sap Jose & -1 & 10. & -133.6\% & 9 & 0 & - 33.3\% & & & \\
\hline Sas hus: Obispo & 15 & 15 & 0.08 & 8 & 3 & - 62.38 & & & \\
\hline Sencen & 16 & 11 & 0.08 & 5 & \(:\) & - 80.08 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{DISPLAY 28 Physical sciences: Cbenistzy, Genaral}


\section*{CAMPNE ATPORMATION}


\(\therefore \therefore t \quad \therefore y \quad y_{i} 0\) Tit

\section*{securintar miforention}


CAMPUS INTORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Soment and Comus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Grrututa Enrollunts}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Armmata Bercial} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Hintr} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Desem} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fall } \\
& 3978 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fan } \\
& 198 \%
\end{aligned}
\] & Preant Chane & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 1977E } \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
14.1 \\
80 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Percent Ghne: & \[
\begin{gathered}
19776 \\
78 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
18810 \\
88 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Parcent } \\
& \text { Ennert }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Uiks merazisy of Celsforaic Berkeley & 45 & 50 & - 2.08 & 7 & 6 & & & & \\
\hline Devis & 4 & 56 & +12.3\% & 3 & 6 & -100.07 & 1 & 3 & - 2000.08 \\
\hline Lot Aaycles & 66 & 61 & . - 10.8\% & 5 & 6 & - \(20.0 \%\) & 5 & 7 & + 60.00 \\
\hline Sares Inrbara & 50 & 39 & - \(28.0 \%\) & 9 & 6 & - \(33.3 \%\) & 2 & 5 & -150.0\% \\
\hline Eabiformia seaca laxvertaty & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Esenno & \(i^{-}\) & 15 & - \(13.8 \%\) & 6 & 6 & \(0.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Long Banch & 38 & 39 & - \(2.6 \%\) & ; & 0 & -100.0\% & & & \\
\hline Los Ampeles & 63 & 55 & - \(22 . \%\) & 2 & 8 & -300.0\% & & & \\
\hline Vorchridre & 38 & 43 & + 23.8 & 2 & - & -100.0\% & & & \\
\hline San Diago & 68 & 95 & + 39.7 & 0 & 23 & -155.3\% & & & - \\
\hline Sax Jose & 02 & 55. & - 21.00 &  & 6 & - 56.36. & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


secmantal micomation


\section*{CNAPUS DAFORMATION}


\footnotetext{

}


CAMPUS INFORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sermat and Exaus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Ernduata Enrollmats}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gradure Bormes} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{LTerm} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{lesters} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7611 \\
& 1978
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fall } \\
& 2922
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { vitent } \\
& \text { chan }
\end{aligned}
\] & Titio 78 & 1510 82 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Preent } \\
& \text { Charen }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
7877^{\circ}
\]
\[
78
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
188{ }^{2} \\
82
\end{gathered}
\] & Parcent \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Ungyersiey of Califerma \\

\end{tabular}} \\
\hline Bertaley & 105 & 29 & - 5.78 & 7 & 5 & - 28.68 & 10 & 11 & + 10.08 \\
\hline Itreme & 28 & 32 & +14.27 & 2 & . 1 & - 50.08 & 3. & 6 & + 33.36 \\
\hline Las Angeler & 207 & 185 & - \(10.6 \%\) & 22 & 28 & - 27.28 & 26 & 31 & - 19.2 \% \\
\hline Riverside & 49 & 47 & - 4.0\% & 6 & 3 & - 50.08 & 0 & 3 & * \\
\hline Sas Diego & -7 & 0 & -100.05 & 8 & 9 & + 12.58 & 13 & & - 46.27 \\
\hline San Francisco & 25 & 30 & + \(20.8 \%\) & 0 & 0 & 0.08 & 3 & 1 & -66.7 \\
\hline Samea bacbera & 49 & 30 & + 2.07 & 3 & ; & -133.3\% & \(\dot{4}\) & 8 & -102.0\% \\
\hline Sagea Crue & 23 & 40 & -73.98 & : & 0 & -100.08 & 3 & - & -133.34 \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Eatiforms State Lespargaty} \\
\hline Inmersfield & 30 & 27 & - 20.05 & 9 & 6 & - 16.38 & & & \\
\hline Euce & 126 & 85 & - 38.3\% & 27 & 17 & - 37.08 & & & \\
\hline Domequest Mills & 69 & 75 & - 8.7 & 3 & 13 & -333.3\% & & & \\
\hline Frasso & 131 & 37 & -45.6\% & 17 & 13 & - 23.5\% & & & \\
\hline Fudlerton & 39 & 60 & - 1.68 & 33 & \(2 \%\) & - 18.15 & & & \\
\hline Hentolds & :26 & 95 & - 33.38 & 4 & 25 & 0.05 & & & \\
\hline Cong samet & 100 & 89 & - 56.30 & mis & 39 & - 13.3\% & & & \\
\hline jos Angeies & +28 & 320 & - 23.8 & 1: & 89 & - 19.8 & & & \\
\hline Vorchridpe & 188 & 197 & - 0.68 & 3i & 41 & - \(20.5 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Sacrampace & :2: & 96 & - \(24.4 \%\) & 20 & 30 & + \(80.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Sas Bermardino & 36 & 59 & -96.68 & : 3 & 28 & - 20.06 & & & \\
\hline San Diego & :28 & 100 & - 0.7 .18 & 37 & 2 & - 56.07 & & & \\
\hline Sas Franc:aco & :10 & \(\because\) & - 35.44 & 65 & 53 & - 18.68 & & & \\
\hline San Jose & \(1: 2\) & 92 & - 18.5\% & 53 & 52 & - \(\quad .8\) \% & & & \\
\hline Sonem. & \(\therefore 2\) & :30 & - 19.68 & \(5:\) & \(3 i\) & - \(-5.6 \%\) & & & \\
\hline Stutstitun:" & \(3^{\circ} 9\) & 34 & - 8.2\% & - & i- & -100. 5 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{stcelantar miromations}


CAMPUS EMFOMMTION

\[
\therefore \text { Almy Yocico }
\]

\section*{SETBINTAL HITORMATION}


CAMPUS mformation


\section*{}


CAMPUS Infonmatyon
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sepmat wal cemens} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Grevat Fncollmats}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gratira Parcm} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{15y\%} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{, 4 com} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fall } \\
& \text { 197 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fail } \\
& 19 ?
\end{aligned}
\] & prame Chates & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { T97\% } \\
78
\end{gathered}
\] & Ity- & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fareme } \\
& \text { chas? }
\end{aligned}
\] & & 1810 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Preme } \\
& \text { Crate? }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline Berkalay & 85 & 106 & - 16.8 & & & & & & \\
\hline Devis & 6 & 29 & - 36.5 & 10 & 6 & - 40.08 & 4 & 6 & 0.01 \\
\hline Los Aageles & 135 & 166 & - 6.68 & 30 & 22 & - 26.68 & 9 & 16 & - 77.81 \\
\hline Rsverside & 37 & 37 & 0.08 & 4 & 3 & - 23.08 & 2 & 6 & -200.0\% \\
\hline San Diego & 25 & 36 & -46.08 & 0 & 6 & & 5 & 1 & -80.08 \\
\hline Sance Berbera & 20 & 50 & - 25.08 & ; & 9 & + \(28.8 \%\) & 2 & 7 & -250.0\% \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Coisforale Stace Uasversssy} \\
\hline Chico & 31 & 21 & - 32.28 & , & 3 & - 60.08 & & & \\
\hline Fullersoa & 69 & 30 & - 26.58 & \(\underline{\square}\) & 3 & -150.07 & & & \\
\hline Mownere & 29 & : & - 58.68 & - & - & - \(6.8 .5 \%\) & & & \\
\hline jois beack & -2 & 25 & - 40.4\% & 3 & 2 & - 33.38 & & & \\
\hline Lus Aageles & 43 & 23 & - 01.80 & \(:=\) & 1 & - 91. \({ }^{\text {\% }}\) & & & - \\
\hline Nortariage & 48 & 26 & - 43.85 & 5 & \(10^{\circ}\) & -0.0.38 & & & - \\
\hline Sacrampace & - 3 & 40 & - \(0.9 \%\) & - & \(\overline{7}\) & - 95.08 & & & \\
\hline San jaeso & 60 & 36
30 & -50.08
-53.88 & 9 & 9 & - 22.80 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\section*{smemeran mpormation}


CAMPUS INFOREATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Serment and Capus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Greture Enrollcmer}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Cratute Prame} \\
\hline & & & & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{FITM} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Dectery} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& F 811 \\
& 2978
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 511 \\
& 192 ?
\end{aligned}
\] & Morcent
Chance & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Tir7e } \\
7 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & Tin & Percent fhery: & \[
\begin{gathered}
79770 \\
78
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Th10 } \\
8 ? \\
\hline 8
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pereont } \\
& \text { Chana: }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Lat versity of ieliformb} \\
\hline Bermelay & 166 & 124, & - 13.85 & 23 & 10 & - 56.58 & 27 & 23 & - 14.84 \\
\hline Davis & 61 & 58 & - 4.98 & ; & 3 & - 57.18 & & 5 & -600.08 \\
\hline Los Amgeles & 143 & 231 & - 8.38 & 23 & 27 & - 17.38 & 19 & 9 & - 32.68 \\
\hline Riverside & 41 & 49 & - 19.38 & \(\dot{-}\) & 16 & +400.06 & 2 & 8 & - 300.0 \\
\hline San Diego & 60 & 58 & - 3.35 & g & 9 & 0.08 & 2 & , & -230.00 \\
\hline Sance marbara & 89 & 93 & - 9.6 & 26 & 27 & - 3.08 & 7 & 3 & - 57.18 \\
\hline Sanea Grue & 0 & 13 & * & 0 & 6 & 1.1 & 0 & 0 & 0.08 \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Eabiforasa stace Uaivarsicy} \\
\hline Fuliertos & 16 & 15 & - \(\cdot \mathrm{A}\) & 4 & 5 & - 23.00 & & & \\
\hline Heware & 19 & 18 & - 22.05 & 4 & 2 & - 50.05 & & & \\
\hline -ang Beacs & 29 & 32 & - 10.34 & 10 & 7 & - 30.08 & & & \\
\hline jor maptios & 30 & 49 & - \(03.3 \%\) & : & 3 & - 30.00 & & & \\
\hline ? \({ }^{\text {asoms }}\) & 37 & 2\% & - 62.:8 & 0 & , & 0.00 & & & \\
\hline Ssersmanco & 28 & 38 & 0.05 & 6 & \(\bullet\) & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline San Dreye & 33 & 35 & - \(6.0 \%\) & - & 6 & C.00 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


16 va :3031279
dISPLAY' 36 social sciences: Goography
secenntal mponmation


CAMPUS INFORMATION




CAMPUS mTORATION




CNMPUE DIFORMATEON
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{sernt mat comen} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Gradrat Encollantu} & & ¢ 1 & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Gremate Pares} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Fain } \\
& 28 \pi
\end{aligned}
\] & 8810 & Critere & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Ty } \\
70
\end{gathered}
\] & 15 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Foremt } \\
& \text { Coner }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { M77 } \\
78
\end{gathered}
\] & 1840 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Mreatit } \\
& \text { grate }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Uasversiey of Califoraia . 40 e 23.58} \\
\hline Earkeley & 186 & 177 & - 6.58 & 16 & 60 & -275.018 & 17 & 21 & + 23.58 \\
\hline Davis & 21 & 31 & - 47.08 & 6 & 7 & -16.73 & 0 & 0 & 0.07 \\
\hline irvise & 2 & 6 & -100.08 & 0 & 0 & 0.68 & 0 & 0 & 0.01 \\
\hline Los Aageles & 79 & 8 & - 7.58 & 21 & 35 & - 29.05 & 6 & 3 & - 50.0 \\
\hline Riverside & 45 & 42 & - \(6.6 \%\) & 6 & 6 & 0.08 & 5 & 6 & - 16.7 \\
\hline Sae Diage & 0 & 13 & \(\stackrel{*}{*}\) & 0 & 0 & 0.61 & 0 & 0 & 0.06 \\
\hline Santa Eerbary & 76 & 6 & - 7.08 & 10 & 16 & - 60.08 & 7 & 5 & - 28.68 \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Caizforata Stafe Univarsicy} \\
\hline Chaco & 8 & 9 & - 12.58 & 5 & 2 & - 60.08 & & & \\
\hline Frasoo & 11 & 10 & - \(0.0 \%\) & 1 & 1 & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline Fullartas & 27 & 16 & - 41.18 & 4 & - & 0.08 & & & \\
\hline Long beacs & 35 & 26 & - 32.4\% & 6 & - & - 16.7 & & & \\
\hline Los Aage.es & \(3 i\) & 33 & - 31.38 & 10 & 3 & - 70.06 & & & \\
\hline - Sosxarsdye & 4 & \(\dot{4}\) & - 904 & 1 & 0 & -100.08 & . & & \\
\hline Sacramance & 37 & 28 & - \(24.3 \%\) & 6 & 5 & - 16.7 & & & \\
\hline Sap Jrego & 23 & 16 & - \(0.0 \%\) & 6 & \(\pm\) & - 06.7 & & & \\
\hline San Frascises & 82 & i & -91.4\% & 18 & 3 & - 83.3 & & & \\
\hline Sas Joee & 33 & 16 & - 51.54 & 13 & 6 & - 53.85 & & & \\
\hline Sogame & -3 & 3: & - \(27.9 \%\) & 6 & 6 & \(0.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{

}

SECEGNTTK INFOPMATTON


CAMPUS INTORMATION
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sement ind camus} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Gradure Enrallmans}} & \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Gradunte Darmes} \\
\hline & & & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{-} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
1977 \\
78
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{cecrem} \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { FaT } \\
& 1978 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{Fin} \\
& 192
\end{aligned}
\] & Preent & \[
\begin{gathered}
7977^{\circ} \\
78
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { TSI- } \\
0 ? \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pareant } \\
& \text { Manis: }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{gathered}
70^{20} \\
0
\end{gathered}
\] & Pracent
Ghen: \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Universiey of callforais.} \\
\hline Earkaley & 105 & 97 & - 7.64 & 11 & 16 & - 45.58 & 13 & 16 & + 8.70 \\
\hline Davis & 26 & 22 & - 15.3\% & 6 & 2 & - \(66.6 \%\) & 2 & 3 & - \(30.0 \%\) \\
\hline UCT & 100 & 202 & - 2.08 & 16 & 10 & - 37.58 & 8 & 11 & - 37.58 \\
\hline giverside & 38 & 30 & - \(21.0 \%\) & 4 & 6 & - 50.08 & - 0 & 0 & \(0.0{ }^{5}\) \\
\hline Sea Diago & 36 & 38 & + 7.48 & \% & 10 & - 21.18 & 1 & 3 & +206.07 \\
\hline San Frameiseo & 25 & 26 & - \(6.0 \%\) & 0 & 0 & 0.08 & 1 & 2 & - 33.38 \\
\hline Seace Barbata & 31 & 62 & - 27.68 & 5 & 6 & - 20.08 & 9 & 2 & - 77.8 \\
\hline Seace Csuz & 27 & 26 & - 21.18 & 15 & 6 & - \(60.0 \%\) & 0 & 1 & * \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|l|}{Califormas Scate Duiversiey} \\
\hline Chaco & 9 & 21 & - \(22.2 \%\) & 13 & 3 & - 76.98 & & & \\
\hline Jominguaz Mixis & 8 & 29 & +262.3\% & 0 & 2 & & & & \\
\hline Fusjersog & 32 & 23 & - 28.1\% & 9 & 3 & - 28.68 & & & \\
\hline Hayware & 13 & 3 & - 76.98 & - & - & - \(30.0{ }^{\circ}\) & & & \\
\hline Humpolat & \(:^{-}\) & 16 & - 17.58 & 1 & 2 & -100.0\% & & & \\
\hline jos angeles & 100 & 4 & - 32.82 & 5 & 6 & - 20.6 & & & \\
\hline Nortaridge & 4 & 15 & -.*i.9\% & - & 2 & - 50.08 & & & \\
\hline Surramise & 25 & 19 & - 32.28 & 5 & 2 & - ac.of & & & \\
\hline San Diege & 51 & :1 & - \(58.8 \%\) & 10 & 1 & - 90.06 & & & \\
\hline jan jose & 36 & , & - - - & 8 & - & - \(36.0 \%\) & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: Falsforma Pooceecomdery Enceacica Commasion.
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TABLE 14 Ethaicity of University of California Graduate students by Field of Study, Fall 1978 and Fall 1982*

 miscellamems prograna.
1.4BLE 15 Ethnicity of California State University Graduate Students by Field of Study, Fall 1978 and Fall 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Gisciplime Divisions} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(\qquad\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{B1-ck} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Misponic} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{mite} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Numer of Students } \\
& \text { Tho Declarnd } \\
& \text { Their Ethnicity }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & T62 & 7978 & 1982 & & 152 & E78: & 190 & & \\
\hline Agricuifire and Wetarsl Resnarcea & 7.8 & 3.5 & 1.3 & 0.6 & 2.4 & 2.6 & 85.3 & 8.1 & 368 & 311 \\
\hline Architerinym and & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline Envirommental Destan & 6.8 & 6.8 & 1.8 & 1.9 & 3.0 & 6.4 & 83.8 & 79.6 & 219 & 265 \\
\hline Biologiral Sriencen & 8.8 & 10.2 & 1.6 & 3.2 & 3.0 & 6.6 & 80.8 & 78.1 & 1,389 & 1,029 \\
\hline Businenn ant hanasmant & 11.9 & 11.4 & 3.9 & 2.7 & 3.0 & 3.3 & 76.9 & 79.6 & 5.092 & 6.698 \\
\hline Commuatratimin & 2.1 & 3.2 & 7.8 & 5.6 & 4.6 & 3.8 & 80.0 & 84.6 & 370 & 340 \\
\hline Campuefr and Information Sripprea & 13.7 & 23.9 & 2.5 & 2.9 & 1.5 & 3.1 & 17.5 & 66.4 & 400 & 1.235 \\
\hline Efucation & 5.5 & 4.1 & 6.9 & 5.8 & 8.1 & 9.9 & . 74.6 & 76.2 & 9,294 & 8.971 \\
\hline Entiapering & 20.6 & 30.5 & 2.1 & 2.2 & 5.1 & 4.2 & 64.6 & 57.6 & 1,229 & 2.163 \\
\hline Fine ami Applian Arta & 4.7 & 6.3 & 3.5 & 3.4 & 4.0 & 6.0 & 82.7 & 79.0 & 1,875 & 1,576 \\
\hline Foreinn langanges & s. \({ }^{\text {\% }}\) & *. & 2.3 & 2.6 & 29.6 & 27.2 & 58.1. & 56.0 & 432 & 305 \\
\hline Health Praforsiona & 6.7 & 6.7 & 4.9 & 4.7 & 3.8 & 5.0 & 79.5 & 78.5 & 2,483 & 2.531 \\
\hline Home Eranomirs & 8.4 & 7.3 & 4.2 & 4.3 & 4.2 & 3.0 & 17.7 & 81.1 & 497 & 662 \\
\hline lopttere & 3.6 & 2.8 & 3.6 & 3.0 & 4.2 & 5.3 & 83.0 & 83.6 & 1.792 & 1.592 \\
\hline Hithrary Srimer & 5.4 & 6.0 & 0.0 & 2.4 & 2.7 & 1.2 & 87.7 & 84.1 & 73 & 82 \\
\hline Mathematire & 14. 7 & 15.5 & 3.5 & 2.4 & 2.9 & 5.8 & 73.4 & 70.3 & 313 & 380 \\
\hline Physfrat Scirnema & R. 6 & 8.4 & 1.7 & 2.2 & 2.5 & 3.3 & 80.6 & 80.8 & 628 & 126 \\
\hline Psycholung & 3.9 & 3.8 & 7.3 & 6.1 & 5.0 & 6.8 & 79.5 & 78.8 & 1.863 & 1.135 \\
\hline Public Affaitn and Serviona & 5.0 & 4.7 & 41.4 & 10.1 & 7.6 & 10.5 & 10.4 & 69.9 & 2,353 & 2,297 \\
\hline Social Srimiran & 5.0 & 6.3 & 6.0 & 5.5 & 6.6 & 10.8 & 16.1 & 74.3 & 2,122 & 1.520 \\
\hline Alt firlis & 5.6 & 7.8 & 6.0 & 5.1 & 8.0 & 7.6 & 74.3 & 75.1 & 33.401 & 34.970 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


TABLE 16 Ethnicity of University of California Haster's Degree Recipients by Field of Study, 1978-79 and 1982-83
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Disciplime DivIsloms} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Aaten ar Pectific islomer} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{alegh} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Micpenic} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{White} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{aber of Students Whe Beclared Their Ethaicity} \\
\hline & & & Fir & FI &  & \[
\frac{16}{1!}
\] & F188 & 158 & & \\
\hline Agriculture mand Matniel Remonrroe & 2.7 & 6.5 & 0.0 & 3.2 & 0.0 & 3.2 & \$9.9 & 70.7 & 110 & 123 \\
\hline Arrive prtore and Envimmental Denifa & 8.7 & 6.0 & 11.2 & 4.2 & 6.3 & 6.0 & 70.2 & 60.8 & 161 & 215 \\
\hline Blolongical frimaces & 5.0 & 5.5 & 0.8 & 0.9 & 0.4 & 2.8 & 68.8 & 79.2 & 260 & 216 \\
\hline Rurimens and Msmagrent & 6.2 & 8.5 & 3.0 & 2.6 & 3.0 & 3.6 & 85.0 & 77.0
100.0 & 661 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 809 \\
& 10
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Commiraltoma & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 6.2 & 0.0 & 87.5 & & & \\
\hline Conaputer and Infonmeien Sctewcel & \(9.9{ }^{\circ}\) & 12.5 & 0.0 & 0.8 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 87.3 & 77.0 & 298 & 112 \\
\hline Etacneion & 3.3 & 6.3 & 3.8 & 3.7 & 3.6 & 5.3 & 83.7 & 75.8 & 321 &  \\
\hline Emalnerting & 13.8 & 17.8 & 0.9 & 0.8 & 1.7 & 2.9 & 81.9 & 72.8 & 281 & 29 \\
\hline Fine and Applied Arts: & 3.6 & 4.0 & 2.5 & 3.0 & 1.8 & 4.0 & 71.2 & 72.8 & 113 & 8 \\
\hline Forrign Lamangen & 0.9 & 0.6 & 1.8 & 8.8 & 8.6 & 5.0 & 77.0 & 78.0
76.5 & 663 & 505 \\
\hline Anatich Profenstmas & 5.9 & 6.5 & 8.6 & 6.4 & 1.6 & 5.6 & 89.6 & 81.3 & 25 & 6 \\
\hline Wome Rrmasalica & 6.8 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.9 & 3.8 & 89.6 & 81.3 & 12 & 103 \\
\hline Eepters & 2.4 & 3.1 & 1.6 & 1.0 & 1.6 & 3.8 & 28.4 & 64.8 & 155 & 9 \\
\hline Cibrary sidewce & 6.5 & 6.0 & 3.2 & 1.0 & 1.3 & 3.8 & 84.4 & 76.5 & 90 & 11 \\
\hline Narthantice & 6.7 & 9.8 & 4.4 & 0.0 & 2.3
1.3 & 1.0 & 90.3 & 78.3 & 228 & 184 \\
\hline Phynical sciencen & 4.8 & 7.2 & 1.8 & 2.6 & 5.9 & 7.1 & 44.3 & \(73.8{ }^{\text { }}\) & 31 & 42 \\
\hline Pryebology & 3.9 & 11.9 & 3.9 & 2.6 & 5.9 & 7.1 & 2. 3 & 13.8 & & \\
\hline Pablif Alfairy and Rervices & 11.1 & 6.7 & 7.4 & 9.7 & 12.4 & 12.1 & 62.1 & 66.7 & 161 & 165 \\
\hline Sumial seiemem & 3.5 & 3.9 & 5.1 & 2.5 & 3.5 & 6.5 & 8.0 & & 37 & \\
\hline Alt Fielde & 6.2 & 7.7 & 3.7 & 2.7 & 2.7 & 6.3 & 83.0 & 67.9 & 4,48 & 4.512 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*Nither "other" category cham te 1978.

TABLE 17 Ethnicity of University of California Doctoral Degree Recipients, by Field of study, 1978-79 and 1982-83
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Asfas or Pacific \\
ER Islentr
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(\cdots\) Etnet} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Mirseals} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Mater} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Blvisions & & & Yys & 18: & Kin & In & \[
\underline{1 i}
\] & 180 & & \\
\hline Agriculfare and Malneni Resmarcea & 9.5 & 3.3 & 0.0 & 3.3 & 0.0 & 3.3 & 90.3 & 76.7 & 21 & 30 \\
\hline Architmenener mad Envirmmental Devien & 0.0 & 0.0 & 10.0 & 6.7 & 10.0 & 0.0 & 80.6 & 66.7 & 10 & 13 \\
\hline Envirnhment il Demith Bialoniral Scimeren & 4.1 & 8.0 & 2.2 & 1.4 & 1.3 & 3.6 & 88.6 & 73.7 & 316 & 346 \\
\hline Buainmeng mat Managrament & 0.0 & 15.0 & 0.0 & 5.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 100.0. & 63.0 & 24 & 20 \\
\hline Comparter and Informelion Simacem & 9.0 & 0.0 & 0.6 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 91.7 & 81.2 & 11 & 16 \\
\hline Eduent irve & 4.3 & 4.2 & 5.4 & 9.3 & 6.5 & 5.8 & 81.5 & 71.2 & 92 & 118 \\
\hline Engimerine & 10.0 & 17.6 & 0.8 & 1.6 & 0.0 & 0.8 & 06.7 & 6.6 & 120 & 126 \\
\hline Fine nowl Applied Arts & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.8 & 0.0 & 17.0 & 96.9 & 48.6 & 26 & 35 \\
\hline Frreign lumpmagea & 0.0 & 2.8 & 3.8 & 0.0 & 3.8 & 17.1 & 88.5 & 78.6 & 40 & 69 \\
\hline Heslin Profexsimme & 5.0 & 4.0 & 5.0 & 2.8 & 0.0 & 2.0 & 66.6 & 0.6 & 3 & 0 \\
\hline Home Erammirs & 31.3 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0
0.0 & 3.0 & 1.0 & \$3.4 & 72.8 & 76 & 92 \\
\hline Letiers & 0.0 & 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.8
0.0 & 2.8 & 87.8 & 76.4 & 41 & 43 \\
\hline Mathematirs & 4.9 & 9.3 & 2.4 & 0.0 & 0.0
0.0 & 2.3
1.0 & 87.7 & 72.6 & 227 & 216 \\
\hline Plysiral Srimences & 6.2 & 7.0 & 1.3 & 0.6 & 1.6 & 1.0 & 87.1 & 69.1 & 70 & 81 \\
\hline Peyrhoingy & 1.6 & 2.4 & 7.1 & 3.7 & 1.4 & 6.2 & 6\%. & 6.8 & & \\
\hline Publir Affalrs and serviern & 0.0 & 17.6 & 0.0 & 5.8 & 12.5 & 0.0 & 87.5 & 58.9
70.0 & 16 & 17 \\
\hline Sorisi Srimimen & 3.6 & 2.5 & 4.2 & 2.0 & 3.6 & 2.0 & 0.9 & 70.0 & 192 & \\
\hline All Fimida & 4.1 & 6.6 & 2.6 & 2.2 & 1.3 & 2.9 & 87.9 & 70.5 & 1,401 & 1,562 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


TABLE 18 Ethnicity of Celiforaia state Oniversity Haster's Degree Recipionts by Field of study, 1978-79 and 1982-83
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TABLE 19 Percent and Mumber of Nanter's Dagrees Amarded to Women in California, 1978 and 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Sermant} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Porcent of Degrees \\
marded to Homen
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percentage Point Chanre} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Number of Degrees Awarded to Women} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Percent Change} \\
\hline & 1978 & 1882 & & 1978 & 1982 & \\
\hline University of Celifornia - & 39.1\% & 40.1\% & +1.0\% & 2,191 & 2,396 & + \(9.3 \%\) \\
\hline Califormia State Uaiverstty & 50.8 & 56.0 & + 5.2 & 5,156 & 5,463 & + 5.9 \\
\hline Independent Institutions & 31.8 & 39.3 & + 7.5 & 4,752 & 5,809 & \(+22.2\) \\
\hline Statewide Total & 39.4\% & \(44.8 \%\) & +5.4\% & 12,099 & 13,668 & +12.9\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Pontsecondary Education staff analysis.

TABLE 20 Percent and Aumber of Malter's Degrees Amarded to Women in Seiected fields of Study in California, 1978 and 2982


Above Average:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Public Affaire and Services & \(33.5 \%\) & 48.0\% & +14.5\% & 804 & 729 & -9.3\% \\
\hline Business and & & & & & & \\
\hline Management & 16.6 & 28.1 & +11.5 & 951 & 1,909 & +100.7 \\
\hline Social Sciences & 30.0 & 40.2 & +10.2 & 573 & 423 & - 26.1 \\
\hline Psychology & 50.6 & 60.2 & \(+9.6\) & 614 & 948 & \(+54.3\) \\
\hline Home Economics & 77.9 & 85.4 & \(+7.5\) & 120 & 152 & \(+26.6\) \\
\hline Library Science & 75.0 & 82.3 & \(+7.3\) & 424 & 154 & - 63.3 \\
\hline Fine Ates & 49.7 & 56.2 & +6.5 & 603 & 628 & + 4.1 \\
\hline Computer Sciences & 15.4 & 21.3 & \(+5.9\) & 56 & 118 & +110.7 \\
\hline Biological & & 21.3 & & & & \\
\hline Sciences & 34.4 & 39.8 & \(+5.4\) & 228 & 231 & \(+1.3\) \\
\hline Average: & & & \(\pm 5.48\) & & & \(\pm 12.9 \%\) \\
\hline Below Average: & & & & & & \\
\hline Letters & 56.7 . & 61.3 & \(+4.6\) & 556 & 507 & - 8.8 \\
\hline Agriculture & 21.9 & 26.1 & \(+4.2\) & 66 & 99 & \(+50.0\) \\
\hline Health Professions & 68.5 & 72.4 & \(+3.9\) & 1,136 & 1,307 & +15.1 \\
\hline Physical Scieaces & 16.4 & 20.2 & + 3.8 & 91 & 110 & \(+20.8\) \\
\hline Engineering & 6.9 & 3.6 & \(+2.7\) & 167 & 236 & \(+41.3\) \\
\hline Comminications & 49.1 & 51.7 & \(+2.6\) & 111 & *89 & - 19.8 \\
\hline Architecture & 34.0 & 36.0 & \(+2.0\) & 104 & 136 & + 30.7 \\
\hline Mathematics & 21.9 & 23.1 & + 1.2 & 60 & 56 & - 6.6 \\
\hline Educstion & 74.6 & 71.5 & - 3.1 & 5,434 & 4,166 & - 24.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Postsecondary Education Comission staff anslysis.

TABLE 21 Percent and Mumer of Doctor's Dagrees Awarded to Women in California, 1978 and 1982
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Serment} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Parcent of Degrees Amarded to Women} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percentage Point Chanre} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Number of Degrees Awarded to homen} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Percent Change} \\
\hline & 2978 & 1988 & & 1978 & 1982 & \\
\hline Univeraity of California & 21.7\% & 26.8\% & +5.4\% & 410 & 532 & +29.7\% \\
\hline Califormia State University & 75.0 & 0.0 & -- & 3 & 0 & -- \\
\hline Independent Institutions & 25.0 & 31.8 & +6.8 & 604 & 770 & +27.4 \\
\hline Statewide Total & 23.6\% & 29.3\% & +5.9\% & 1,017 & 1,302 & +28.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Source: California Pontsecondary Education staff analysis.

TABLE 22 Percent and Number of Doctor's Degrees Awarded to Women In selected fields of Study in California, 1978 and 1982

\section*{Field of Study}

Parcent of Degrees Percantage Number of Degrees


Above Average:


Source: California Poatsecondary Education Comisaion scaff analyeis.
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