2009 Graduate Study in Psychology: Faculty and Student Data

Discussion of Results

Jessica Kohout
Marlene Wicherski

November 2009

Center for Workforce Studies
American Psychological Association

Early each year the APA's Education Directorate notifies the chairs of graduate departments of psychology of the annual Graduate Study in Psychology effort. The following month the chairs are sent a link to the survey. This original email is followed by three subsequent contacts. APA receives a notification email when a program has completed the survey and programs are dropped from the database when they have not updated their data for two straight years.

Caveats

When using the information in this report, readers should be aware of possible sources of error. Analyses are based on the subset of departments that participated in the survey, not the population at large.

Further, some information was collected at the department level and some at the program level. This is an important distinction because master's programs can reside either in doctoral-level departments or departments where the master's is the highest degree granted. Therefore, information on some master's degree programs would be presented in tables reporting doctoral department data.

Tuition and financial assistance amounts reported by Canadian departments are provided in Canadian dollars.

Discussion of Results

Faculty Characteristics

In 2007-2008, 572 U.S. graduate departments of psychology reported a total of 14,186 faculty while Canadian departments reported 1,782. (Table 1). Sixty-one percent of U.S. faculty were in public settings, 39% in private settings. Almost ¾ of faculty were full time while 27% were part time. The distribution of full- and part-time faculty varied substantially between public and private graduate departments with full-time faculty being more numerous in public settings (82% vs. 59%). Forty-one percent of faculty in private settings were part time compared to 18% in public settings.

Seventy-one percent of the faculty were located in traditional academic settings while 29% were found in professional school settings. Traditional academic settings made greater use of full-time faculty with 83% full time versus 44% in professional schools.

In 2007-2008, women represented 48% of all faculty and 46% of full-time faculty in U.S. graduate departments of psychology. They were 57% of those working part time. By contrast, women were just under 42% of all faculty in Canadian departments of psychology, 39% of full-time faculty and 54% of part-time faculty.

Minority faculty represented 13% of the total faculty in U.S. graduate departments of psychology in 2007-2008. Representation differed for full- and

part-time minority faculty by type of institution, with two thirds of full-time minority faculty employed in public settings and 34% in private settings. The reverse is true for part-time minority faculty, with 64% in private settings and 36% in public. The same patterns hold for non-minority faculty. (Table 5). Minority faculty were 12% of faculty in traditional settings and 15% of faculty in professional school settings in 2007-2008. (Table 6). Please see http://www.apa.org/workforce/publications/09-fac-sal/index.aspx for additional information on graduate faculty.

Faculty in Doctoral-level Departments

Four hundred and eight U.S. doctoral departments of psychology reported 11,095 faculty in 2007-2008. Fifty-eight percent of these individuals were employed in public institutions. Seventy-five percent were employed full time while 25% were employed part time.

Fully two thirds of full-time faculty in doctoral departments of psychology were located in public settings while 33% were in private settings. In contrast, part-time faculty were more often found in departments in private institutions (68%), not public settings (32%).

Women were almost 58% of faculty in doctoral-level departments in the U.S. in 2007-2008. They were 45% of full-time faculty and 56% of part-time faculty. These patterns hold for doctoral departments in public and private institutions.

Patterns for distribution of faculty by race/ethnicity in doctoral departments of psychology in U.S. institutions resembled those noted above. (Table 7).

Women were better represented in professional school settings than in traditional academic settings in doctoral departments of psychology (78% versus 53%). In comparison with men, women represented a larger proportion of part-time faculty in both traditional and professional school settings. (Table 2).

Eighty-two percent of faculty in Canadian doctoral departments were employed full time, while 18% were employed part time. Women represented just under 41% of Canadian faculty in doctoral departments. Thirty-nine percent of Canadian faculty employed full time were women, while 53% of faculty employed part time were women. (Table 3).

Faculty in Master's-Level Departments

One hundred and sixty four U.S. Master's departments of psychology reported 3,091 faculty in 2007-2008. Seventy-two percent were located in public settings. Two thirds were employed full time while 34% worked part time. (Table 4).

Seventy-seven percent of full-time faculty in U.S. master's departments were in public settings, with 23% in private settings. Unlike doctoral departments, most part-time faculty in master's departments are found in public settings, not private.

Women represented almost 55% of faculty in master's departments. They were a larger proportion of part-time faculty than full-time faculty (61% versus 52%). Women outnumbered male faculty in master's departments in both public and private settings, and as full- and part-time faculty.

Minority faculty were 13% of faculty in U.S. master's departments of psychology in 2007-2008. Part-time faculty were more apt than full-time faculty to be employed in private departments and this holds regardless of race/ethnicity. (Table 8).

First-Year Full-time Students

Data from Table 9 indicate that 516 U.S. graduate departments of psychology reported a total of 14,754 first-year full-time students in 2007-2008. Seventeen Canadian departments reported 365 first-year full-time students. Overall, in the U.S., Whites were 71% of 1st-year full-time students, Blacks or African/Americans comprised 10%, Hispanic students were at 9%, Asians were at 6%, and Native Americans were at 1%. First-year full-time students who claimed a multi-ethnic background were at 3%.

In doctoral departments in the U.S., White first-year full-time students were 69% of the total, Blacks were 10%, Hispanics were 9%, Asians were 7% and Native Americans were at 2%. Students claiming a multi-ethnic background were 3%. Students in master's departments were less diverse. Fully 78% were nonminority. Seven percent were Black, 7 % were Hispanic, 4 % were Asian, 1% was Native American and 3% were multi-ethnic.

The student body in doctoral departments in private institutions was slightly more diverse than that in public settings (37% versus 27% minority). There was no difference in minority representation among students in master's departments in public and private settings; both reported 22% minority.

Canadian departments reported 92% nonminority 1st-year full-time students. Asian students represented 6% of the total minority students reported by Canadian departments, while the remaining percentages were distributed across the other ethnic groups.

First-Year Part-Time Students

Three hundred and sixty one U.S. graduate departments of psychology reported a total of 2,286 1st-year part-time graduate students. (Table 10). Seventy percent of the U.S. students were White, 12% Black, 9% Hispanic, 6% Asian, 1% Native

American and 2% multi-ethnic. Too few Canadian departments responded to report results.

As was true with full-time students, students in doctoral departments were more diverse than students in master's departments (33% vs. 24% minority). However, at the master's level, even with small Ns, the student body in public institutions was a bit more diverse.

First-Year Doctoral Students by Setting of Department – full time

Three hundred and eighty departments reported 11,909 first-year full-time doctoral students in 2007-08. Seventy-five percent of first-year full-time doctoral students in traditional academic settings were White compared to 63% in professional schools. Blacks were 7% in traditional settings and 14% in professional schools, while Hispanics were 8% in traditional settings and 11% in professional school settings. Native Americans and multi-ethnic students were 3% and 2%, respectively of those in professional schools versus 1% and 2% in traditional settings. Asians, on the other hand, were a smaller proportion of minority students in professional settings than in traditional at 7% and 6%, respectively. (See Table 9a).

Looking at this another way, 67% of black students, 58% of Hispanic students, 78% of Native American students, 51% of multi-ethnic students, but only 46% of Asians and 44% of Whites were located in professional school settings.

First-Year Doctoral Students by Setting of Department – part time

Two hundred and fifty-six departments reported a total of 1,415 first-year part-time doctoral students. Overall, the patterns exhibited by part-time students resembled those of the full-time students addressed above. There was greater minority representation in professional school settings than in traditional academic settings (38% vs. 29%). (Table 10a).

Applications, Enrollments, and Degrees Awarded – Doctoral and Master's programs

Fourteen hundred and twelve doctoral programs in the United States reported a total of 89,465 applications for 2007-2008. See Table 11. The median number of applications per program was 38, and the first and third quartiles were 17 and 84. There were 539 private doctoral programs and 873 public doctoral programs. Despite the larger number of public programs, both types reported fairly close totals (both over 40,000 thousand.). The median for public programs was lower as were the first and third quartiles, than was the case for private programs.

Almost 21,000 students were accepted by doctoral programs, 13, 736 of these were accepted by private programs. Medians and quartile ranges were higher and larger for programs in private settings.

It is the case that new enrollments, newly admitted full-time students, newly admitted part-time students, degrees awarded, and openings anticipated all were higher in private than in public doctoral programs.

Three hundred and twenty-four master's programs in the US reported 12,008 applications total for 2007-08. The median number per program was 29 and the 1st and 3rd quartiles were 15 and 50. There were 112 master's programs in private settings and 212 in public settings.

Just over 6,011 students were accepted by master's programs in the US. Three thousand five hundred and seventy three were accepted by master's programs in public institutions, while 2,438 were accepted by private settings.

Applications, Enrollments, and Degrees Awarded – US APA Accredited Programs by Degree Type -- PhD/PsyD

This section addresses pipeline information provided by accredited programs in clinical, counseling and school in the U.S. By definition these are doctoral programs only. The data for this section can be found in Tables 12 and 15.

APA accredited U.S. PhD programs received 34,975 applications in 2007-08. (Table 12). U.S. APA accredited PsyD programs reported a total of 10,628. (Table 15). PsyD programs reported a higher median number of applications than did PhD programs and the range in the number of applications from 1st to 3rd quartile started and ended at a higher number for PsyD programs. Not surprisingly, Clinical psychology is responsible for the bulk of applications in both settings, but more so in PsyD (92%) than in PhD (79%) programs. Too few PsyD programs in Counseling and School responded to be included in the discussion below. Data from Counseling and School PhD programs are discussed following the Clinical section.

Clinical PsyD programs accepted a higher overall and median number of applicants than did PhD programs (42 vs. 10). The ratio of applications accepted to applications received for applicants to Clinical programs was 8% among PhD programs and 31% among PsyD programs.

The ratio of newly enrolled students to total applications was 20% for Clinical PsyD programs and 5% for Clinical PhD programs, indicating that PsyD programs accepted a larger proportion of those applying to their programs.

The ratio of newly enrolled students to applicants accepted was 67% among PhD programs and 62% among PsyD programs for Clinical psychology. This

difference is not substantive and indicates that approximately two thirds of the students accepted actually enrolled.

Newly enrolled doctoral students represented 16% of total enrollments in Clinical PhD programs and just under 21% in Clinical PsyD programs. Students were more apt to be enrolled full time in PhD than in PsyD programs (96% vs. 86%, respectively).

Clinical PsyD programs awarded somewhat more doctorates in 2006-2007 than did PhD programs, (1,319 vs.1,188 total and for medians, 21 vs. 7) and PsyD programs anticipated more openings in 2008-2009 than did PhD programs. The totals, medians and quartiles provided for PsyD programs all were higher than those provided by PhD programs.

Data from Table 12 indicate that 60 Counseling psychology PhD programs reported receiving 5,002 applications in 2007-08 and accepting 10%. Seventy percent of those who were accepted actually enrolled and the newly enrolled represented 15% of the total enrollment in Counseling PhD programs. Most Counseling students were enrolled full time (87%). Three hundred and seventy two doctorates were awarded in 2006-2007, with programs reporting a median of 6. The range was very small with a 1st quartile at 5 and the 3rd at 7 new doctorate degrees. Projected openings in 2008-09 were 412; this is 29 more students than were newly enrolled in 2007-2008.

Forty-three School psychology PhD programs responded to Graduate Study in 2007-2008 and reported 1,693 applications (Table 12). They accepted one fourth of these applicant and enrolled almost 63% of those accepted. Newly enrolled students represented 16% of all enrollments. For the most part, enrollees were attending full time (88%). The programs awarded 206 doctorates in 2006-2007 with a median of 7. The first quartile was at 5 and the third was 8. The programs projected 285 openings for 2008-2009 which is 23 more than the number newly enrolled in 2007-2008.

Applications, Enrollments, and Degrees Awarded – US APA-Accredited PhD Programs by Type of Institution – Private/Public

This section addresses pipeline information provided by accredited PhD programs in clinical, counseling and school psychology in the U.S. By definition these are doctoral programs only. The data are located in Tables 12, 13, and 14.

Programs in public institutions were more numerous and were larger in size (applications, acceptances, enrollments, graduates) than was the case for programs in private settings. However, when we considered patterns among programs by subfield – there were some interesting variations.

Clinical psychology programs in public settings did receive more applications overall but programs in private settings reported a higher median number of applications (161 vs. 159 in public settings). The data revealed that programs in private settings received more applications per program than was the case in public settings.

Clinical psychology programs in private settings accepted a greater proportion of the applications received than was the case for public settings (11% vs. 6%). Seventy percent of those accepted were enrolled in programs in public institutions while 64% of acceptances were enrolled for those programs in private settings.

In both settings newly enrolled students represented 16% of all enrollees in clinical programs. Almost 98% of those in Clinical programs in public settings were full-time students while 95% of those in private settings were full time.

Programs in private settings awarded 538 doctorates in 2006-2007 and those in public settings awarded 650. Programs in private settings reported a slightly higher median number of graduates than was the case for those in public settings (7 vs. 6) and the upper limit of the distribution for private settings was also higher. The number of graduates was almost 10 per program in private settings versus just over 6 per program in public settings.

Clinical programs in private institutions projected 701 openings for 2008-2009, while those programs in public institutions reported 735. The median and the first and third quartiles were lower and the range was smaller in programs in public settings.

Forty-eight Counseling PhD programs in public settings reported receiving 3,626 applications in 2007-08 and accepting 12%. Seventy percent of those who were accepted actually enrolled and the newly enrolled represented almost 16% of the total enrollment in Counseling PhD programs in public institutions. Most Counseling students were enrolled full time (90%). Two hundred and ninety-three doctorates were awarded in 2006-2007, with programs reporting a median of 6. The range was very small with the 1st quartile at 5 and the 3rd at 7 new doctorate degrees. Projected openings in 2008-09 were 335; this is 23 more students than were newly enrolled in 2007-2008.

Counseling PhD programs in private settings (12) reported receiving 1,376 applications in 2007-08 and accepting 7%. Seventy-four percent of those who were accepted actually enrolled and the newly enrolled represented 15% of the total enrollment in Counseling PhD programs in private institutions. Most Counseling students were enrolled full time (78%). Seventy-nine doctorates were awarded in 2006-2007 by programs in private settings, with programs reporting a median of 7. The 1st quartile was at 4 and the 3rd at 8 new doctorate degrees.

Projected openings in 2008-09 were 77; this is only 6 more students than were newly enrolled in 2007-2008.

Thirty-six School psychology programs in public settings reported receiving 1,337 applications in 2007-08 and accepting 27%. Sixty-two percent of those who were accepted actually enrolled and the newly enrolled represented almost 17% of the total enrollment in School psychology PhD programs in public institutions. Most students were enrolled full time (90%). One hundred and seventy-six School Psychology PhDs were awarded in 2006-2007 by psychology departments, with programs reporting a median of 4. The 1st quartile was at 3 and the 3rd was at 7 new doctorate degrees. Projected openings in 2008-09 were 243; this is 13 more students than were newly enrolled in 2007-2008.

There were very few School psychology PhD programs in private settings included in these data (7). They reported receiving 356 applications in 2007-08 and accepting a little more than 13%. Sixty-five percent of those who were accepted actually enrolled and the newly enrolled represented 12% of the total enrollment in School psychology PhD programs in private institutions. Just over three fourths of students (77%) were enrolled full time. Thirty doctorates were awarded in 2006-2007 by programs in private settings, with programs reporting a median of 3. The 1st quartile was at 2 and the 3rd at 8 for new doctorate degrees awarded. Projected openings in 2008-09 were 42; this is 7 less students than were newly enrolled in 2007-2008.

Applications, Enrollments, and Degrees Awarded –U.S. Clinical Doctorate Programs by Setting: Traditional/Professional

One hundred and fifty-one doctoral program in traditional academic settings and 84 programs in professional school settings responded to this section. The data are found in Table 16. Despite being fewer in number, programs in professional schools accepted, enrolled, and awarded degrees to more students than was the case for programs in traditional settings. On average, Clinical programs in professional schools enrolled 138 full-time students compared to an average of 42 for Clinical programs in traditional settings.

Programs in traditional settings received a higher median number of applications than did those in professional settings (157 vs. 119). Programs in traditional settings accepted just under 6% of the applications received. By comparison, programs in professional settings accepted 36%. New enrollees represented almost 16% of all enrolled students in programs in traditional settings. Among students in professional school settings, new enrollees constituted just under 23% of all students.

Eighty-eight percent of all students were enrolled full time in Clinical programs in professional settings. The same can be said for almost 98% of students in Clinical programs in traditional academic settings.

Nine hundred and forty doctorates were granted in 2006-2007 by 151 programs in traditional academic settings and 1,603 were awarded by 84 programs in professional school settings. That is, 36% of the 235 Clinical psychology doctorate programs responding accounted for 63% of the doctorate degrees awarded in Clinical psychology in 2006-2007.

Sixty-nine percent of the 3,556 openings projected for 2008-2009 were located in Clinical programs in professional schools.

Applications, Enrollments, and Degrees Awarded -- U.S. Clinical Doctorate Programs by Setting and Type of Institution: Traditional/Professional and Public/Private

This section compares data from programs in traditional settings to those in professional schools by type of institution (public or private) (Table 16a). The initial distinction between types of settings is that the vast majority of traditional academic programs are in public settings (70%) while programs in professional school settings are predominantly private (87%).

Programs in private professional school settings accepted, enrolled and awarded the highest numbers in comparison to the other settings and types. They accepted 40% of the applications filed while programs in professional schools in public settings accepted 11% and the programs in traditional academic settings accepted 6%, each.

All programs enrolled at least two thirds of those accepted. Newly enrolled were a larger proportion of total enrollments for programs in professional schools (just over 20%, each) in comparison to those in traditional academic settings (17% and 15% for public and private).

Greater than 96% of students were enrolled full time in programs in traditional academic settings, both public and private, and in programs in public professional schools. Programs in private professional school settings reported that 87% of students were enrolled full time.

On average, programs in traditional settings awarded 6 degrees apiece in 2006-2007. Those in private professional school settings awarded 20 and those in public professional school settings awarded 10.

Projected openings followed similar trends. Just under two thirds of all openings projected by these programs for 2008-2009 were found in programs in private professional school settings, and they were 31% of all programs responding to

this section. Programs in traditional academic settings and public institutions accounted for 45% of those responding and projected 20% of the total openings.

Applications, Acceptances and Enrollments, by Level of Program and Subfield

Tables 17, 18 and 18a contain the data for this section of the report. Summary statistics were not reported in cases in which less than 10 programs provided data. Acceptance and enrollment rates were substantially higher for master's programs than for doctoral programs. The median acceptance rate for master's programs in health service provider subfields was 50% compared to 13% for doctoral-level programs. The respective enrollment rates were 33% and 9%. Among programs in research and other subfields the acceptance rate for master's programs was 53% while that for doctoral-level programs was 17%. Enrollment rates in research and other fields for master's and doctoral programs were 33% and 10%, respectively.

Applications, Acceptances and Enrollments, by Institution Type (public/private) and Subfield

See Tables 19 and 20 for these data. There were 1,044 programs in public institutions and 584 in private settings, yet those in private settings enrolled more than those in public settings. Overall, just under 52 students applied to each program in a public setting, while 79 applied to each program in a private setting. Just over ten students were accepted by each public program, and 28 were accepted by private programs. Finally, almost 7 students enrolled in each public program while 18 were enrolled in private programs.

Tables 19 and 20 include data for both master's- and doctoral-level programs. Table 19 contains data on 385 public health service provider programs and 316 private health service provider programs. Numbers of applications were about equal for both public and private settings at over 33,000 each. However we found that programs in public settings accepted and enrolled less than half the number accepted in private settings for the health service provider subfields. Table 19 also includes data on the research subfields in psychology. There were 651 research programs in public institutions and 260 research programs in private settings. The number of applications to programs in public settings was at 20,135 compared to 12,216 to programs in private settings. However, the median number and the range of applications were lower for public than for private programs.

Table 20 presents data on the acceptance and enrollment rates for U.S. graduate programs in 2007-2008 by type of institution and program area. As noted earlier the acceptance and enrollment rates are higher for private than for public settings. The acceptance rate in public settings was 25% and the enrollment rate was 15%, private settings reported an acceptance rate of 39% and an enrollment

rate of 23%. These differences were driven by a disparity in the overall acceptance and enrollment rates found in the health service provider fields in private vs. public settings. HSP programs in private settings reported rates twice those reported in public settings. The situation was different for research programs in which the acceptance and enrollment rates did not vary substantially between public and private settings.

Test Score and GPA Requirements – U.S. Master's Departments

Tables 21 and 22 address requirements for entry as noted by master's-level departments of psychology in the United States. One hundred and forty-nine departments responded overall but not necessarily to each of the items. Thus the percentages reported are not always based on the 149 respondents but on the number indicating whether a particular test or score was required.

Over 90% of the responding departments required verbal and quantitative GRE scores as well as the overall undergraduate GPA. Eighty-four percent required the last 2 years GPA and 85% required a Psychology-specific GPA. GRE Analytic, Subject and MAT tests were less often required. Average minimum and median scores/GPAs can be found in Table 21.

Test score and GPA requirements among master's departments by institution type (public/private) can be found in Table 22. Departments were pretty similar across institution type with a few exceptions. Departments in private settings more often required the GRE-Analytic than did those departments in public settings. Further the MAT was more a factor for departments in private settings. Almost all master's departments in public settings required the GPA from the last two years compared to only 65% in private settings. Private institutions noted somewhat higher average GRE verbal and quantitative minimum and median scores.

Test Score and GPA Requirements – U.S. and Canadian Departments

Table 23 presents data on the requirements for entry into master's and doctoral programs in doctoral departments of psychology in the US and Canada. The vast majority of U.S. and Canadian departments required the GRE-V and GRE-Q, the overall undergraduate GPA, and last two years GPA of applicants to **master's** programs. Most departments also required a Psychology GPA score. Canadian departments were substantially more likely to require the GRE-Analytic and -Subject scores than were U.S. departments.

Large majorities of both U.S. and Canadian departments required the GRE-V, -Q, and Analytic, as well as the overall undergraduate GPA for entry into **doctoral** programs. Around half of each required the GRE -Subject test in Psychology. Canadian departments were more likely to require the additional GPA information

(last two years, Psychology and Master's GPA) than were U.S. departments (90% or better vs. 73% or less).

Generally speaking, the scores reported for entry into master's programs were lower than those reported for entry into doctoral programs in the U.S. and the scores reported by Canadian departments were higher than those reported by U.S. departments. Due to the small number of Canadian departments responding in certain categories, caution should be exercised in interpreting these results.

Test Score and GPA Requirements – U.S. Master's and Doctoral Programs in Doctoral Departments in Public and Private Settings

Doctoral departments in public settings were more likely to require GRE-V, GRE-Q, and last two years GPA scores for entry into master's programs than were departments in private settings. See Table 24. Analytic portions of the GRE were required by about half of the departments regardless of setting, while Subject GRE scores were required by one fourth or less. Almost 90% of all departments required an overall undergraduate GPA. Psychology GPA was required for entry into a master's program by over half of the departments.

The GRE-V, GRE-Q, and overall undergrad GPA were required for admission into doctoral programs by over 90% of the responding departments in both public and private settings. Eighty percent of departments required the GRE-Analytic and 40% the GRE-Subject scores for admission to doctoral programs. These held across setting type. Last two years GPA was more often required by departments in public settings than those in private settings, while the reverse was true of the psychology GPA and Master's GPA.

For the most part, scores were higher among doctoral programs than among masters.

Test Score and GPA Requirements – Traditional Academic and Professional School Settings

Table 25 presents data on reported scores and requirements for master's and doctoral programs in doctoral departments in traditional academic and professional school settings. The undergraduate GPA was the most often required score for master's programs in both types of settings. GRE verbal and quantitative scores were required by a larger percentage of master's programs in traditional settings than was the case for those in professional schools (over 80% as opposed to 65%). Overall undergraduate GPA was important in both settings as was the last two years GPA. Psychology GPA was more often required in master's programs in professional school settings than was true of programs in traditional settings. Overall the average minimum and median scores were somewhat higher for programs in traditional academic settings than among

programs in departments in professional schools. Undergraduate GPA and last two years GPA were fairly similar.

Importance of Admission Criteria by Level of Department and Type of Institution

Table 26 presents the data for this section. Doctoral programs in public settings gave the greatest importance to letters of recommendation, a statement of goals and objectives and the GPA. Those in private settings ranked a statement of goals and objectives highest, followed by letters of recommendation and the GPA. Lowest-ranked admission criteria (least apt to be rated as highly important) included extracurricular activities and work experience.

Master's programs in public and private settings chose as the top three admission criteria: GPA, letters of recommendation and a statement of goals and objectives. Least important at the master's level was the category of extracurricular activities. Work experience and clinically related public service were each judged as medium in importance.

Further analyses were compiled for doctoral programs in public versus private settings by traditional health service provider, professional school and non-HSP classifications. Responses differed as to the relative importance of admission criteria across these various settings and classifications. Not surprisingly, programs that were not focused on training HSPs or who were training HSPs **and** were located in traditional academic settings placed greater emphasis on research experience than was the case for programs training in health service provision in professional school settings. This distinction was particularly marked for those in private institutions.

All program types and classifications valued letters of recommendation and statements of goals and objectives (75% or better stated that they were highly valued). GPA information was also deemed important across all program types and institutions. GRE/MAT scores were more often ranked as being of high importance among HSP programs in traditional settings and non-HSP programs than among professional schools, and this was particularly so for the professional schools in private institutions.

Extracurricular activities did not appear to be a critical factor in admissions decisions, particularly so for non-HSP programs. Clinically-related public service was deemed to be of moderate to high importance in admissions decisions by better than 90% of professional schools in public and private settings. Work experience was most highly valued by programs in professional schools than by traditional HSP or non-HSP programs.

An interview was ranked as having greater importance among programs preparing psychologists for health service provision and this was particularly so for programs in private settings.

Tuition for Doctoral Students in U.S. and Canadian Departments of Psychology by Institution Type and Residency

The data are reported in Table 27. A total of 293 U.S. departments and 25 Canadian departments provided data on tuition. As might be expected, there are substantial differences between the tuition rates of departments in public and private settings for U.S. departments and between tuition required of residents and nonresidents in public U.S. and Canadian departments.

The median annual tuition for state residents in public doctoral departments was $6,819 in 2007-2008, while that for nonresidents was more than double this amount at $16,334. In terms of hourly tuition this worked out to a median of $309 per credit hour for state residents in public settings in the U.S versus $704 per credit hour for non-residents in public university settings. Canadian departments also reported differences by residency status. Those able to claim residency paid about half of what those without residency were charged ($5,249 vs. $10,951).

Departments in private settings did not report distinguishing among students based on residency. Median tuition paid by residents in public settings was about one fourth of that paid by resident students in private settings. Median tuition paid by nonresidents in public settings was 64% of that paid by nonresidents in private settings. In all cases the tuitions were higher in private settings.

Tuition for Master's Students in U.S. and Canadian Departments of Psychology by Institution Type and Residency

See Table 28 for data on this section. A total of 355 U.S. departments and 21 Canadian departments provided data on tuition at the master's level. As might be expected, there are substantial differences between the tuition rates of departments in public and private settings for U.S. departments and between tuition required of residents and nonresidents in public U.S. and Canadian departments.

Public settings.
The median annual tuition for **state residents in public doctoral departments with a masters program** was $6,013 in 2007-2008, while that for **nonresidents** was more than double this amount at $15,567. In terms of hourly tuition this worked out to a median of $288 per credit hour for state residents in public

settings in the U.S versus $694 per credit hour for nonresidents in public university settings.

The median annual tuition for **state residents in public masters departments** (master's was the highest degree granted) was $4,590 in 2007-2008, while that for **nonresidents** was more than double this amount at $10,532. In terms of hourly tuition this worked out to a median of $272 per credit hour for state residents in public settings in the U.S versus $498 per credit hour for nonresidents in public settings.

Private settings.
Master's departments in private settings did not report major distinctions among students based on residency. It is the case that nonresidents paid a slightly higher amount than residents for master's programs in private settings and the difference was largest among masters programs in doctoral-level departments.

Public versus Private.
Median tuition paid by residents in public settings was about one third of that that paid by resident students in private settings for U.S. master's programs in doctoral departments. Median tuition paid by nonresidents in public settings was 85% of that paid by nonresidents in private settings. Median tuition paid by resident students in U.S. master's departments was just under a third of that charged to residents in private settings. Finally, median tuition expected from nonresidents in public master's departments was 72% of that charged to nonresidents in private master's departments. In all cases the tuitions were higher in private settings.

Canadian departments.
Canadian departments did not differentiate between master's programs in doctoral departments and those master's programs in settings for which the master's was the highest degree granted. However, they did report differences between the tuition charged to residents versus nonresidents. Those able to claim residency paid less than half of what those without residency were charged ($4,664 vs. $11,125).

Overall, full-time students in departments in public settings (90% of doctoral students, 45% of master's students) were more likely to receive financial assistance than were those in private settings (60% of doctoral students and 23% of master's students). See Table 30.

Financial Assistance for First-Year Students in U.S. Departments by Degree Level and Type of Institution
Tables 29 and 30 provide the data for this section. The categories of financial assistance were divided into teaching assistantships, research assistantships, traineeships and fellowships/scholarships. **Across the board, stipend amounts**

were lower for master's students than for doctoral students regardless of type of institution.

Teaching Assistantships (TA). The stipends varied somewhat by type of institution such that departments in **public** settings reported higher medians for 1st year master's students than did departments in private settings. Conversely, departments in **private** settings provided higher medians for 1st year doctoral students than was the case for departments in public institutions. The ranges of stipends were larger for departments in private settings and the third quartile was higher for those in private settings than for departments in public settings. The median hours worked per week were less among departments in private settings.

Teaching assistantships for 1st year students were offered more often in public than in private settings and among departments in public settings were more frequent for doctoral than for master's students. Additional tuition remission was most characteristic for those in public doctoral programs/departments

Research Assistantships (RA). Median stipends for **r**esearch assistantships for 1st year students were higher among departments in public settings. Median hours worked per week were lower in private settings.

Research assistantships for 1st year students were offered more often in public than in private settings and among departments in public settings were more frequent for doctoral than for master's students. Additional tuition remission was most characteristic for those in public doctoral programs/departments.

Traineeships. Median stipends for traineeships for 1st year students were highest among doctoral and master's departments in private settings. First and third quartiles both were higher in private than public settings.

Despite the higher amounts noted for traineeships, their use by graduate departments is far less than that reported for research or teaching assistantships or fellowships/scholarships. Less than 15% of doctoral departments and less than 10% of master's departments reported offering traineeships for 1st year students.

Fellowships/Scholarships. Median stipends and hours worked per week for fellowships and scholarships were generally highest among doctoral programs in public settings.

Just over 70% of doctoral programs in both public and private settings reported offering fellowships or scholarships while around 40% of departments at the master's level did so. Additional tuition remission was most frequent among doctoral departments in public settings.

Financial Assistance for Advanced Students in U.S. Departments by Degree Level and Type of Institution

See Tables 29 and 30 for this section. The categories of financial assistance are divided into teaching assistantships, research assistantships, traineeships and fellowships/scholarships.

Teaching Assistantships (TA). The stipends varied somewhat by type of institution such that departments in **public** settings reported higher medians for advanced students regardless of level of degree. The ranges of stipends were larger for departments in private settings and the third quartile was higher for those in private settings than for departments in public settings. The median hours worked per week were less among departments in private settings.

Teaching assistantships for advanced students were offered more often in public than in private settings and among departments in public settings were more frequent for doctoral than for master's students. Additional tuition remission was most characteristic for those in public doctoral programs/departments

Research Assistantships (RA). Median stipends for **r**esearch assistantships for advanced students were higher among departments in public settings. Median hours worked per week were lower in private settings.

Research assistantships for advanced students were offered more often in public than in private settings and among departments in public settings were more frequent for doctoral than for master's students. Additional tuition remission was most characteristic for those in public doctoral programs/departments.

Traineeships. Median stipends for traineeships for advanced students were highest among doctoral and master's departments in private settings. The third quartiles were all higher in private than in public settings.

Despite the higher amounts noted for traineeships, their use by graduate departments is far less than that reported for research or teaching assistantships or fellowships/scholarships. Traineeships were offered by less than 28% of public doctoral departments, 25% of private doctoral departments, less than 8% of public master's departments and 10% of private master's departments. Additional tuition remission was less common with this mode of support.

Fellowships/Scholarships. Median stipends and hours worked per week for fellowships and scholarships were generally highest among doctoral programs in public settings.

Almost 69% of doctoral programs in public settings and just under 74% of doctoral programs in private settings reported offering fellowships or scholarships

while around 34% of departments at the master's level did so. Additional tuition remission was most frequent among doctoral departments in public settings.

Financial Assistance for First-Year Students in U.S. Doctoral Departments by Type of Setting – Traditional Academic and Professional Schools

Tables 29a and 30a provide the data for this section. The categories of financial assistance were divided into teaching assistantships, research assistantships, traineeships and fellowships/scholarships.

Teaching Assistantships (TA). Stipends for teaching assistantships for 1st-year students in traditional academic settings were almost three times the value of those found in professional schools. This was still the case when the average hours worked per week was considered.

Fully 78% of departments in a traditional academic setting used TAs for 1st-year students compared to 25% of professional schools, and over half the departments in traditional settings reported providing full tuition remission. Tuition remission was not as common among professional schools (2% provided full remission).

Research Assistantships (RA). Median RA's for 1st-year students in traditional academic settings were over four times the amount paid in professional school settings. This was still the case when the average hours worked per week was considered.

Eighty-five percent of departments in traditional settings used research assistantships for first-year students versus 56% of programs in professional schools. Eighty-five percent of departments in traditional settings reported that they provided full or partial tuition remission. Although tuition remission was not used as often in professional schools at least 49% offered some remission.

Traineeships. Median stipends for traineeships paid to 1st-year students in professional schools were 40% of those paid in traditional academic settings.

Only 15% of departments in traditional settings used traineeships for 1st-year students while 6% of departments in professional schools did so. Departments offering this type of support did provide some remission.

Fellowships/Scholarships. Fellowships and scholarships were substantially less in professional schools than in traditional academic settings for first-year students (less than one fifth). It is the case that the hours worked per week were fewer in this category across the board.

Just over 70% of both traditional and professional school settings offered fellowships or scholarships to first-year students. Almost half (48%) of

departments in traditional settings offered full tuition remission, while 26% of programs in professional schools offered partial tuition remission.

Financial Assistance for Advanced Students in U.S. Doctoral Departments by Type of Setting – Traditional Academic and Professional Schools

Table 29a and 30a provide the analyses for this section. The categories of financial assistance are divided into teaching assistantships, research assistantships, traineeships and fellowships/scholarships.

Teaching Assistantships (TA). Stipends for teaching assistantships for advanced students in traditional academic settings were more than four times the value of those found in professional schools. This was still the case when the average hours worked per week was considered.

Fully 91% of departments in a traditional academic setting used TAs for advanced-year students compared to 75% of professional schools, with 86% of departments in traditional settings providing some tuition remission and 36% of professional schools doing so.

Research Assistantships (RA). Median RAs for advanced students in traditional academic settings were over four times the amount paid in professional school settings. This was still the case when the average hours worked per week was considered.

Ninety percent of departments in traditional settings used research assistantships for advanced students, while 71% of programs in professional schools did so. Over 83% of the departments in traditional academic settings reported that they used full or partial tuition remissions. Tuition remission was not used as often in professional schools, with almost 39% indicating that they offered a full or partial remission

Traineeships. Median stipends for traineeships paid to advanced students in professional schools were 47% of those paid in traditional academic settings. Although the third quartile was higher overall for those students in traditional settings, proportionally students in professional schools had gained at the 75th percentile.

Only 28% of departments in traditional settings used traineeships for advanced students while 22% of departments in professional schools did so. Eighty seven percent of programs in traditional settings and 52% of programs in professional schools using traineeships offered either full or partial remission.

Fellowships/Scholarships. Median stipends for students in professional schools were less than a fifth of those paid to students in traditional academic

settings. It is the case that the hours worked per week were fewer in this category.

Just over 70% of both traditional and professional school settings offered fellowships or scholarships to advanced students. Seventy-nine percent of departments in traditional settings and 43% programs in professional schools offered full or partial tuition remission.