DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 301 HE 005 090

AUTHOR	Miller, James L., Jr., Ed.
TITLE	Scholarship and Teaching in the Field of Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Association of Professors of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	44p.; Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education (2nd, Chicago, Illinois, March 11, 1973)
AVAILABLE FROM	ACT Publications, P. O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Educational Programs; *Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Five papers presented at the meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education (APHE) are divided into three topical areas. These areas concern: the field of higher education, teaching methods utilized in higher education programs, and an informal history of the APHE. Topics concern the isolation of higher educationists as scholars; an introductory overview of a survey of programs in the field of higher education; the administrative internship as an out-of-class methodology in leadership development; and the use of "informal" internship experiences. (MJM)

Scholarship and Teaching in the Field of Higher Education

PAUL DRESSEL · JOHN BRUCE FRANCIS
WALTER C. HOBBS · JAMES L. MILLER, JR.
DANIEL J. SORRELLS · W. HUGH STICKLER

JAMES L. MILLER, JR. (Editor)

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM
FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

PAUL DRESSEL · JOHN BRUCE FRANCIS
WALTER C. HOBBS · JAMES L. MILLER, JR.
DANIEL J. SORRELLS · W. HUGH STICKLER

JAMES L. MILLER, JR. (Editor)

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM
FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The American College Testing Program (ACT) is dedicated to the enrichment of education. It was founded as a public trust and operates as a nonprofit corporation governed by elected educational representatives from individual states or regions, and by a Board of Trustees.

A fundamental goal of ACT is to exercise educational leadership through guidance-oriented assessment and research services in order to (1) assist in the identification and solution of educational problems and (2) communicate to the general and professional publics knowledge and ideas about education.

The chief beneficiaries of ACT's services are students, secondary schools, institutions of postsecondary education, and educational researchers.

For additional copies write:

ACT Publications, P.O. Box 168, Iowa City, Iowa 52240
(Check or money order must accompany request.)

Price $3.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAIRMAN, VICE CHAIRMAN, AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1971-72 ("Committee to Establish an Organization")

Maurice Troyer, Syracuse University (Chairman)
John Brugel, Pennsylvania State University (student member)
Lewis B. Mayhew, Stanford University
James L. Miller, Jr., University of Michigan
Ida Long Rogers, George Peabody College for Teachers
W. Hugh Stickler, Florida State University

1972-73

W. Hugh Stickler, Florida State University (Chairman)
G. Lester Anderson, Pennsylvania State University
Robert C. Berdahl, State University of New York at Buffalo
Sister Marie Fox, Florida State University (student member)
Lewis B. Mayhew, Stanford University
James L. Miller, Jr., University of Michigan (Vice Chairman)
Ida Long Rogers, George Peabody College for Teachers

1973-74

James L. Miller, Jr., University of Michigan (Chairman)
Robert T. Alciatore, University of Texas at San Antonio
G. Lester Anderson, Pennsylvania State University
William D. Carr, Florida State University (student member)
Fred F. Harcleroad, The American College Testing Program and The University of Iowa (Vice Chairman)
Marvin W. Peterson, University of Michigan
Robert I. White, Kent State University

INTRODUCTION

This is the second year in which the *Proceedings* of the annual meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education has been published, although, as Hugh Stickler reports in his paper, the group has been meeting informally for some time.

The five papers divide themselves into three topical areas. The first two deal critically with the field itself. Hobbs and Francis assess some of the shortcomings of scholarly writing in the field, reporting specific research findings that follow up on earlier work which they reported in an article in the January 1973 issue of the *Journal of Higher Education*. Dressel, who was unable to present his paper in person because of illness, presents a preliminary introduction to a survey of programs in the field of higher education which he and Lewis Mayhew have undertaken.

The second area to which attention is given relates to teaching methods utilized in higher education programs, specifically, the use of internships. Sorrells reports the results of a survey concerning the use of internships and Miller describes the use of certain types of on-campus jobs as "informal internships."

The third section contains an informal history of the Association of Professors of Higher Education which was given at the luncheon session by the outgoing APHE Chairman, Hugh Stickler. As Stickler points out, since early records are scant, this treatment of the Association's origins is likely to be as close as we will come to a chronicle of the informal meetings which preceded our formal organization.

This year, for the first time, the *Proceedings* are being published in cooperation with The American College Testing Program. Their part in this venture is most greatfully acknowledged.

Chapter 1

THE ISOLATION OF HIGHER EDUCATIONISTS AS SCHOLARS

John Bruce Francis and Walter C. Hobbs
State University of New York at Buffalo

The thesis of the remarks to follow is that (a) while higher education as a field of study needs to utilize and to extend the theoretical contributions of the disciplines, (b) researchers in higher education are isolated from the disciplines and are not addressing themselves to that need.

In a recent paper (Hobbs and Francis, 1973), we categorized the scholarly activity of higher educationists in terms of technical reports, data reports, analyses-and-recommendations, opinion pieces (i.e., essays) and "gut" pieces. We also delineated the possibilities for theory-oriented research, but we observed that little such research is undertaken by higher educationists, and we urged that "those of us who say we are students of the field[should] begin to study it in such fashion that we can explain it—with verifiable and verified explanations." Our purpose now is to elaborate that position by providing at least some indicative evidence for the assertion that higher educationists are isolated in their activity from the theoretical contributions of the disciplines, and by suggesting how theory—as the disciplines use the term—can contribute to the study of higher education.

Our data can be reported easily without resorting to esoteric statistical analysis or even to tabulations. We examined two sets of journals for two kinds of information:[1] first, we identified all articles addressed explicitly to higher education which appeared during the years 1965-69 in the *Administrative Science Quarterly, American Economic Review, American Political Science Review, American Sociological Review* and the *Journal of Educational Psychology;* the list included 94 such papers. Then we tallied

[1]More accurately, the work was performed at our request by Tuisem A. Shishak, graduate assistant in the Department of Higher Education, SUNY at Buffalo.

the number of instances in which the materials we had identified were utilized, or at least cited, in articles which appeared during the years 1969-71 in *Change* Magazine, *Educational Record*, and the *Journal of Higher Education*.

The tally at step two was zero. None of the articles which appeared in the theory-oriented media was exploited by writers in the three major periodicals in higher education.

We infer from these data that scholars in higher education do not generally concern themselves with the theoretical contributions of the disciplines. That is not to say that higher educationists engage in trivial exercises or that they are incompetent in what they profess to be doing. Of course, either of those two possibilities may be true in given instances, but neither of us contends that such is true of the field in general. Rather we are saying that many, perhaps most, higher educationists place little importance on the utility of theory when they address themselves to profound problems in higher education, and they place even less importance on their own role in the development of such theory. They contentedly pursue their scholarly activity in blissful isolation from that of the disciplines.

Were such a conclusion based solely on the brief review data just reported, serious criticism might well be raised. But supporting evidence is found elsewhere as well: e.g., in a draft chapter by Marvin Peterson for a forthcoming publication by AERA (1973), and in a review essay concerning the Carnegie Commission reports by Wendell Harris in the January 15, 1973, issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

It is unlikely, however, that critics of our thesis are concerned primarily with our data. Of far greater likelihood, such critics will quarrel with us not about whether higher education's scholarship is in fact isolated from the disciplines, but whether that is necessarily bad. Some persons clearly prefer that state of affairs. One reviewer (Mayhew, 1972), for example, in commenting recently on a theoretical piece published by a young scholar, remarked that "if [he] will move from his present firm grounding in theory and some kinds of data to a firmer grounding in clinical experience and broader ranges of data, he should become a first-class scholar of higher education." To the contrary, in our view, that emphasis is precisely what will stultify both that young scholar and higher education as a field of inquiry.

A brief excursus into the nature and role of theory will suggest how eminently well suited is the development and utilization of theory to the tasks which most of us consider to be the *raison d'etre* of the field.

In its broadest sense theory is generalization. But it is easy to confound several types of generalization and fall into the error of imagining that one's nontheoretical generalizations are theoretical after all.

Generalizations can be classified in three categories. First, there are generalizations about actions; we shall call these "value" generalizations. Second, there are generalizations about facts, i.e., "descriptive" generalizations. And third, there are generalizations about (causal) relationships; these last are "theoretical" generalizations.

Generalizations of the first type, value generalizations, encompass interrelated assumptions, observations, and preferences about such matters as how universities should be structured, organized, governed and treated by external constituencies; how faculty and students should comport themselves in and out of class; what tasks should take priority among college and university personnel, etc. To this kind of generalization the term theory is frequently—though, we would argue, not precisely—applied. Sanford Kadish of the AAUP for instance, speaks of a "theory of the [academic]profession" as "an integrated set of propositions with respect to the nature of higher education, with respect to certain shared values, and with respect to certain understandings of the roles of the professor in the university and of the university in the larger community" which support both professional rights and professional responsibilities (1972). John Brubacher refers similarly to different "theories" of higher education which speak to the roles which universities must play in society and to the principles and practices whereby they retain identity and integrity (1970).

Higher education can use such value statements. They serve as stimuli to discussion and action. But they are not theories, at least not as theorists in the disciplines use that term.

The second type of generalization, which we call descriptive generalization, is to be found in most research reports, commission surveys and general data-based analyses concerning higher education today. Descriptive generalizations seek to provide an accurate picture of a complex state of interrelated facts so that decisions or recommendations can be based upon those facts and so that any actions which are taken will fit the real-world context in which those actions are designed to operate.

There is, however, a danger in basing recommendations for action upon a description of a situation, no matter how elegantly that description reduces complex empirical relationships to clearly stated form. Such a process short-circuits the task of understanding those empirical relationships. Either by using predictive statistics or by employing categorizations which derive from a taken-for-granted frame of reference, descriptive generalizations avoid meeting head-on the problem of *why* the findings are what

they are. The difficulty in either case is the failure to realize that one cannot treat of "bare" facts, that instead "facts" are interpreted observations; i.e., they are data which have been organized according to some set of explicit or implicit principles. Those principles determine (a) which of the myriad observations that can be made shall be attended to at all; (b) what priorities shall be given those which are considered; and (c) how they shall be compared with each other in reaching conclusions. When the analyst's scheme of interpretation does not rest on rigorously developed and articulated principles such as those which inform sound theory construction (Rosenberg, 1968), then his interpretation is no more reliable than conjecture. Our criticism of the analysis-and-recommendation activities among higher educationists has this problem in mind—the typical "savant" presents recommendations which presume the adequacy of his interpretation though the latter rests on no stated, and thereby no reviewable, principles. One can only respond to his commentary that these are the analyst's own views—time-bound, situation-bound, astute perhaps, perhaps even correct, but in no sense a contribution to our *understanding* of the problems of higher education.

What is needed instead is interpretation of data which is based upon clearly articulated principles open to review and verification or refutation. Such interpretation should concentrate not on the empirical relations which inhere in the phenomenon but on the causal, conditional, and contributory conditions which give it form and substance. Those conceptual relationships are the stuff of understanding. They yield the third sort of generalization, the sort so lacking in higher education scholarship and so common in the disciplines, namely, theoretical generalization. The purpose of such generalization is to indicate what makes the subject tick, what causes it, what inhibits it, under what conditions it operates. We are not talking here of abstruse explanation or of frontier statistical analyses. Indeed, the data now processed in most research in higher education are already analyzed sufficiently to initiate such theoretical generalization. For example, virtually all student surveys report frequencies and percentages of males and females as well as of freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors. The use to which these data generally are put is to justify descriptive generalization by showing that the sample is representative either of the particular institution's student body or of all students in higher education. This is useful in a survey, but the analysis ought not end there. There are theoretical questions to be raised as well. Sex and class level are important not chiefly as check data for sampling purposes but as factors which help to explain the relationship between, say, two selected attributes. The theorist might ask, for example, what the relationship is between (a) perceptions of student participation in governance and (b) attitudes toward campus revolt, perhaps because he suspects that students who are truly radical are opposed to involvement inasmuch as they believe the involved are usually co-opted. Upon examining the data, he might find confirmation of his

hypothesis in a strong negative relationship; namely, persons who favor student revolt are opposed to student participation, and vice-versa. To *understand* this, however, it is necessary for him to ask further whether that relationship is affected by other factors, for example, by sex and class year (to keep our illustration intact). Does the relationship depend upon whether the respondent is male or female, or on whether he or she is freshman, sophomore, junior or senior? That is, if these factors are introduced, will the relationship between perceptions of involvement and attitudes toward revolt change? (To press it further, then, he would also ask, "If so, why?")

The contributions of extant theory, e.g., the sociology of conflict, or organizational social psychology, may well provide rational and time-saving clues to what causal factors may be operative. And statistical devices, both simple and esoteric, may be pressed into service to test these clues. The fundamental point of these remarks, however, is that explanation of this sort is what higher education needs, it is what theorists in the disciplines do, and it is what higher educationists could and should be doing also, but are not.

Many higher educationists today are hard at work examining one of the nation's most crucial tasks, the extension of postsecondary educational opportunities to new clientele in vastly diverse life circumstances. The ramifications of this phenomenon could occupy an army of researchers indefinitely. There are the questions, for example, of the adequacy of vital resources in the face of demands for extended services, of the effectiveness of tried and true (or even innovative and questionable) teaching strategies for students of an age and background not faced before, of the effect of an intrusion by government into areas of faculty life (such as contact hours) once considered to be necessarily the prerogative of faculty alone, etc.

One reads reports or statistical descriptions of these problems, most of which go on to recommend solutions as well. One also reads treatise after treatise advocating this or that stance on the issues. When specific, the suggestions are labelled opinion. When broad and general, they may be labelled theory. But at rock-bottom, they are value statements.

Something clearly is missing. The problems are described, and solutions are offered, but explanations of how, say, older students learn differently from others, are not provided. In other words, we do not find in these reports explanatory, empirically verifiable, "theoretical" generalization about the causes, conditions, and expected outcomes which the problem of nontraditional postsecondary education entails.

We submit that emphases are being misplaced. As political animals, of course, it is appropriate for us to recommend, or to respond with a yea or nay to a recommendation about various aspects of higher education from a

value-position we endorse, whether it be one necessarily of immediacy or, better yet, of a well-reasoned philosophy of higher education. But as scholars, we should also be seeking understanding, i.e., *verified explanations* which illuminate the problems higher education faces. If we believe in our calling, we believe that the ordered application of the intellect to abstraction, to explanation and to verification will in the long run provide more satisfactory solutions to real-world problems than will mere description and advice, however systematic and eloquent they may be. But our isolation from the theory-oriented disciplines militates against explanation and verification. That isolation, we submit, must be ended if we are to serve higher education as the scholars we professors profess to be.

References

Brubacher, J. S. The theory of higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1970, **41**, 98-115.

Harris, W. Point of view. The Carnegie Commission: To date, less than satisfying. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1973, **7** (15).

Hobbs, W. C., & Francis, J. B. On the scholarly activity of higher education-ists. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1973, **44**, 51-60.

Kadish, S. H. The theory of the profession and its predicament. *AAUP Bulletin*, 1972, **58**, 120-125.

Mayhew, L. B. *The literature of higher education 1972*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Peterson, M. W. *Organization and administration of higher education: Sociological and social-psychological perspectives*. Mimeographed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1973.

Rosenberg, M. *The logic of survey analysis*. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Chapter 2

HIGHER EDUCATION: WHENCE, WHERE, AND WHITHER?

Paul L. Dressel
Michigan State University

A Highly Personal Prelude

Events often fail to live up to expectations. When I accepted Jerry Miller's invitation to present a paper here on the examination of higher education programs which Lew Mayhew and I are coordinating, I had full expectation that Lew and I would have been well along on visits to campuses by this date and that both Lew and I would be here to express some preliminary observations and get your reactions. As it turns out, we have fallen behind for reasons beyond our control.

At this point, we have received copious information from a large number of places, and we have done rather extensive preliminary reading and analysis. I have had to ask one of my associates to make a number of visits for me, since the present excited state of my right sciatic nerve is not conducive to travel. Rather than attempt to report on our study, therefore, I would like to share with you some concerns which caused Lew Mayhew and me to undertake this project. I have already detected in the materials and letters which I have received that many others share these, but I also detect some concern about the nature of the critical scrutiny that we propose to give higher education programs. And certainly there may be some concern that we haven't fully developed in our own thinking. I trust, then, that this statement will be regarded by all of you as exploratory and that either someone here takes some notes to forward to me or that any of you feel free to write some suggestions and reactions. Critical evaluation is always, in my mind, the prelude to improvement, and that is certainly what Lew and I seek here.

Paul L. Dressel

We have tentatively titled our study "A Discipline in the Making: Higher Education as a Field of Study." This title and subtitle in themselves raise some questions about the nature of higher education as a field of study. Our use of terminology in speaking about higher education is unclear. English, which is really a language, is often spoken of as a discipline, whereas either language or literature is probably a more appropriate disciplinary characterization. Medicine, law, theology, and other fields are often characterized as professions, but law and theology are also occasionally referred to as disciplines. Engineering, nursing, and business are variously characterized as vocational, technical, or professional fields, but seldom, if ever, as disciplines.

Is education a discipline or a profession? More specifically, is higher education a discipline or a profession? One could argue this issue a long time with no significant gain. That is why, as a subtitle, we characterized higher education as a "field of study." That subtitle brings out one of our major concerns: an institution of higher education—and particularly a university—involves problems of finance, organization and administration, construction of facilities, research, teaching, public service; it constantly adds to its array of courses, programs, services, and research activities and rarely discontinues anything. And the organization of higher education is characterized by colleges, departments, institutes, centers, and many other units which indicate that specialization has become the major characteristic of the modern university. Starting from this point of view, anyone who characterizes himself as a specialist in higher education (which seems to be the general implication of a PhD in higher education) is either an idiot or an egotist—or, as a critical-minded graduate student once told me, "possibly both." The only way out of that situation seems to be to say that a program in higher education is made up of specialists in various aspects of higher education. Unless we are prepared to include (in higher education institutes, departments, and centers) persons with advanced training in all of the many disciplines and activities involved in the modern university, higher education can hardly expect to draw upon all of the relevant expertise required to understand the complexity of the field in the present day. Note that I am not here arguing *against* higher education as a field of study: I am simply suggesting that, by having placed the emphasis on *education* and by officially or unofficially having associated programs in higher education with colleges of education, we tend to have sealed ourselves off from the many disciplines (economics, psychology, sociology, accounting, history, science, management, etc.) which are essential background for study of higher education problems and equally essential for effective operation in the administrative mode in higher education.

I am also concerned about the extent to which higher education has become a self-producing organism. We produce PhDs in higher education

who, in turn, expect to go into existing departments of higher education or start new ones. I suspect we might do much better to offer a few courses in higher education and encourage professors in many departments of a university to take some work and turn their attention to the implications within their discipline for higher education rather than, like all other fields, concentrate on reproducing our own kind. Some years ago I operated for a period of time in the area of student personnel work, specifically counseling. At that point in time, I did not hire PhDs in counseling or in student personnel work because there weren't very many around. The few such programs in existence were not ones for which I had much respect. As I look back over the span of years, I would still prefer to hire the more broadly trained counselors I did 25 or 30 years ago than those who decide that they are going to specialize in student personnel work or counseling as undergraduates or beginning graduate students. I have some qualms that PhD programs in higher education may likewise be moving toward a too narrow focus. Although in some institutions the PhD in higher education is actually so liberally interpreted that it can include vast segments of work in other fields (provided those fields or departments tolerate the students), I have also looked over a good many credentials from students in higher education programs and have found, as in all other fields, a proliferating set of courses in higher education and a pattern which moves rapidly toward putting more and more of the student's time into such courses. Much depends upon the committee, especially on the chairman, as to the breadth and quality of the program which emerges.

I must say it also pains me to see—and I have in one case, at least—a person listed as an instructor in higher education. It's bad enough to see an assistant professor in higher education, who one assumes has at least finished his PhD. One part of my concern here is the issue of the purposes served by higher education programs. If they are primarily oriented to research on higher education, it might seem at first thought that experience is relatively unimportant. Yet I would argue that anybody who does much research on higher education should have experienced several different roles in higher education as a background for a depth of understanding, without which no successful research can be carried on. This is particularly true if one wishes his research to have a practical significance. If, on the other hand, higher education is to train people to become administrators, then I look with some qualms on a program which would take a young graduate student and prepare him in 3 or 4 years to become a dean or college president. In fact, my sympathies are altogether with the discipline-oriented faculties who think that foisting on them as an administrator a person with such a background is the height of indecency. Certainly I would like to see more administrators with some depth of understanding of higher education, but I believe that this orientation can be provided by offering courses or seminars (perhaps on a postdoctoral level) for those who have

become interested in, and have already had some practical experience in, administration.

I do not think that this practical in-service approach, however, justifies moving broken-down deans or university presidents into higher education programs as distinguished professors or endowed chair holders. Even when these individuals, after a prestigious period as administrators, retain their alertness, it is quite possible that they have not, themselves, indulged in enough scholarly reading, thinking, and research about higher education as a field of study to justify appointment as a professor in the field. It seems to me that the title of professor in higher education, if used at all, should not be lightly given. I would rule out appointment of anybody as instructor or assistant professor of higher education, and only in rare cases appoint associate professors of higher education. I think we only make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the rest of the university faculty when we hire young people who, in the phrase oft used in my younger years, are not yet "dry behind the ears" to offer courses which presume to examine in depth any aspect of higher education.

Another problem with programs in higher education is their apparent tendency, not unnoticed elsewhere in higher education, to expand into any area of need. For example, our reports from campuses indicate not only that PhDs in higher education are offered in student personnel work, in counseling, in curriculum development, in administration, in research on higher education, and in institutional research, but also that degrees are being offered in various fields in college teaching. In their descriptions, several of these make very clear that they are attempting to provide the equivalent of a Doctor of Arts degree on a campus where the traditional departments have not accepted the responsibility of preparing people for teaching in a 4-year college or community college. Beyond this, we find some indication of programs that imply the offering of degrees in sociology of higher education, economics of higher education, etc. Now, much as I feel that we should improve the preparation of college teachers, I doubt whether a department of higher education is the right place to do this. There are many problems. First of all, I would suspect that, in most cases, a student in higher education would end up by taking 50 percent or less of his work in the particular discipline which he proposes to teach. Second, I suspect that anything in the way of experience in teaching or courses in curriculum development, evaluation, formulation of objectives, and the like will be quite broad and often not readily interpretable by the student in terms of the particular discipline which he hopes to teach. If, on the other hand, higher education is given to an individual who takes 85, 90, or 95 percent of his work in chemistry, history, English, or some specific teaching discipline, then in all candor I would question the operation of a graduate school which permitted a department to give a degree to a student who had taken almost

all of his work in another discipline, with no one person in the department qualified to direct that work. Finally, I would resist development of a program of college teaching which is patterned on that used for elementary and secondary teaching.

I should like now to turn to the concern about overspecialization in PhD programs in higher education. I find a few places that offer an emphasis in institutional research. I happen to be the first and longtime director of institutional research at Michigan State University, which has been the source of many leading institutional researchers around the country. I must say very bluntly that if a person applied for a job at my institution with a program labeled as a PhD in institutional research, he would have two and one-half strikes against him. The other half strike would be called by my associate and assistant directors who, in all likelihood, would agree with me. I am sure that whatever the impact of institutional research at MSU has been over the years has come from the fact that it has drawn upon individuals with a diversity of backgrounds prior to and at the doctorate level. We have had persons with backgrounds in economics, in accounting, in English, in counseling, in physical education, in mathematics. In institutional research we need people who know or who are not afraid to learn something about statistics, data processing, budgets, demography, but I would rather hire a person who has taken all of his work in business or accounting to work with a group in which there are others who have specialized in other fields than to hire several people, each of whom has had one or two courses dealing with the many aspects of higher education in which an institutional researcher inevitably becomes involved. We also need persons with backgrounds inclusive of the arts and humanities, for institutional research which attempts to force all departments into a common mold must (and should) fail.

The various points which I have made reflect a number of things which originally caused Mayhew and me to become concerned with this problem. Yet I would by no means imply that all of what is going on in higher education departments is unsatisfactory. Since it is an emerging field, Lew and I feel that it is high time that we probe it in some depth and come out with a statement of suggestions and guidelines which will put it on a basis more secure than it would be if we continue to have a large number of developing programs, each one of which tries to comprehend everything that goes on in higher education. In the preliminary review that we have made so far, we are concerned that business and finance, institutional planning, system planning and coordination, and the broad area of university administration seem to be covered inadequately through lack of involvement of faculty members or administrators who are expert in these several areas. We tend to believe that the basis of such a department in a college of education imposes severe limits upon its operation. Faculty members in other areas such as business, finance, administration, economics have, in some cases,

said quite bluntly they want no part of association with a program in a college of education. Members of central administration sometimes are also hesitant about a too close affiliation with a program in a college of education, fearing that if interns in their office or graduate students working on particular projects are always seen by departments and faculty committees as associated with the college of education there are possible difficulties ahead. We believe that these problems delimit both the range of experiences and the kind of research involvement of students.

We think there should be some clarification of the role of study of higher education on a campus and the need for firsthand experience in higher education operations. We think, too, that some means should be found for people who have expertise in a relevant discipline to collaborate with others in application of it to problems of higher education in ways which fall outside the usual channels of decision making while not debarring those from occasional observation. We think the practical and the theoretical preparation for administration and research on higher education are not antithetical, but we do think that programs which encourage students to feel that a degree will assure them a job as dean or president need to soften this emphasis to suggest only that there is a need for administrators who have some skills and depth of knowledge of higher education. We think there is a need for people who will develop a body of theory about the operation of higher education, and we also believe that we need people who are in position to do something about reorganization and redirection of higher education. Just how these practical and theoretical approaches are to be tied together, we do not yet see clearly, but we are convinced that some higher education programs are needed and that we need to consider carefully their nature in respect to courses, internships, and research requirements. We will be in further contact with many of you, and we encourage you to share with us your concerns and suggestions.

Chapter 3

THE ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNSHIP AS AN OUT-OF-CLASS METHODOLOGY IN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Daniel J. Sorrells
University of Georgia

From the beginning of recorded time, man has advanced personally, socially, and technically through situations which have involved joint participation. The learning process included situations in which one individual was recognized for his expertise in an endeavor as a result of his experience and proven ability. Other individuals involved were considered to be, because of their lack of developed potential, the beginners, the untrained but trainable. This relationship of learned to learner, seasoned to unseasoned, master to apprentice has applied to individuals in all vocations from all walks of life, be they doctors, lawyers, or Indian chiefs. Perhaps learning as co-worker is the oldest of educational techniques, used long before the written page provided an opportunity to read about procedures and practices for mastering a skill.

The craftsman-to-learner concept is applicable to almost every area of business and industry, as well as to education. Even with all the advanced technologies for developing human potential, there is no substitute so effective as a well-directed experience in an actual operational setting. Such experiences are varied in concept, form, and duration. We have become a nation geared to applying technological advances to existing situations to bring about improved change. Laboratory techniques have become an integral part of the training process. Wherever real life situations are not available for such experiences, simulated conditions are often established and "mock-ups" are dealt with as though they were actualities. Even though these are vicarious in nature, they do produce a simulation of reality. Model building has become the target of expanded research. Today personnel, time, and funds are being expended in no small degree, and

sometimes without proper limitations, in the hope that new patterns of process may be designed to bring about improved practice in educational administration, business, and industrial management.

Elementary and secondary educationists have long considered the period of student teaching a requirement for certification. The internship and residency are essential components of training for professional medical practice. Pharmacists must serve an apprenticeship-type experience before being licensed. Psychiatrists and psychologists participate in periods of supervised practice as a part of their professional training. Most industrial and business concerns also use some variation of on-the-job training for all levels of managerial personnel. Since these professions and many others require preparation of an internship nature, can beginning college administrators afford to function without this type experience? The only honest answer is that they have in large numbers in the past, and continue to do so with varying degrees of success. However, the complicated exigencies of college administration today warrant a hard look at the desirability of a firsthand experience for each student aspiring to such an occupational goal. Why shouldn't prospective college administrators be as much in need of this developmental growth process as physicians or psychiatrists or master plumbers?

Within the past 25 years, formalized professionally-oriented courses in higher education have been included in curricular offerings of various colleges and universities throughout the country, and over the past 15 years, a few fully implemented programs for administrator aspirants have evolved. But, even today, the administrative internship experience, if provided at all, remains an optional offering in most schools. Why?

A brief review of some of the efforts which have been made in educational leadership training would seem appropriate. Among the earlier moves to give impetus to administrative leadership in higher education was the program of the Harvard Institute for College and University Administrators (1955-64). As early as 1957, the Carnegie Corporation, recognizing the potential of an internship-type experience for college level administrators, underwrote in conjunction with the University of Michigan, the establishment of the "Michigan Fellows and Scholars Program in Higher Education." In 1964, under the joint sponsorship of the American Council on Education and the Ford Foundation, ACE began the "Academic Administrators' Internship Program." The Phillips Foundation also fostered the "Phillips Interns" concept. In the 60s, the Junior College Leadership Program flourished, sponsored by AAJC and the Kellogg Foundation. During these same years, the University of California at Los Angeles established a vibrant Junior College Leadership Program. Another effort which has provided viability to college administrator development has been the work of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools under its

Leadership Training Projects. Other cooperating agencies, including the New England Board of Higher Education, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), and the Center for the Study of Higher Education of the University of California at Berkeley, have made substantial contributions to the formalized training (though without academic credit) of the potentially nationwide college administrator pool. All of these successful efforts have had an impact on planning for professional internship experiences for budding as well as practicing administrators in education. However, many have been postdoctoral adjuncts to other programs, not integral parts of advanced degree efforts as such.

The stage has been set through these and similar programs sponsored by concerned professional organizations, foundations, and individual institutions in concert or individually. Their goal has been to provide varied types of on-the-job experiences to aspiring professionals who want to become more attuned to the many requirements and demands of major administrative positions in higher education. Yet, extensive cooperation among colleges and universities, and among universities and other professional organizations concerned with the administrator development function remains marginal at best. As Ray Schultz indicated in the March 1968 issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan*, the role to be played by universities in the art and science of higher education administrator training can be great, but the "how" remains undefined and undeveloped. Even now, a consensus as to what constitutes adequate preparation for filling administrator leadership posts remains undefined.

According to a recent Association of Governing Boards bulletin, there were 2,629 established, accredited colleges and universities functioning in the United States as of July 1972. Of this total, some 59% remain classified as private. (This is a startling fact in light of all that is heard today about the decline in numbers and influence of private institutions.) Assuming that each of these 2,600 plus schools has at least 4 administrative posts, and most have many more, there are some 10,516 potential top-level positions which will sooner or later need replacements. Assume again that only half that number will change personnel within the next 5 to 10 years, there are more than 5,200 opportunities to fill these with professionally educated administrators. The possibility exists, provided our departments of higher education become involved in recruiting, developing, and placing such needed professionals. Complicating this dilemma is the fact that many presidents and most boards of trustees fail to recognize that the candidate professionally trained in higher education is more desirable to fill administrative vacancies. Professionally oriented candidates all too often stand less chance to be selected than someone who, because of longevity of employment in the same or another institution, or because of prestige in an academic speciality, or because of a successful business career, becomes

the first consideration. Thus, added to the need for programs of administrator development is the very pertinent need for focusing on the reeducation of personnel selection boards and search committees to the importance of filling major staff positions with professionals who have an administrator orientation and development background. How these tasks of no small proportion can be accomplished will require the combined thinking and planning of the best minds among us. Coming to grips with the real issues involved in improving college and university administrator development programs remains our priority among priorities. Waxing biblical, the harvest is great and the reapers are few.

Perhaps many of us remember Collins Burnett's excellent presentation on the role, scope, and status of higher education as a field of study at last year's APHE conference. An elaboration of this review is included in the winter 1973 *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, along with a host of other pertinent articles which should help us as practitioners to gain a more holistic view of our field. I commend this particular issue to your careful reading. Our mission today is not to argue the importance of advanced programs for developing leaders to assume major roles in college administration, but rather it is to accept this mission as necessary and desirable, if improvement in theory, program, and practice of administration in institutions of higher learning is to eventuate.

I perceive our mission to be one of exploring ways in which programs of advanced degree work may best be formulated to serve as a catalyst for understanding college and university mission, history, development, growth, and progress. Many ingredients go into the building of such a curriculum and each training institution must decide for itself how interdisciplinary, how broad, how deep, how specific, how sequential its offerings can become. It is on structured on-the-job experience that we desire to concentrate our thinking herein, without discounting the many, many other kinds of in- and out-of-class experiences which must make for a well-rounded course of study to be pursued by the neophyte administrator or by the experienced practitioner who wants to learn about new approaches to improving performance.

The history of the administrative internship as a leadership development device within a formalized educational effort is not well established, nor do we have copious examples of such programs. Perhaps the foremost reason for the glaring paucity of this kind of methodology is that meaningful, supervised internship experience possibilities are not necessarily recognized as worthy and required components of the developmental process by the staffs of many degree-granting institutions. When the importance of such experience is recognized, exemplary internship center possibilities are not easily identified. If located, the staffs in such institutions are often unable or unwilling to engage in a cooperative leadership

development venture. Most schools welcome a visit, a "look-see" experience for 1 or 2 days, but they feel somehow reluctant to expose their inner workings to outsiders on a continuous basis. Another objection bearing much validity is that an internship, effectively carried out, requires a heavy involvement of personnel, time, and funds on the part of both institutions. Since all institutions are engrossed in day-by-day operations, in meeting the exigencies at hand, many feel that neither staff time nor funds can be made available for this "extra" effort. Last, many administrative personnel in 2- and 4-year colleges fail to perceive their potential to serve a staff development function. They prefer to hold the degree-granting institution totally responsible and accountable for whatever administrator training they alone can provide.

In May 1971, now almost 2 years ago, a survey was completed of 60 institutions offering work at the doctoral level in the field of higher education. The purpose of this research was to learn about the status and extent of administrative internship offerings. Of the 60 institutions selected to participate in the study, 68% (41 institutions) responded. Of those who replied, 85% (35) furnished usable data, i.e., they offered some type of planned internship program for majors in higher education. A brief analysis of these findings would seem to afford us some tangible indication of the frequency, calibre, and complexity of internships as they now exist as a viable component for the development of administrative personnel for leadership roles in colleges and universities. This analysis may be considered current, since to the researcher's knowledge, a more recent study has not been completed.

Tabulation of results from 41 schools indicated 15% (6) offered only the doctoral program in higher education at that time. Twenty-two percent (9) offered only master's level work, while 63% (26) provided two levels of degrees in their curricula. Only 22% (8) of the total group required a full-time internship, with an average duration of one quarter or one semester. Sixty-nine percent (24) considered the experience to be an optional aspect of their program, with 6% (2) indicating the optional or required aspect would depend on the circumstances and previous work pattern of the student. (One school failed to reply to this question.)

Internships were located in all types of accredited institutions, depending on availability, proximity to the degree-granting institution, recognized worth of a school's administrative efforts, the school's willingness to cooperate in the venture, and the desires of the individual student involved. Types of internship experiences ran the gamut of college and university administration, but the typical interns served as assistants to presidents, academic deans, directors, and department heads. In some junior colleges, the intern also held part-time instructorship responsibilities. In 74% (26) of the institutions, the higher education departments indicated that initial

establishment of internship centers was a joint venture between them and other institutions, including colleges and other educational agencies. Twenty-two percent (8) of the institutions assumed total responsibility for initiating requests for establishing an intern center. One program reported its staff responded only to outside requests of schools which desired to cooperate in the internship effort, thus making all internships fall into a kind of "request for service" category. The internship was served under the student's major adviser in 57% (20) of the institutions. In 37% (13) of the programs, one individual was made responsible for program coordination and was usually designated as Internship Coordinator or carried a similar title. Six percent (2) of the schools used dual coordinators.

Relative to monetary compensation to the student involved, 83% (29) of the departments indicated interns received stipends for their efforts. In 17% (6) of the schools where remuneration was not a consideration, internships were part-time only. Compensation ranged from $5 per hour to $10,000 for a full year. An average estimate was $2,000 for a semester or quarter. Remuneration varied from monetary only to service only, i.e., food, board, transportation costs, to a combination of both. Sources of funds varied from a cooperative effort by both schools, to the total cost being borne by the internship center, to total expenses underwritten by the degree-granting institution. No consistent pattern existed. As for academic credit, all institutions indicated the experience was the important objective and 94% (33) of the schools offered varying academic credit. The two schools allowing no credit programmed only part-time internships.

Concerning outcomes, the objective of most schools could be summarized as that of providing an opportunity for on-the-job experience whereby, through a continuously planned effort, the student would become a more functionally able administrator, once permanently employed. Objectives as perceived by the cooperating institutions included obtaining economical manpower and bringing in new insights and improved technology.

One may surmise, on the basis of this study, that the administrative internship as a vehicle for developing staff leadership personnel is yet in its infancy and has little consistency of operation except for purpose and outcome. It remains an optional venture in most schools and wherever it does exist as a requirement, the duration and degree of effort vary greatly. One could argue that existing conditions are as they should be, for an internship by design complements other aspects of a student's total experience. However, the lack of frequency with which internships are operative makes one wonder if sufficient consideration has been given to this particular technique as a viable developmental medium. Furthermore, with approximately one school per state offering a graduate program in higher education (based on total number, not location), perhaps there is need to expand the concept of college administrator development by

strengthening already established programs through offering the internship opportunity on a more widespread basis.

In the hope that more serious consideration may be given by higher education departmental staffs in support of the learning-by-supervised-doing technique, some of the features of a planned internship concept are enumerated below. If the venture is to be successful, it must be accepted in principle by a majority, hopefully all members of a given department. Some staff person should assume the responsibility of coordinator. This need not be a full-time position, although programs having larger enrollments would require a proportionately greater expenditure of staff time. The coordinator would serve both in initial and follow-up contact roles for the program. Only institutions which would seem to offer an opportunity for administrative role participation in a vital, dynamic way should be considered. Herein lies an ever-present problem. Where do examples exist of on-going programs of administrator effectiveness within easy access to the degree-granting institution? Hopefully, a sufficient roster of intern centers could be made available to offer each doctoral student the choice of an environment similar to that in which he hopes to seek employment upon completing his degree program. Internship arrangements with any given institution may be established on a one-time or a continuing basis, depending on the willingness of that institution to initiate and continue such a program. Every effort should be made by the coordinator to place interns where new environments are possible and where "innovative" practices in administrative policy and procedure are operative. Having a required internship is open to much debate; but, based on our own experience at the University of Georgia, if an objective of the doctoral program is to provide opportunity for administrative learning experience without full job responsibility, this device has great merit.

Working out the details involved in an actual internship experience must be based on variables among the staff of the intern center, the degree-granting institution's departmental personnel, and the capabilities of the student. Variations and adaptations of policy and practice become the basis for a viable program. The philosophy of all concerned must be in concert with the idea that the internship as a culminating experience provides opportunity to actualize theory, experiment, explore, and compare a variety of principles in day-by-day practice. The degree of openness with which the staff of an intern center is willing to include the intern as an integral part is crucial. The degree of understanding by the intern center school of the philosophy and goals and program of the degree-granting institution will largely determine the "how" of the internship, as it is experienced. None of these conditions is subject to exact prediction of outcomes. The more nearly the staffs and the students recognize the internship process as an opportunity for positive interaction and growth, the more nearly a successful experience can be assured. Insofar as negative performance can become a learning

experience, the student's observation of not-so-workable aspects of an institution's administration are also important.

In conclusion, we all recognize there is no single avenue by which college administrator or other professional potential is developed. Multiple influences, in and out of the classroom and on and off the campus, are operating constantly and neither student nor staff quite fully recognize what combinations of experiences afford the greatest opportunity for learning. The magic formula is yet to be derived and serendipity remains a potent factor. However, within a variety of administrator developmental techniques which are available and which may be adopted, adapted, and used, some commonalities and threads for continuity can exist. One such medium is the internship. It remains an empirical means for professional administrative growth without the obligations of final decision making commensurate with permanent employment. If we who have accepted the responsibility for leadership development in higher education are willing to incorporate the merits of the internship, with all its inconveniences and imperfections, into our own doctoral programs, as one viable means to administrator development, perhaps administrative success will be less subject to chance. Better prepared college and university administrators can yet be the results of our concerted efforts.

References

Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities. *Notes*, 1972, **3** (6).

Astin, A. W. Research findings on the academic administrative internship program. *Educational Record*, 1966, **47**, 173-184.

Burnett, C. W. Higher education as a specialized field of study. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1973, **6** (2), 4-13.

Cox, L. The ACE academic administration internship program. *Educational Record*, 1966, **47**, 163-172.

Ewing, J. C., & Stickler, W. H. Progress in the development of higher education as a field of professional graduate study and research. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1964, **15**, 397-403.

Johnson, B. L., & Kintzer, F. C. How internships work: University-junior college cooperation. *Junior College Journal*, 1963, **33**, 17-19.

Medsker, L. L. Junior college leadership training programs. *Journal of Secondary Education*, 1961, **36**, 29-64.

Phillips, E. L. Toward more effective administration in higher education. *Educational Record*, 1966, **47**, 148-162.

Schultz, R. E. Preparation of College and University Administrators. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1968, **49**, 390-394.

Sorrells, D. J. *The administrative internship in higher education: An instructional technique for leadership development*. Athens: University of Georgia, Institute of Higher Education, 1972.

THE USE OF "INFORMAL" INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCES

James L. Miller, Jr.
University of Michigan

Internships play a role in professional education which is important and varied. Professional education in most fields includes some form of real or simulated job experiences. For the totally inexperienced individual, these provide an introduction to the professional milieu which is richer and fuller than could be true of any classroom or textbook descriptions. By the same token, classroom discussions become more meaningful when they are illustrated and illuminated by actual (or simulated) experiences. To some extent internship experiences and other work experiences provide opportunities to try out practices and theories learned during the course of an educational program.

Many of the characteristics of an ideal internship have been well summarized in Sorrells' paper. A formal internship experience should be carefully structured to emphasize the learning possibilities inherent in it while minimizing the investment of student time in repetitious or non-learning activities. This requires the careful selection of the internship position; frequently it necessitates the creation of a quasi-job specifically designed to fulfill the internship function. It requires an on-the-job supervisor who is sympathetic to the purposes of the internship, qualified both professionally and pedagogically to supervise it, and willing and able to devote to the internship the time necessary to supervise it. Internship situations also require constant and careful supervision by a member of the instructional staff who is fully cognizant of the students' needs, who is familiar with the actual and potential characteristics of the internship situation, and who possesses skill in working with both internship supervisors and interns. There must be enough internship positions and

internship supervisors to take care of all of the students who need the internship experience. Furthermore, since educational programs are constantly accepting new students, the internship agency and the supervisor must be willing to repeat the internship periodically. Individual students vary in their previous experience and their needs for additional job-like learning experiences, and internships need to accommodate to these individual variations insofar as possible.

Internships in professional education are difficult to manage. If they are a major component of the program, they require a major investment of time and effort from the teaching faculty. In most university settings, it is not likely that a sufficient number of totally ideal internships will be available on a regular basis to take care of all of the students enrolled in a graduate program in higher education. Therefore it may be necessary for us to identify and accept something less than the theoretically ideal.

There are a number of informal internships which are really surrogates for more formal ones. Informal internships are used in many universities either by design or by default. The principal purpose of this presentation is to take note of some of these.

The use of case studies in some ways represents a surrogate internship experience. A well-done case study can have the educational advantage of fitting into the formal instructional program more predictably than can an actual job experience. It can involve a larger number of students. It can be introduced into the curriculum at precisely the time chosen by the instructor as opportune for illustrating a particular set of points or job-situation characteristics. The case study is predictable in the problems and possibilities it imposes on students, whereas the actual job situation cannot be equally predictable. The case study can introduce complexities which are important for learning purposes and which could not be routinely expected from every internship situation to which a student might be assigned. Case studies also make possible major economies in the use of student time, since organizational situations which might take months or even years to unfold can be summarized in a case study which is worked through in a matter of hours, days, or at most weeks. A major limiting factor in the use of case studies is the severe shortage of appropriate case study materials.

My colleague at the University of Michigan, Marvin Peterson, has been the principal utilizer of case studies in our program. He tells me that a good case study takes weeks of intensive work to develop and test and that once developed, an effective case study is apt to have a life expectancy of only a few years before it becomes too dated to use. These statements may be surprising to anyone who has viewed case studies as simply anecdotal material designed to illustrate certain points. Peterson's comments pertain

to genuine "teaching cases" such as those which have been utilized in the education of future business executives at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration—cases which are designed for fairly sophisticated case-method teaching.

The case method of teaching merits far more attention than it has received thus far as a time-efficient method of integrating classroom-textbook instruction which stimulated organizational experiences. Such an expanded use of case-method teaching would help to provide one (though only one) of the benefits which we frequently seek to give students through on-the-job internships. It is a simulated internship which for some purposes far exceeds the real thing in potential value. However, if we are to make greater use of the case method—or even experiment with making greater use of it—there will need to be a major investment of staff time (and therefore of money) in the development and updating of case material.

The most important surrogate for the formally organized internship is educationally relevant part-time employment for students. At the University of Michigan we have cultivated this kind of student job opportunity and we frequently look upon it as an informal internship. I will describe some of the ways in which we have gone about cultivating these positions and some of the advantages and disadvantages which we have found associated with them.

To summarize briefly the present situation, there are a number of administrators and administrative offices at the University of Michigan and at nearby public and private institutions which look to graduate students from the University's doctoral program in higher education as a source for semi-permanent, second-echelon staff people of high capability and possibly high levels of training and experience. These terms require some elaboration. By semi-permanent I mean that employers can expect graduate students to remain on the job for the 1 to 3 years it will take them to complete their doctoral programs, including dissertations. While there also is the possibility that the employing institutions will be able to keep the individual after he or she finishes the degree, this is recognized as problematical. By second-echelon employees, I mean that in most cases the employing institution is not willing to hire into the top position in any administrative area an individual who is by definition "semi-permanent" (nor, for that matter, are the majority of doctoral students ready to assume the responsibilities of such positions). Advanced graduate students are most apt to go into staff positions rather than "line" or operating positions. In some instances they become one of a group of individuals performing somewhat similar professional functions (such as being one of several analysts in an institutional research office or being one of several counselors in a student personnel office). In other cases the student will become an administrative assistant to an administrative officer such as a

dean, an associate dean, a vice-president, or even a president. These "assistant to" positions provide unusually rich opportunities for observing and participating in a wide variety of educationally relevant administrative experiences as well as opportunities for observing an administrative team in action. Finally, my reference to the possibility of advanced graduate students having considerable experience refers to the fact that so many students who enter doctoral programs in higher education do so after having had actual administrative experience which in and of itself prepares them for a number of on-campus jobs. The dilemma with which graduate students in this category are faced is the fact that the best learning opportunities will come from seeking employment in areas in which they do not already have professional competencies. The jobs for which they are most obviously qualified and most actively sought may be the very jobs which are educationally least profitable.

At the University of Michigan we receive calls from campus administrators with a fair degree of regularity asking about the availability of advanced graduate students to fill staff positions. Unfortunately, although these contacts come with some frequency, they are not altogether predictable. Many job openings do not coincide neatly with the beginning of a school year or school term. Those jobs which most frequently do coincide with the school year tend to be the more routine kinds of jobs, such as those in student counseling and residence hall advising, which provide a less varied exposure to academic administration or top-level university administration. Therefore, one of the things we have learned is to expect, and to advise students to expect, that educationally relevant job opportunities may come along at almost any time of the year and may require students to rethink their educational plans and timetables. Frequently these jobs make it possible for a student to stay on campus long enough to finish the dissertation as well as course work, but the trade-off for this is a stretch-out of the student's original time schedule. An important aspect of our advising with individual students relates to whether or not they ought to make such an adjustment in their time schedule in order to accept a position on campus.

We have found that campus administrators usually want to consider students who have actually been enrolled in the higher education program long enough to permit our faculty to evaluate the individual's potential. We think that one reason we get a good deal of "repeat business" from certain administrative offices is the fact that we have tried to be careful about informing prospective employers fairly of both the strengths and weaknesses in the graduate student's qualifications.

The situation is not altogether stable, however. It is not unusual for an administrator to employ an advanced graduate student who stays for a couple of years and for the administrator then to seek a replacement who is

qualified to pick up at the level of sophistication developed by the departing student. Sometimes the employing administrator is the one who recognizes that he does not want to start over in the training of a new employee; in other cases we ascertain this when we make it clear that we are referring individuals who are at a level of expertise comparable to that possessed by the departing employee at the beginning of his or her employment.

A frequent problem we face is an inability to match students to a particular job at the time the employer is ready to fill it. This can be a severe disappointment to administrators who have accepted the idea that the higher education program possesses a pool of potential employees. The faculty in the higher education program has an important responsibility in maintaining contact with these disappointed prospective employers so that their offices will continue to alert the higher education program to future job openings even though they do not get an employee every time they seek one.

When a large contingent of advanced graduate students hold varied administrative jobs on campus, a number of important peripheral benefits accrue. The graduate student employees become important referral sources for additional job openings, especially those that have good learning possibilities associated with them. The employed graduate students also become important formal and informal learning resources. They bring to informal discussions the perspective of the jobs they occupy and they sometimes become valuable resource people for formal classroom presentations, seminars, coffee hours, and the like.

One factor which facilitated the development of these opportunities at the University of Michigan was the fact that for a number of years the Center for the Study of Higher Education operated a postdoctoral program which brought to campus for a full year a group of able and mature individuals who were interested in making the transition from faculty positions to academic administrative positions. On-campus internship experiences constituted an important aspect of the postdoctoral program, and many administrative offices originally got the idea of turning to the Center for the Study of Higher Education for personnel because of their contact with postdoctoral fellows. This gave us entree to introduce our advanced doctoral students into university offices, although for a while we found it necessary to spell out carefully the differences when we were recommending an advanced graduate student rather than a postdoctoral fellow. The presence on campus of a group of postdoctoral fellows was a special circumstance at the University of Michigan which is not true on most campuses, but its principal effect was in initially opening opportunities. Job opportunities would not have continued to open up year after year had there not been a continuing satisfaction with the performance of students and a continuing cultivation of job opportunities by the Center for the Study of Higher Education's faculty and student group.

Several guidelines can be suggested concerning the use of jobs as informal internships. It is important to maintain continuing contact with the offices in which students are employed even though this contact will not be so frequent or structured as would be true in formal internships. In this way the employing offices are reminded from time to time that their employee is indeed a student in the higher education program as well as a member of the staff. Such indirect reminders sometimes make a difference in the extent to which the employing office attempts to structure the job itself to maximize its learning possibilities. It also reminds the employing administrator that there are other graduate students in the pool when future job opportunities open up.

The higher education faculty have an important responsibility to students in advising them carefully (1) whether or not to accept job opportunities, (2) when during their academic programs to consider accepting such a position and, (3) what special conditions, if any, should be sought by the student.

With individual exceptions, we have tended to advise students not to take positions until they are well along in their course work. I already have suggested that this has some importance from the employer's point of view because of the qualifications it may suggest the student possesses. It also is important from the student's point of view because it makes the difference in whether the student has gotten fully enough into the swing of being a full-time student so that he can view the job as a quasi-internship. The student who has a job from the beginning of his studies frequently finds his situation to be that of an employed person who is pursuing part-time study instead of that of a student who has an internship-like job.

It is important to advise students fully and honestly concerning the extent to which a particular job has internship-like qualities. Jobs vary greatly in this respect and the higher education faculty are more apt than the student to be able to make judgments on this matter. If a student needs the financial assistance a job will provide, it may be necessary to take a job with higher pay and low internship possibilities, but the student should be fully aware of the choice being made.

Students should be advised carefully concerning the probable time commitments associated with jobs they are considering. This involves consideration of whether they should bargain for part-time as against full-time employment. Of equal importance is the fact that some jobs are naturally "9 to 5" jobs while others are the kind that inevitably require overtime and that one "takes home from the office." The latter kind of job is far more disruptive of an individual's academic program, but in some cases it also is high in "informal internship" possibilities. We have had more than one situation in which students invested their creative energies in an

interesting internship-like job instead of putting them into a dissertation and eventually had to relinquish the job in order to complete the dissertation.

The possibilities of an interrelationship interposed between a job and a dissertation should be explored for some students, but the idea should be eyed critically. Frequently administrators who suggest this possibility to students are unaware of the theoretical and conceptual components of the faculty's dissertation expectations. However, some jobs provide a good dissertation tie-in. The academic adviser can help to identify and evaluate this possibility.

Students have certain complaints about jobs as informal internships. At the University of Michigan internship-like jobs tend not to be available to new students. The reasons for this are understandable, but it remains a cause of discontent for some students.

A greater student dissatisfaction stems from the unpredictability which is inherent in the informality of the system. Almost every year the Michigan faculty are urged by students to formalize the whole process. The student image of the outcomes of such formalization is that interesting jobs or internships would become available at the beginning of each year or each term. Students also imagine that there would be better advance information to enable students to better plan their programs and select their jobs. However, at least some of our faculty are convinced that university administrative offices would be unwilling to put their most interesting and sensitive jobs into such an internship pool. *Some* positions in *some* offices might be, but there would be a tendency for the pool to be heavily loaded with routine types of jobs and with conventional internships, that is, internships which are nonpaying or low-paying and which are structured as a series of show-and-tell displays of the administrator's job, project assignments for the intern, or opportunities to accompany the administrator as he makes his daily rounds.

Although the distinction may be subtle, I am persuaded that over a period of time administrators would make a sharper and sharper distinction between what they would expect a formally designated "intern" to do and what they would expect a semi-permanent employee to do. An employee is selected for a particular job and therefore the employer has certain expectations of and confidence in the individual who is hired. An intern arrives because the calendar reaches a particular date. In accepting an intern the administrator is fulfilling an educational obligation; when he hires a new employee he is often at the apex of his own enthusiasm over a new activity for which the person is hired. The fact that an intern must be selected from among a limited pool of prospects is going to dampen the enthusiasm of administrators who recognize that each year some agency must take the weaker students in the pool. The administrator's wariness will be

heightened if he or she has had personal experience with one of the less than satisfactory students.

The principal argument in this paper is that on-campus jobs can constitute "informal internships" that have some, if not all, of the advantages of formal internships and that offer some opportunities which go beyond those of formal internships. They should be recognized as an alternate possibility which might be utilized as a supplement to a formal internship program or even as a substitute for it.

THE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

W. Hugh Stickler
Florida State University

The Association of Professors of Higher Education is a young organization. In fact, this is only our second annual meeting. And, as we know, our meeting time is limited. It is difficult for us to find time to talk about ourselves. So here at this luncheon meeting I have elected to talk about us, our organization, our Association. In the next few minutes I should like to indicate where we have been, where we are, and where we seem to be going. Finally, I wish to make a proposal regarding a major project I should like to see APHE undertake in the near future.

OUR PAST

Concerning this Association one thing is certain: there was no planned parenthood here. In fact, we do not even know who the parents were or are. And it is highly doubtful that APHE ever wanted to be born in the first place.

But let me begin at the beginning. For reasons which will become evident in a moment I am relating this history from memory. I may be in error in some of the minor details, but I think I am essentially right in the broad sweeps of APHE's gestation period. And it goes about as follows.

By the mid-1950s higher education had begun to emerge as a field of graduate study. There were a dozen or a score of fledgling programs about the country, but a "Professor of Higher Education" was still something of a rarity. In this atmosphere of uncertainty, almost of naivete, eight or a dozen persons interested in higher education met here in the Conrad Hilton Hotel

in Chicago to "talk shop."[1] I would guess the year to be about 1955 or 1956.

It was the most informal of informal meetings, and it lasted about an hour. As I recall, the group agreed on four things: (1) it should meet briefly each year to exchange ideas; (2) it should get the word of the next meeting to other persons interested in higher education; (3) it should (and did) appoint a single person to plan the next meeting, bring the group together, and oversee the operation of the meeting; and (4) it should *not* move toward the establishment of a formal or permanent organization to serve our simple needs. In fact, the last idea was thoroughly and completely rejected. Another professional organization was precisely what we did not want. In our judgment, there were far too many such organizations already.

So things began. At the first "planned" meeting a dozen or 15 people must have been present. The next year the number went to a score or 2 dozens. And the third year the number skyrocketed to 40 or 50 persons. The "administration" remained simple—one person chosen at the end of each meeting to "run things" for the next year. Also the format of the program remained simple and informal. In the main the programs were of the following type: "We do things this way at our place. How do you do them at yours?"

Along about this point—during the period October 13-17, 1957, to be exact—an event took place at Stanford University which had bearing on what has now come to be known as APHE. At that time W. H. Cowley convened on the Stanford campus a conference of more than a score of well-known educators in the field of higher education. He proposed that a new organization be established—to bear some such name as the "National Society for the Study of Higher Education"—and that it assume as its primary obligation the production and publication of a quality yearbook in the field of higher education.

Alas, the conferees would have none of it. Some felt the idea had merit but that it was premature. But, perhaps more important, the idea of still another professional organization was almost violently resisted. And so the conference adjourned. I can assure you that Cowley was not left as a happy man!

But let us get back to Chicago. There the annual meetings continued and attendance increased. By the early 1960s an annual attendance of 100 or more persons was common. It was along about this time that we prevailed upon the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) to serve

---

[1] The primary reason for our being in Chicago in the first place, of course, was the National Conference on Higher Education, operated annually by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE).

coffee at the "Higher Education Meetings" so a note of sociability was injected. By this time the "administration" chores had become too burdensome for one person, so the task annually was consigned to a small committee (three or five persons as I recall). Moreover, the programs became somewhat more formal. Each year one or two well-known educators—I remember, among others, Eckert, Henderson, Mayhew, McConnell, and McGrath—would be asked to present a formal paper on some aspect of interest in the field of higher education. Question-and-answer periods usually followed, but as the size of the audience increased, the intimacy of the discussion diminished. Incidentally, some of the papers were later published.

Periodically some person or group of persons would renew the suggestion of a formal organization. Duryea and his associates made such a suggestion in the early 1960s. And I have a letter in my files from M. M. Chambers dated October 24, 1963. In it he writes, "To make a long story short, I think if you were to organize a National Association of Professors of Higher Education [note the name] there would be nothing to lose and everything to gain." But the group as a whole would have nothing to do with such ideas. Not only were the ideas resisted; they were resisted with a vengeance.

At first each "chairman" (if that was what he was) and later each committee was a world unto himself or itself. Insofar as I know, no data, no records, no correspondence were kept nor passed on from year to year. All such things were ephemeral. No organization was in the making, it was thought—and hoped. So why keep such materials? As a result of such thinking, no file of "APHE historical happenings" is available, at least insofar as I am aware. If such materials exist anywhere for the period prior to 1970, they must be the most fugitive of fugitive materials!

So matters continued. The number of programs of higher education in American colleges and universities increased to more than 100, and the number of professors of higher education increased accordingly. Moreover, graduate students and other persons interested in higher education (e.g., governing board members, personnel from state and federal agencies) began attending the annual meetings. By the middle 1960s attendance reached 200, and by the late 1960s it had gone to close to 300 persons. Something had to be done.

At the 1970 meeting 300-350 individuals must have been in attendance. At the end of the meeting a resolution was passed that the group, which so long had been meeting informally, now organize itself into a formal professional association. A committee was activated to accomplish the task.

Unfortunately, the committee was unable to obtain funds with which to pursue its work. So it returned to the 1971 meeting empty-handed and with

little or nothing accomplished. Persons attending the meeting were not happy about that! They made it abundantly clear that they wanted a new professional organization and they wanted it soon. So another committee was appointed. (That is normal procedure in such a situation!)

This time things went better—much better. The committee obtained a modest grant of money from the Sloan Foundation, and The American College Testing Program assisted in the mass mailings. The committee met several times and made good progress. By early fall of 1971 it had designated the embryonic organization the "Association of Professors of Higher Education" (note similarity to the Chambers' suggestion of 1963) and it had made arrangements that APHE would function as a division of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). Moreover, the committee had created a constitution for the new organization. By late fall of 1971 the APHE constitution had been ratified by the members-to-be. In early 1972 the first officers were elected and on March 5, 1972, the First Annual Meeting of the Association of Professors of Higher Education was held here at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago.

You know the rest of the story. APHE, perhaps reluctantly, has been born, and it is a healthy child. Earlier I mentioned that the parenthood of APHE is quite uncertain. But one thing we do know for sure: Dr. Maurice E. Troyer of Syracuse University was the obstetrician. The amount of work done by his committee[2]—and especially by Troyer himself—in bringing this Association into being was prodigious. We all owe him and the committee a debt of gratitude.

So much for our past. Perhaps I have dwelled too long on these matters leading up to our formal establishment. But I did want to record these events, imperfect though my memory of the details is, "for posterity."

OUR PRESENT

We shift now to the present situation in our organization and the progress we have made during the past year. This portion of my remarks can and will move at a faster pace.

It has been a good year for APHE. The proceedings of our 1972 meeting have been published under the title *Higher Education as a Field of Study*

---

[2]The total membership of the committee consisted of the following persons: Dr. G. Lester Anderson, Pennsylvania State University; Mr. John Brugel (graduate student), Pennsylvania State University; Dr. Lewis B. Mayhew, Stanford University; Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., University of Michigan; Dr. Ida Long Rogers, George Peabody College for Teachers; Dr. W. Hugh Stickler, Florida State University; and Dr. Maurice E. Troyer, Syracuse University (Chairman).

and distributed to members. Our mailing list has been somewhat updated. A house organ, *APHE Newsletter*, has been launched and three issues have been distributed to members and to potential members. A membership brochure has been developed, published, and mailed to nearly 1,000 persons who are or ought to be interested in membership in our Association. Finally, two professional documents have been distributed gratis to our membership. They are *The University—Its Identity Crisis* by John S. Brubacher, made available through Central Connecticut State College and *Graduate Education: Purposes, Problems, and Potential* by the National Board on Graduate Education, made available through that agency. And I am pleased to annouce that in both instances the initiative for the distribution came from the respective agencies, not from APHE or any of its officers.

Also I am pleased to bring to your attention another matter which is about to come to fruition. Several months ago Mr. Allen Jossey-Bass, President of Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, approached the APHE Executive Committee with the following proposal. Each year APHE would select the outstanding doctoral dissertation in the field of higher education. Jossey-Bass would reward the writer with a cash prize, and if the dissertation should be of publishable quality and the title should be of sufficiently wide appeal, Jossey-Bass would offer to negotiate with the author about possible publication of the document in book form. After considerable thought and discussion the APHE Executive Committee approved the idea. An agreement has been developed which incorporates the points just mentioned. An excellent selection committee has been activated and is now at work. You will undoubtedly be hearing from that committee in the not distant future as it hopes to make its first "dissertation-of-the-year" selection during the calendar year 1973. The members of the Executive Committee—and, we hope, you too—are quite excited about the long-range possibilities of this project.

Throughout the past year APHE has remained solvent. A little money—something like $1,000—was left over from the grant from the Sloan Foundation. We still have that. But the year's accomplishments were financed out of operating funds which came from membership dues. APHE does not have a lot of money, but we had enough to "get by" this past year, and in these days that is an accomplishment in itself!

I cannot close this report on the past year's activities and where APHE is now without saying a word of appreciation for our parent organization, the American Association for Higher Education, of which we are a division. AAHE has been helpful in every way. The Washington Office has encouraged us, supported us, and assisted us at every turn. And Dyckman Vermilye and Anne Yates of the AAHE Washington Office have been just

wonderful. We could not have asked for better support than they have given. APHE is greatly in their debt for these many and splendid services.

OUR FUTURE

Now let us turn to the future. What does it hold for APHE? Almost certainly the projects which are now underway will be continued. The proceedings of this meeting will be published and distributed to the membership. Also members may expect to receive several issues of the *APHE Newsletter* during the coming year. The membership brochure will be revised, published, and widely distributed. And the Jossey-Bass-APHE "dissertation-of-the-year" project should result in the selection of the first winner-designate(s).

But over and above the project already under way the incoming Executive Committee expects to move forward on at least three fronts.

First, a real and far-reaching effort will be made to develop, perfect, and publish an accurate *Directory of Professors of Higher Education* in the United States. True, we currently have a working document which, during the past year, has served our purposes reasonably well. But it contains many inaccuracies and imperfections. The new perfected document in this area will be most welcome.

Second, the Executive Committee will double its efforts to increase APHE membership. At the beginning of today's meeting we had only about 175 members.[3] We know, of course, that because of its nature, APHE will never be a large organization. But there is good reason to believe that the current number of members should and can be doubled within the foreseeable future. During the coming year the Executive Committee will work toward that goal.

Third, APHE will seek to establish working relationships with other similar organizations. One such group is the professors of community and junior college education which meets each year at the time of the annual conference of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). For some time that group has been keeping and distributing a log of doctoral research completed and in progress, in community and junior college education. Possibly a trade-off can be arranged in which the AACJC will include the area of higher education in their log of doctoral research. In return APHE might include in its new *Directory* not only professors of

[3] By the end of the March 11, 1973, meeting the membership of APHE had increased to approximately 240 persons.

higher education per se but also professors of community and junior college education.

Another group which will be consulted will be the University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA). In fact, APHE representatives will participate in a UCEA meeting in Columbus, Ohio, later this month. The hope here is that APHE can help UCEA to strengthen its research efforts in the field of higher education.

A PROPOSAL

Before closing these remarks on the future of APHE, I wish to make a proposal concerning a major project upon which I hope APHE will embark. As of this time I have not discussed this proposition with anyone, so it will be as new to the Executive Committee as it is to the other members of the Association.

In my review of the events leading to the establishment of APHE you will recall my mention of the Stanford conference on the study of higher education in 1957. You will recall further that Cowley proposed at that conference the creation of a "National Society for the Study of Higher Education." Further still, you will recall he proposed that the to-be-created organization assume as its primary obligation the annual production and publication of a quality yearbook in the field of higher education. Finally, you will recall the proposal was rejected. Several of the conferees thought the idea was premature, that the time and "situation" for such an undertaking simply were not right.

But some 16 years have elapsed and things have changed. I believe the time and the "situation" are now right for such an undertaking. Therefore, I propose that the Association of Professors of Higher Education undertake as a major and continuing project the annual production and publication of a quality yearbook in the field of higher education.

I have several reasons for making this proposal. I shall mention four. First, there is a lot of talent in this organization; in fact, because of the talent evident in our membership, APHE is uniquely qualified to undertake such a project. Second, because of its nature there is reason to believe that APHE can obtain funds to finance such a project, even in the long haul. Third, many aspects of higher education today are so complex that an individual, however scholarly, cannot handle them: often a team approach is needed. Fourth, and finally, APHE *needs* for its own successful future operation a sustaining project of this nature. The production and publication of a quality yearbook would give substance, purpose, continuity, and visibility to our organization. Through such an undertaking APHE could make a

PROCEEDINGS of the
SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
of the ASSOCIATION OF
PROFESSORS OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Chicago, Illinois
March 11, 1973