DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 020 SP 010 214

AUTHOR Cyphert, Frederick R.; Zimpher, Nancy Lusk
TITLE The Education Deanship: Who Is the Dean?
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Background; *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; *College Deans; Inservice Education; Leadership Training; Professional Personnel; Professional Recognition; *Professional Training; *Schools of Education

ABSTRACT

This study identifies the personal, professional, and job-related characteristics of deans of schools, colleges, and departments of education. The study was organized to identify and describe: (1) personal characteristics of current deans; (2) professional background characteristics; (3) current professional activity data regarding practicing deans; (4) perceptions and role expectations that superordinates and subordinates have of deans; (5) characteristics of persons who recently left a deanship; (6) characteristics of prospective school, college, and department of education leaders; (7) behavior of leaders; (8) characteristics of deans in fields other than education; and (9) the interrelationships of the findings of this research with those of Clark and Guba regarding universities as complex organizations. Questionnaires were sent to 271 schools, colleges, and departments of education. Data from the 181 respondents indicate that American deans of education today are most commonly healthy and energetic, middle-aged, married, male, white, protestant, democrat academics from a relatively non-college-educated, lower middle class, non-professional-managerial, native-born, small-town, multi-child family background. They hold the doctorate degree, have had some training in educational administration, entered the profession through public school experiences, advanced from there to the university faculty, and took the deanship directly from a position in higher education. (DMT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126020

U.S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EDUCATION DEANSHIP: WHO IS THE DEAN?

A Paper Prepared for the 1976 Annual Conference

of the

American Educational Research Association

Session 27.09
Administration in Higher Education

Frederick R. Cyphert
Nancy Lusk Zimpher

SP010 214

THE EDUCATION DEANSHIP: WHO IS THE DEAN?

A Paper Prepared for the 1976 Annual Conference
of the
American Educational Research Association

Frederick R. Cyphert
Nancy Lusk Zimpher

The Problem Area

It is apparent that various groups within the education profession have increasingly elevated the question of leadership training for deans in schools, colleges, and departments of education to a high level of priority. Organizations such as the University Council for Educational Administration, Harvard University, the American Council on Education, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges have all been engaged at one time or another in this kind of activity.

Educators have long recognized the need for the specific training of personnel within the profession. Historically this training has been organized around programs for the certification of teachers, principals, superintendents and other school personnel. Ironically, those individuals who have been chosen for leadership positions in schools, colleges, and departments of education which offer these certification programs have not had the benefit of prior job-specific training. Instead we have assumed that past experience, chiefly as a professor in higher education, could provide sufficient orientation for becoming an education dean. Concurrently, the responsibilities of these leaders have increased and the pressing problems of higher education have demanded an even higher level of expertise in virtually all facets of this leadership role, e.g., budgeting, collective bargaining, program improvement, and the "management of decline." It seems unreasonable to continue to assume that persons who come to these leadership positions will be able to respond to the demands of the role without the opportunity for job-specific training.

The end result of this and related studies, we hope, will be the creation of programs designed to enhance the effectiveness of deans. Theoretically, any training program for education deans must be based on a body of knowledge about the role responsibilities of deans as well as an understanding of the persons who execute these role responsibilities. In effect, a training program for deans involves the successful interrelating of these two sets of prerequisite data. This study was aimed at the second of these two factors, namely, an answer to the question of who is the dean. For instance, we know virtually nothing about the goals of incumbents in these leadership positions; where they come from, what their backgrounds are, what their personal characteristics are. Neither do we know who might be potential candidates for these administrative positions. We know more about the processes by which these individuals

are selected than we do about the survivors of this screening process. We are not knowledgeable about the career aspirations of incumbents in leadership positions. In addition, we know very little about why recent deans have left their positions. Likewise, we have no knowledge about the characteristics of a pool of future deans. Is the commitment of incumbents to the job significant enough to warrant their training and further development, or should our attention be focused primarily on prospective candidates? And finally, although we are giving some consideration currently to institutional differences, we do not know what effect these differences have on the leaders in these institutions.

Without knowledge of the above illustrative concerns, we are attempting to organize training programs with a substantive deficit. At the very least, we must depend on the participants in these programs to provide us with a set of concerns for which they need solutions. Yet we have no evidence to suggest that these concerns are the ones that will effect improved performance in the administrative roles involved.

Parenthetically, both the university presidency and the university professoriate have been the object of numerous studies: However, university "middle management," the deanship, represents a void in our data base, even though its cruciality is increasingly recognized.

The Problem

The purpose of the study was to identify personal, professional, and job-related characteristics of deans of schools, colleges, and departments of education. These characteristics provide a basis for making inferences about the preparation for and the responsibilities of the education deanship.

More specifically, the study was organized around the following nine objectives (with illustrative subquestions):

A. Phase One (as reported in this paper)

I. Identify and describe personal characteristics of current deans.

(a) What is the personal profile of deans (age, race, sex, health, geographic background, etc.)?

(b) What is the family background of deans (parental education, occupation, etc.)?

(c) What value structure guides a dean's personal behavior (politics, religion, etc.)?

II. Identify and describe professional background characteristics of current deans.

(a) What are the career patterns of deans?

(b) In which institutions do deans study?

(c) What factors influenced incumbents to become deans?

III. Identify and describe current professional activity data regarding practicing deans.

(a) What are the role expectations of deans?

(b) What do deans perceive as their successes and failures, needs and expertise?

(c) What are the future plans and desires of deans?

B. Phase Two (to be reported at a later date)

I. Identify, describe, and compare the perceptions and role expectations which superordinates and subordinates have of current deans with the incumbents' self-perceptions.

(a) Is the dean perceived as satisfied with the position?

(b) Is the energy level of the dean the same as that which the dean is perceived to have by others?

II. Describe the characteristics of persons who recently left a deanship for any reason other than death. Responses to appropriate questions from the survey of current deans will be solicited from past deans. In addition, the following unique questions will be addressed:

(a) What were their reasons for leaving a deanship?

(b) What are the personal attributes or competencies needed for somebody to be successful in the position vacated?

III. Describe the characteristics of prospective school, college, and department of education leaders. Responses to appropriate questions from the survey of current deans will be solicited from future deans.

(a) What are the personal/academic characteristics of this pool?

(b) Would those identified in this pool consider taking such a position?

IV. Probe more extensively into some questions treated only superficially in the present inquiry.

(a) What are the causes of varying leader behavior?

V. Identify and describe characteristics of deans in fields other than education.

(a) How do the characteristics of non-education deans compare with those of education deans?

(b) What are the generic and unique profiles of deans?

VI. Inter-relate the findings of this research with those of Clark and Guba regarding universities as complex organizations.

(a) How do leadership persons affect organizations?

(b) How do organizations affect the behavior of deans?

Methodology

The population of this study included deans of schools, colleges and departments of education. The term dean was used generically and in the broadest sense to include that single person who carries the chief administrative responsibility for that academic unit of a college or university responsible for the preparation of professional education personnel. In some institutions this person may be known as dean of the school or college of education, while in others the title may be chairperson or head of the department of education. The study does not focus on members of a dean's staff, or department chairpersons in a multi-department unit.

All institutions of higher education which have a teacher training program were included in the total population of this study. Further, the total population was divided according to the taxonomic category system of institutions of teacher education developed by the Center for Research on Insitutions of Teacher Education at Indiana University. The system has eight major categories of institutions which are based on:

1. The level of degree offered; doctorate, masters or bachelors
2. The type of control; public or private
3. The type of campus; main or regional

The categories are displayed in the Appendix.

This study was based on a 20% sample of the entire population of schools, colleges and departments of education. To assure that each of the eight categories discussed above had equal representation, a 20% sample was drawn from each of the eight categories. In addition, prior to drawing the sample, the institutions within each category were ranked from low to high according to their total enrollment to assure that the sample was representative of size as well as the other factors mentioned previously. Using a table of random numbers,

a stratified random sample of institutions was drawn. At the time of the drawing (October, 1975), discounting institutions for which data were not yet available, the population of schools, colleges and departments of education totalled 1,360 institutions. The 20% sample, and the population to which questionnaires were sent, totalled 271.

The original organization of the questionnaire was intended to capture a sense of the dean's past and present characteristics and future aspirations. Rather than organizing the questionnaire into these three parts, however, an instrument was designed to include questions about past, present and future characteristics from a different three-part division. This new organization was as follows: 1) personal data, 2) professional background data, and 3) job-related data. The process of developing questions was one of beginning with a general area considered to be important, such as career path, and then developing specific key questions which would enable us to generalize regarding the original area. After arriving at an initial list of questions, other relevant studies were surveyed. As a result, the instrument was modified to generate data comparable to the information in the Stanford Project on Academic Governance[1], the Cohen/March study[2] of the university presidency, the Bagley study[3] on education professors, and the Campbell/Newell study[4] of professors of educational administration.

The first draft of the questionnaire was quite lengthy, so every attempt was made to structure the questions into a multiple choice or short answer mode, and the number of open-ended questions was reduced. The questionnaire was field-tested in September, 1975, with deans of the state-assisted institutions in Ohio, heads of five private institutions in Ohio, and nationally by seven deans, associates and former deans. Of the total population, 89% responded to the field test. As a result of their suggestions, the instrument was again shortened and several ambiguous questions were deleted. The final questionnaire which went to the population of this study had an eight-page printed format and was divided into three parts as follows: personal data (with 22 questions); professional background data (with 14 questions); and current professional data (with 40 questions).

---

[1] J.V. Baldridge, D.V. Curtis, G. Ecker, and G.L. Riley. The Stanford Project on Academic Governance (Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Forthcoming).

[2] Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974).

[3] Ayers Bagley, The Professor of Education: An Assessment of Conditions (Minneapolis: Society of Professors of Education, 1975).

[4] Roald F. Campbell and L. Jackson Newell, A Study of Professors of Educational Administration (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973).

After the 20% stratified random sample was drawn by institution, it was then necessary to identify the name and title of the head of teacher education in each school, college and department of education. The primary source for these addresses was the information on file at the Center for Research on Institutions of Teacher Education. This information was supplemented by the directories of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the American Council on Education. For the few remaining respondents, calls were made to the institutions to identify the correct individual. To assure the appropriateness of the respondent, an information sheet was attached to each questionnaire asking that the individual identified please forward the questionnaire to the head of teacher education, if it was incorrectly addressed. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study and also advised respondents that completion of the questionnaire could be facilitated by enclosing a current resume with the return. About 30% of the respondents took advantage of this opportunity.

The questionnaire, complete with cover letter and return envelope, was mailed to the entire sample on November 3, 1975. Approximately three weeks later 32%, or 89 responses had been returned. Follow-up letters were mailed to the remainder of the population between November 21-26. Again, within three weeks an additional 51 responses were in, making the total response 51%. Follow-up calls were made to the respondents, and at the cut-off date necessary for mailing a preliminary report of this study, 181 respondents had returned usable questionnaires, for a total response of 68%. Three respondents indicated that they were unwilling to complete the questionnaire. The stated reason was that the information requested was too personal and that questions appeared to be irrelevant to the specified purpose of the study.

The profile of the non-respondent population, by sex, title, and terminal degree was comparable to the respondent population. In some instances, institutions identified in the original sample were no longer preparing teachers, and in those instances, a second institution was drawn to complete the sample.

Of the 76 questions in the instrument, approximately one-third of them allowed for open-ended responses. The initial task in the analysis of the data required the derivation of several systems to classify responses. For the first 40 questionnaires which were returned, responses to the open-ended questions were compiled. A broad and complex classification system with repeated applicability was derived to permit direct comparisons of open-ended responses regarding respondent feelings and functions in role. What follows is a brief explanation of the elements of this major classification system:

1) Leadership - used only when the respondent used the word, almost always unspecified.

2) Planning - used for goal setting, fact-finding, seeking more or better knowledge of the field, knowledge of the law in higher education.

3) Organizing - executing, facilitating, climate-building, decision-making, administrivia.

4) Student development - anything related to students; recruitment, advising, etc.

5) Evaluation - related to accreditation activities, self-study.

6) Program development - related to program stimulation, course organization.

7) Staff development - in-service training of faculty, recruitment, tenure and promotion.

8) Budgeting - resource allocation/acquisition, financing.

9) External relations - public relations, liason for educational unit to those outside unit (central administration, community, legislature); building a politically viable constituent base.

10) Professional duties - teaching, research, reading; activities commonly associated with the professorial role.

11) Power - personal influence, autonomy, authority, personal pay-off.

12) Other - unclassifiable.

Each open-ended question was coded into one of the above classifications and information was transferred from the resumes submitted onto the instrument. Instruments were key-punched and verified; and a computer program was selected. The number of variables totalled 180. Variables appear to cluster, and can be viewed in some combination. Variables can also be cross-tabulated. Means and frequencies were tabulated for responses in each of the eight categories, both separately and for all categories combined. Because the rate of response was unequal among categories, it was necessary to weight each category to find a mean response for the total population.

In addition to viewing separately or as a total group each of the eight categories discussed earlier, it was possible to divide them into several meaningful clusters for analysis. One approach was to combine the private institutions and to contrast them with the public. Another sort combined the doctoral granting institutions and compared them separately with the master's level institutions and the bachelors level colleges. A third way of analyzing the data compared chief administrators who are entitled "dean" with those who are called "chairpersons." Other efforts compared females with males, and whites with racial minorities. And finally, the data from new deans was contrasted with that of deans with longer tenure. Means and frequencies were computed for each of the clusters. In addition, a chi square was computed to

test the degree of significance for frequency responses; and, an analysis of variance was employed to measure the significance of mean response. (Due to the quantity of data retrieved in this study, tables were not incorporated in this discourse.)

Analysis of the Data (Findings)

I. First, the data reveal the following profile of the personal characteristics of deans:

1) The mean age at which respondents assumed their current deanship is 43 years, with a mean range of from the age of 37 to 48. Because only 3% of the respondents have had more than one deanship this is also the mean age for assuming an initial deanship. In looking at the mean age within individual categories, the only significant relationship (at the .05 level) occurs by type of degree offered at the respondent's institution. The deans of doctoral and bachelor degree granting institutions assume the deanship at an older age (Ph.D. - 45; B.A. - 44), than do the leaders of master's granting institutions (age 41).

2) A physical picture of deans reveals that the mean age for all deans currently is 48; with deans at doctoral and bachelors institutions being slightly above the mean and deans at master's institutions slightly below this average. Some perspective on these data can be gained from the Campbell and Newell study (p. 17) which shows that the mean age of practicing professors of educational administration is 48, and from the Cohen and March research (p. 8), listing the mean age of presidents in office at 53.

Women deans average 5'2" in height and 138 pounds. The men included in this study average 5'10" in height and 178 pounds.

3) Our respondents are 84% male (16% female), with no women heads of teacher education appearing in public or private doctoral level institutions and with the highest percentage of women heads of teacher education employed in private bachelors degree institutions (25%). Women are more likely to carry the title "chairperson" in contrast to men who are more often called "dean."

Ferrari reported in Cohen and March (p. 12) his findings that 11% of college and university presidents are female, while only 2% of the educational administration professoriate are women (Campbell and Newell, p. 18). However, 20% of the doctorates in the broad field of education are awarded to women (Bagley, p. 87). As in presidencies, women deans appear to be chiefly in the smaller and the Catholic affiliated institutions.

4) The respondents to this study are 93% white, 6% Black, and 1% oriental. There were no Blacks in the population of private doctoral and private master's

or public regional institutions; but rather they are most heavily represented in what formerly may have been all Black institutions, in the public bachelor's institution category. Parenthetically, 97% of educational administration professors are white, and precise data regarding presidents are not available.

5) The entire population of respondents describe themselves as in excellent health (73%), with only 2% of the populations identifying themselves as in less than in good health. When asked if they saw themselves as hyper-energetic, having more energy than most people, or having average or less than average energy, 71% felt they had more energy than most, 7% being hyper-energetic.

6) Of the respondents, 86% are married, 4% widowed or divorced, and 10% never married. Among categories, 100% of the deans of doctoral institutions are married in contrast to a low of 78% married in private bachelor's institutions. There is a highly significant relationship between one's sex and marital status. Ninety-three percent of all male respondents are married as contrasted with 44% of women heads of teacher education being currently married. Moreover, 44% of women deans have never been married.

Other studies show that approximately 74% of <u>all</u> professors of education are married (Bagly, p. 92); that 94% of the educational administration professoriate are married (Campbell and Newell, p. 19), and that virtually all unmarried presidents are members of celibate orders (Cohen and March, p. 12).

The mean number of children for the total population sampled in this study is 2.1. There is a significant relationship between number of children and one's sex, one's title, and the type of institution where one is employed, all of which may be explained by the high proportion of unmarried females entitled "chairperson" in the private institutions.

7) Fifty-nine percent of the spouses of those respondents who are married are currently employed. Ninety-four percent of the spouses of non-white respondents are employed in contrast to 54% of the spouses of whites who are employed. The spouses of deans in private doctoral institutions are those that are most likely to be employed, i.e. 80% of these persons are currently working. Of those spouses who are employed, 61% are educators (elementary/secondary school teachers, instructors in higher education). Sixteen percent are practicing a profession other than in education (e.g., law, nursing, accounting), although these spouses in non-educational professions do not seem to marry deans in doctoral institutions. In each category more than half of the working spouses are in education, with the sole differentiation being that 33% of the female deans are married to small businessmen while 65% of the male deans are married to educators. Of the spouses who were previously employed, as this differs from being currently employed, the mean number who were educators is 73%.

8) In regard to family background and youth, 96% of the respondents were raised at home by their parents; and, 56% of the population were either

middle or last born children. All totalled, 93% of the respondents come from multi-child families. These data are quite comparable to those for educational administration professors who show 55% as middle or last-born and 90% from multi-child families.

9) Although 92% of the respondents have doctorates, 54% of their mothers and 58% of their fathers received no education beyond the high school diploma. Twenty-six percent of both parental groups attended college with 14% of both parents receiving degrees. There seems to be no major difference between the amounts of education of the mothers and the fathers, with the unique exception that the mothers of female deans have a higher educational level than the mothers of male deans.

The 41% of university presidents' fathers who attended college and the 27% who completed college are both substantially above the general United States figures for the appropriate age group. Even more distinctive was the proportion of presidents' mothers who attended college (34%) and completed college (16%) (Cohen and March, p. 17).

10) Forty-eight percent of the fathers of deans were employed as owner/managers of small businesses or as skilled laborers or artisans. Only 4% of the fathers were employed in an education-related occupation, in contrast to 21% of those working mothers. However, 55% of the mothers of male deans were not employed outside the home, in contrast to the 47% of the mothers of female deans who were employed, primarily as educators.

For purposes of comparison, 14% of education professors in general had fathers with professional employment. Fifty-four percent of the fathers of professors were white collar workers, and 33% were semi- and un-skilled laborers (Bagley, p. 92). While presidents appear to come from all occupational groups, working-class and farmer fathers tend to be under-represented relative to their proportion of the nation's population, while professorial, executive, manager, and proprietor fathers tend to be over-represented. Fathers who were secondary school teachers appear to be particularly over-represented (Cohen and March, p. 16).

11) Seventy-five percent of the respondents in the sample were raised or spent the majority of their youth in rural areas, small towns or small cities (rather than in large cities and their suburbs). In addition, 98% of the deans spent their youth in the United States. Of those few who did spend a large percentage of their youth outside the United States, they are almost exclusively found now in doctoral level institutions. Of the respondents who identified the state in which they were born, the largest dean producing states were Pennsylvania, New York and Wisconsin. Fifty-eight percent of today's deans practice in a state other than the one in which they were reared. However, most movement is confined to adjoining states, and the few who move out of their native region have followed the trend of the general population westward and southward. Like presidents (Cohen and March, p. 18), most deans are employed within 500 miles of their birthplace, and larger schools are more likely to draw leadership from a great distance than are smaller schools.

12) In an effort to measure the perceived change in social class of deans, we asked the population to identify their class standing at three periods in their life; youth, age 30, and currently. The stratification used was upper class, upper middle, middle, lower middle, and lower class. In youth, 55% of the respondents viewed themselves as lower or lower middle class, and 40% middle class. At age 30, 70% identified themselves as middle class and the upper middle class category showed an increase of from 11% to 16%. Deans identify their current class standing as 35% middle class, and 59% upper middle class. Clearly, the results indicate upward social mobility. In youth, only 12% of the respondents perceived themselves as above middle class. Their current status shows 62% feel that they are above middle class. Consistently, the women studied view themselves as occupying higher socio-economic status than do men respondents. The continuum of perceived current social status declines from deans in public doctoral institutions at the upper end to chairpersons in private bachelors institutions at the lower level.

13) Two other demographic indicators, of political preference and religious identity, reveal that 52% of the deans who responded are Democrats, 24% Independent, and 22% Republican. The mean range is from 80% Democrat in the doctoral institutions to 42% Democrat in the bachelor level institutions. Therefore it follows that there are fewer Democrats and Independents and more Republicans proportionately in private institutions than in public colleges. Political preference appears to shift by degree orientation, but appears to be unaffected by central or regional status. In this value preference, deans appear to be closer to professors of administration (where the choices are 46% Democrat, 26% Republican and 26% Independent [Campbell and Newell, p. 22] than to president who register as 41% Democrat, 37% Republican and 22% Independent [Cohen and March, p. 13]).

In religious preference, 61% of the respondents are Protestants, 21% Catholic, 4% Jewish, 6% some other religious preference, and 8% had no affiliation. Unlike the political pattern across categories, there appears to be no real pattern in religious identity, other than that in most cases the religious affiliation of the dean is same as that of the institution, and a higher percentage of non-affiliation is reported by doctoral respondents. The data show that the deans of education in non-church-related schools in the United States are overwhelmingly Protestant. In these respects, deans resemble presidents. Similarly, professors of administration are more likely to be Protestant (71%) and less likely to be Catholic (Campbell and Newell, p. 22).

II. Next we come to a profile of the <u>professional background</u> of the dean.

1) Of the respondents who received doctorates (again, 92%), the mean age for completion of the degree was 37, with the means of categories ranging between the ages of 31 and 40. This figure is similar to the mean of 38 which is when the average professor of educational administration received a terminal degree (Campbell and Newell, p. 26). In general, female respondents,

those who are employed in private institutions, those who carry titles other than "dean," and those who work in bachelor's level institutions obtain doctorates at a later age than do their public, male, graduate "dean" counterparts.

2) In a population of 178 deans, there were doctorates from 79 different institutions. No single institution prepared more than seven deans, although there were several institutions clustered in the six to seven graduate range. These institutions, as identified in our study, were Harvard, Indiana University, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Iowa. Three of these four institutions were identified in the Blau study as within the top 12 institutions in education. In fact, for the entire population of our study, 34% of the deans received their doctorates at one of these 12 prominent institutions.

3) For purposes of classifying areas in which respondents have engaged in study, instruction, and research, we devised a system of subject areas as follows: 1) education, unspecified; 2) social and historical foundations of education; 3) teacher education (elementary/secondary, teaching of specific subject areas, general instruction); 4) guidance, counseling and student personnel services; 5) educational administration and supervision; 6) psychology; 7) research, measurement and evaluation; 8) higher education; and 9) others. The highest percentage, 34%, of the deans took their doctorate in teacher education, with 28% majoring in educational administration. It is interesting to note that no surveyed dean of a private doctoral institution received the doctorate in administration, which contrasts with public doctoral institutions which have the highest percentage of respondents who did. We asked as well how many respondents had been involved in some prior training in administration. The affirmative response was 67%. Even though category two respondents did not pursue a doctoral major in educational administration, 60% of them have had prior administrative training.

4) We also asked the respondents to identify activities in which they had participated during the last year for the specific purpose of improving their competence as a higher education administrator. The responses were categorized as yes (unspecified); yes, through relatively insignificant activities (meaning attendance at annual conferences, etc.); yes, through more significant activities (training institutes, leave of absence for further study in an area related to role, etc.); and no. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents recorded that they had not engaged in such activities in the last year. Twenty-seven percent engaged in self-improvement activities of minor

---

[5] Peter M. Blau and Rebecca Z. Margulies, "The Reputations of American Professional Schools," Change Magazine, December, 1974.

significance and only 5% of all respondents, largely from private institutions, participated in programs with a clear and specific professional growth dimension.

5) The respondents were also asked to identify those areas in which it would have been most helpful to have had prior or additional training, and their responses were categorized according to the system described earlier (ranging from "leadership" to "power"). Twenty-seven percent of those responding wanted more help in "organizing" (executing, facilitating, making decisions); and 20% wanted prior or additional help in budgeting. In terms of leadership and program development, females report a need for additional training which exceeds that reported by males. In addition, respondents in doctoral level institutions indicate a need for prior training in coping with power relationships in complex organizations. Although clearly current deans want additional training, only one-third of them appear to have sought or found any of it available last year.

6) The survey instrument included a cluster of questions related to the career paths of deans. It may be best to begin the explanation by citing the breakdown of our respondent population by title. Thirty-seven percent are deans or acting deans; 40% are chairpersons or acting chairpersons; and the remaining 23% are heads, directors, professors or other titles. The title "dean" is used for 80% of the leadership persons in doctoral institutions. In the remaining public institution categories, 50 - 60% are deans. In the private institutions below the doctorate, fewer than 25% are titled "dean." In general this means that a higher proportion of men are likely to carry the title "dean" than are their female counterparts. (Even though this breakdown exists, we will continue to refer to the entire population as "deans," and will refer to "chairpersons," etc. only to indicate significant relationships according to title.).

7) Eighty-nine percent of the respondents took their current deanship from another position in higher education, and 57% of the population took the position from within the same institution in which they were already employed. A dean is more likely to have come from another institution in categories one, two, and three, than in the remaining categories.

8) We also reviewed information on previous employment to find that only 27% of the respondents had held prior administrative positions in higher education. Twelve percent had been chairpersons; 12% had been associate or assistant deans; and 3% had been both. Less than 1% of the population had held another deanship prior to the current one. Seventy-two percent of the respondents have had prior experience in elementary/secondary schools. Of those who have had it, 40% had been classroom teachers, 22% administrators, and an additional 38% had been both teachers and administrators. Respondents were also asked when (i.e., in what year) it first occured to them that they were interested in becoming a dean. In general, those who acquire a deanship do so about two years after first giving it serious consideration. One's

sex is a significant factor in relation to career planning since males take slightly more than this amount of time (2.2 years), while females take considerably less time between consideration and acquisition (.65 years). It is interesting to note that 91% of the current deans feel that their behavior has been influenced by an administrative role model. Far and away the biggest percentage, 36%, of these role models are other deans.

9) Another cluster of questions within professional background deals with scholarly productivity. Fifty percent of the respondents report that they had published books and/or monographs, although this percentage is above 80% in the doctoral level institutions. Deans of doctoral level institutions, particularly those in public colleges, report that they published from two to three books/monographs each, prior to entering the deanship. This rate of productivity decreases to less than one such publication for all other categories. For all categories, the rate of book publication decreases after entering the deanship.

Seventy-three percent of the respondents report that they have written articles. The mean number of articles written prior to entering the deanship is 4.3, and during the deanship, two. If the number of books and articles reported during the deanship is combined and divided into the mean number of years current deans have served, the rate of productivity for deans is one publication every two years for the total population. The deans of doctoral level universities, in contrast, produce a mean of one publication every year. In general, males write more than females. However, this discrepency in productivity appears to be accounted for by the institutional press to publish rather than being a function of one's sex.

10) The total respondents report authorship of a mean of 2.2 research and development proposals, and 2.0 training proposals during their careers. The major producers of training proposals are public doctoral level deans. Forty-six percent of the respondents are currently engaged in research (only 3% related to their job, and 10% related to their educational speciality). "Deans" appear to do more research than persons carrying other administrative titles.

On the average, deans engage in paid consulting about six days per year. With consulting and other outside activities, 82% of the deans generate less than $2,000 income per year individually, in excess of their regular salaries. In general the higher the degree level of the institution, the higher the "other" income level of the dean.

Respondents were asked to rank the amount of time spent on research and development, training projects, and consulting prior to the deanship as more, less, or the same as the amount of time spent during the deanship. Forty-nine percent of the respondents report that they spend less time now on research and development; 40% report more time on training projects, and 51% report less time in consulting. The greatest reduction in the amount of time spent on developing training projects and consulting occurs in public doctoral level institutions.

11) At this point we should note that it becomes increasingly arbitrary to separate professional background data from current professional data. A case in point is the question asked concerning membership in professional organizations. We asked first how many memberships and offices were held other than because the respondent was dean. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents belong to three or fewer national organizations, with the largest percentage of membership occuring in doctoral institutions; 2% of these same persons hold top offices in these organizations (president, vice president); and 5% of the population hold middle range offices (committee chairperson, etc.) in national professional groups. Ninety-six percent of deans, chiefly in public institutions, belong to three or fewer non-national (state, regional, or local) organizations; 5% hold top offices; and 10% hold middle range offices in these organizations. Similarly, when asked about memberships and offices held because they are deans, 95% responded that they belong to two or fewer national and two or fewer non-national organizations. The most predominant joiners tend to be "deans" in public doctoral institutions. One percent hold top national office in dean related associations; 3% hold top office in non-national groups; 9% hold middle range national office; and 8% hold middle range non-national offices. All persons who hold top offices for either professional or dean-related reasons fall within categories 1, 2, and 3. The respondent population spends 11 days at conferences yearly, with the highest attendance occuring among deans in the doctoral category.

12) We also asked questions about time away from the job, other than for professional reasons. Of those responding, 35% take all of the vacation to which they are entitled. Of those who do not take all of their vacation, 61% do so because of the press of work demands. Fewer than 10% of the respondents at doctoral institutions take all of their vacation. "Chairpersons" from private institutions are most likely to utilize all of their vacation.

13) Respondents were also asked how they spend their recreational time. The mean number of hours per week spent in recreational activities was 24. That figure includes a mean of four hours for physical recreation, five hours for recreational reading, nine hours for professional reading, and five hours for other types of recreation. Women are more likely to engage in professional and recreational reading in contrast to men who spend more of their recreation time in physical activities. Non-white respondents spend more time on professional reading than do white respondents. In addition, 83% of the respondent population felt that the deanship restricted them from pursuing personal and professional activities.

14) When asked what professional activities deans would pursue if, miraculously, they had eight working hours a week free, 64% said they would pursue activities related to their professorial interests (reading, writing, conducting research). Other less important desires were that 8% would engage in program development, and 8% in liason work or public relations. There is a significant relationship between length of tenure in the deanship and increasing interest in spending more time on activities related to staff

development. Female respondents report interest in spending more time in activities related to the power dimension of administration. Deans in private institutions would pursue program development activities if they had more time. Non-whites report an interest in spending free hours on professional activities.

Somewhat ironically, the ways in which deans would spend this additional time if they had it are unrelated to the kinds of help they state they need. Whereas deans report needed assistance in organizational matters and budget, fewer than 2% would spend newly acquired time on either organizational or budgetary problems.

III. Data which resulted from the third part of the questionnaire present a current professional profile of deans.

1) Today's typical dean has held this position for 70 months (nearly six years). His or her predecessor served a mean of eight years in the deanship. There is a significant relationship between one's title and how long one anticipates remaining in the deanship. The mean expectancy for "deans" is four to six years of additional service, while "chairpersons" anticipate remaining in that role for only one to three years. Non-whites expect to remain in office for a longer period of time (seven years or more), than do their white counterparts. In general, the same tenure expectation discrepancy exists between deans in doctoral institutions and those in bachelors level units. When comparing the data from respondents with less than one year of service as deans with those having more than two years in the role, one finds that there are few significant differences between the characteristics, perceptions of role and responsibilities, productivity, and personal and professional characteristics. This indicates that length of tenure is unrelated to the factors measured by our study.

2) An analysis of the employment condition suggests that 97% of the respondents hold academic rank. Sixty-four percent are professors, and 23% are associate professors. In general, the higher percentage of full professors occurs among males, who carry the title "dean," in public doctoral institutions. Of those who have academic rank, 74% also have tenure as a faculty member. One-hundred percent of the respondents in the doctoral institutions have faculty tenure. In contrast, 92% of the total array of respondents do not have tenure as deans. Sixty percent of the respondents have 11/12 month contracts, and 40% have 9/10 month contracts. There is a direct relationship between 11/12 month contracts, and respondents who are male, carry the title "dean," and are employed in public doctoral institutions.

3) Thirty-four percent of the deans reported that they are earning a salary of between $15,000 and $19,999 this year. Seventeen percent are earning less than $15,000 and 16% are earning between $20,000 and $24,999 this year. Only 3% of the respondents earn $40,000 or above. The highest mean

salary is reported for doctoral institutions; with the lowest salaries occuring in bachelors institutions, where private fall below public institutions. To illustrate, 40% of the private doctoral level respondents make above $40,000. In contrast, 58% of the respondents from private bachelors institutions make $20,000 or less.

4) Another cluster of questions in the current professional background arena describes the dean's span of control. Forty-eight percent of the respondents report that they have professional assistance on their immediate staff. An analysis of individual category response reveals that the majority of the subordinates exist in the doctoral institutions and in public master's degree institutions. Of these respondents who report the responsibilities of their immediate staff members, 13% work in the area of teacher education, 12% in student services, 10% in laboratory experiences, and 43% are classified as other, including administrative assistants. Only 6% of those who have assistants assign them to fiscal affairs, and another 6% have assistants for graduate programs.

5) An additional cluster of questions focused on the professional dimensions of a dean's job. Eighty-six percent of the respondents report that they teach classes. The lowest mean number of courses taught annually by those deans who teach is 1.2 in doctoral level institutions as contrasted with 4.2 in private bachelors level institutions. The mean number of courses taught last year by all respondents was reported as 3.2 courses. White respondents teach more courses than do non-white respondents. The data show that 50% of the instruction which deans execute is offered in "the teaching of" a particular subject field, in general methods of instruction courses, and in several cases includes the supervision of student teachers. The next area most frequently taught by deans is educational foundations (15%).

6) The bulk of the student advisement carried out by deans occurs in public and private level bachelors institutions. The mean number of undergraduates being regularly assigned to a dean is reported at 19. Deans at doctoral level institutions, when they advise at all, do so at the graduate level.

7) A significant portion of the questionnaire and, consequently, of the data, relate to what we have previously called respondent perceptions of feelings and functions in role. It seems appropriate to describe initially the responses recorded in relation to the question: "What do you consider to be the major functions and responsibilities of the deanship?" Using the system developed to classify the responses to open-ended, role-related questions, 17% of the respondents recorded organizing responsibilities as a major function of the deanship. Significant percentages were recorded for other functions, as follows: 16% for staff development, 14% for liason and public relations functions, 13% for program development, and 9% for budget related activities.

Statistically significant differences in functions reported were:

a. More females than males report that student development is an important function of the deanship.

b. Doctoral level respondents assign a higher priority to planning than do their colleagues in other types of institutions.

c. Budget is of greater concern to deans in public doctoral level institutions.

d. Staff development is viewed as a function more by deans than those with other titles.

e. Non-white respondents report evaluation as an important function more often than do their white counterparts.

8) Keeping in mind the functions which the respondents identified as appropriate to the deanship, an analysis follows of other related questions, using the same classification system as above. Deans were asked to identify one of their most successful, and one of their least successful activities during the past year of their deanship. A mean of 42% of the respondents experienced success in the area of program development. Eighteen percent recorded success in evaluation related activities (such as reaccreditation), and 14% identified success in staff development activities. In contrast, the highest percentage of failures, paradoxically, was recorded for activities related to staff development (25%). Twenty-one percent of the respondents experienced failure in program development activities, and 15% in budgetary activities. In both success and failure, program and staff development appear to be important considerations. Not surprisingly, only 3% of the respondents felt successful with regard to financial matters. There were no significant differences in the successes and failures reported by respondents among categories.

9) Another sequence of related questions asked deans to list three each of their most significant satisfactions and frustrations. Eighteen percent of the respondents indicated that deans receive the most satisfaction from activities associated with that portion of their role which is professorial (e.g., research, instruction and writting). "Chairpersons" spend more time in this activity and appear to get more satisfaction from it than do "deans." Before reporting other satisfactions, we will insert further explanation of perceptions related to the professorial role. It is interesting to note that 60% of the respondent population, if given a sabbatical leave, would prefer to engage in activities related to the professoriate (further study, research, writing, or a visiting professorship), as this differs from more administratively allied activities. While 55% of the respondents feel that their administrative position is one of the most important aspects of their life, this feeling is primarily exhibited by deans at public graduate level

institutions. Another 40% feel that their administrative position is only one of several important career activities; with other activities, such as teaching, research, and service being of similar importance. Also, 59% of the deans feel that they are likely to become a professor after leaving the deanship. And when asked what position they would prefer to assume, 55% again specified the professorship. Ascension to the presidency and academic vice presidency is more desired than expected - very few want to become dean at another institution - but nothing competes with the professorship.

Other satisfactions noted were as follows: 16% in the area of program development; 14% in activities related to student development; 13% in staff development (especially by respondents in public institutions); and 11% in activities related to organizational responsibilities (particularly by doctoral level respondents). Additionally, a significant number of women report staisfactions from activities related to the liason function of the deanship.

These results can be contrasted with items reported as frustrations. Twenty-four percent of the respondents report that they have experienced frustration in activities related to organization (i.e., execution, facilitation, climate-building, etc.). Eighteen percent of the respondents report frustration in the area of fiscal affairs; 16% in liason/public relations; and 15% in staff development. There is a significant relationship between certain of these frustrations and respondent groups as follows:

a. Women respondents are more frustrated by activities related to student development and power relationships

b. Respondents at master's level institutions report more frustrations with matters related to organization.

10) Closely allied to the above responses, deans say that they might be most expert in helping other deans in organizational activities (25% response) and in program development activities (also 25% response). The next most frequently recorded area of expertise is in staff development activities (11%). A more detailed analysis of these data reveal the following respondent patterns:

a. Doctoral level respondents report expertise in evaluation and in fiscal affairs. Bachelors level respondents appear least secure in these same areas.

b. Female respondents report that they could be more helpful than their male counterparts in functions related to leadership and staff development.

c. Private deans describe themselves as having student development skills in contrast to public deans who report expertise in staff development.

d. "Deans" appear to feel more secure with program-building activities than do non-deans.

As reported previously, deans collectively say that it would have been most helpful to have had prior or additional training in the areas of organization, program development and fiscal affairs. Surprisingly, needs and expertise appear to fall in the same groupings.

11) Questions related to mode of operation of deans reveal further information about role perception. We asked deans to describe faculty/administration roles in the decision-making process in their administrative unit. The format for this question was multiple choice and, as such, 46% of the respondents felt that their unit was characterized by strong leadership from officials, but much influenced by a broad spectrum of faculty through committees, faculty senate, etc. An additional 40% felt that their unit was more or less democratically run by faculty and administrators working together, as this differs from domination by faculty, college or central administration, or other external forces. It is significant that domination of the teacher education unit by the central administration increases as the degree granting level of the unit decreases.

12) Deans were also asked on what basis they made their decisions on a continuum from almost exclusively politically to almost exclusively substantively. Fifty-four percent of the respondents reported that they made their decisions on a primarily substantive, but somewhat political basis, and 23% felt that their decisions were almost exclusively substantively based.

13) Also related to the decision-making process, deans report that they typically seek advice on matters of serious professional concern primarily from their administrative superior. Sixty-eight percent responded affirmatively to this choice, which was the highest positive percentage received for any of the possible choices. Other choices which received a high percentage of "yes" answers were: 1) the faculty (collectively), 2) a professor in the same college, and 3) a member of the immediate administrative staff. Clearly rejected were such choices as professional association or agency persons, or an elementary/secondary school colleague. There seem to be no differences among the responses of varying types of deans on this question.

14) Another general question about decision-making asked deans to estimate approximately how much influence they have over institution-wide policies that effect their administrative unit, compared to their perception of the average dean. Forty-nine percent of the respondents felt that they had more than average influence. An additional thirty-eight percent of the respondents reported that they had about the same influence as other deans.

15) All of the above questions which relate to respondent feelings and functions should be juxtaposed to the responses which follow. To the

question "If you had it to do over again, would you still become a dean?" the response was an impressive 83% "yes." To the question, "Which statement describes your feeling toward your current deanship?" 24% find the role highly satisfying to them personally; 50% enjoy it most of the time; 20% find it equally satisfying and frustrating, for a 96% total response indicating moderate to high satisfaction.

Inferences, Interpretations and Projections

The purpose of this study was to collect descriptive baseline data in an area of significant interest, where heretofore there has existed only a data void. As such this is a low inference, descriptive study. The data which have evolved will be added to and tested repeatedly, both by us and by other interested researchers.

We have drawn from these data some correlations and levels of significance among and between types of respondents. To this end we offer substantive generalizations regarding the personal and professional background and role perceptions of today's deans of education.

I. Substantive Generalizations:

A. Personally, American deans of education today are most commonly healthy and energetic, middle-aged, married, male, white, Protestant, Democrat academics from a relatively non-college educated, lower middle class, non-professional-managerial, native-born, small-town, multi-child family background.

For those who are only moderately familiar with the deanship today, there were only a few, if any, major surprises to be found in our data. Not only are heads of teacher education as a group what we might have expected, but most of the differences between "deans" and "chairpersons" could have been predicted.

While using the deanship as a means of upward social mobility was expected, the relatively low level of education in the homes from which deans come was unanticipated. Similarly, the high level of spouse employment and the professional nature of that employment were surprising.

B. Professionally, American deans of education today normally hold the doctorate degree, have had some training in educational administration, entered the profession through public school experiences, advanced from there to the University faculty, and took the deanship directly from a position in higher education. Despite their administrative duties, they manage to engage in as much research and writing as do their professorial colleagues, find however that the deanship does constrain

both their personal and professional activities, belong to several national and regional professional associations, acknowledge the need for professional self-improvement, but engage in relatively little of it.

Although a common perception may have been that deans, as chief administrators of colleges of education, have therefore primarily been graduates of administration doctoral programs, they are instead predominately graduates of programs in the teaching of specific subject areas and in general instruction.

Also surprising is the apparent lack of a clear career path to the deanship. The myth of academe suggests a move from professor, to department chairperson, to assistant or associate dean, to dean, with the terminal move to the deanship generally not occuring within the same institution. Our data show that a high percentage of deans come directly from the professoriate and are as likely to be promoted from within as to change institutions to acquire a deanship.

C. The profile of the American college education dean's current status is far less clear than are the personal and professional background profiles. First, and foremost, deans are obviously happy, satisfied, secure and perceive themselves as relatively influential.

Today's dean involves faculty democratically, reaches decisions primarily on their substantive as opposed to their political merits, and consults regularly with administrative superiors on professional problems. In addition to administrative responsibilities, the dean does a modicum of teaching, advising and consulting. The dean is normally a tenured full professor, on an extended administrative contract, who is paid a salary slightly in excess of regular faculty.

Deans are capable of identifying their feelings and functions associated with role (i.e., the satisfactions and frustration, and successes and failures inherent in the deanship), and recognize a need to improve upon skills related to the deanship.

The preceding profiles are descriptive of the total population studied in this research. Other combinations of the respondents suggest two emerging profiles which do not deny the validity of those presented earlier, but which constitute contrasting and perhaps more meaningful ways of viewing the administrative heads of teacher education programs.

D. It is reasonably clear that there is one head of teacher education stereotype (type A) characterized by persons who are male, who are called "dean" and who are employed in relatively large doctoral awarding universities. These persons are productive scholars, active in national associations, and take an administrative, as opposed to a professorial perspective of their role. They appear to be relatively

autonomous in their decision-making capacity, work year around, hold full professor rank, earn a reasonably high salary, have relatively little direct student contact, and consult moderately. They tend to take little vacation, and have the job security of long-expected tenure in the deanship.

E. It is equally clear that a type B head of teacher education stereotype is confirmed by our data. This classification consists of males and females in equal number who are called "chairperson" and who are employed in relatively small bachelors degree granting colleges. They spend little time writing and researching, but have considerable student contact through teaching and advising. These persons are active in state and regional professional associations. Professorial functions and duties are as important to them as are administrative responsibilities. The central administration impinges significantly on the decisions they make. They are employed on an academic year contract, are likely to hold a rank below full professor, earn low to moderate salaries, consult irregularly, and take all of the vacation they earn. They tend to see their administrative role as temporary.

F. There is a third and far less distinct profile which we shall label transitory. Persons in this category exhibit some characteristics of both stereotypes A and B but have relatively few unique attributes. They do appear to have more problems with organizational questions than do their colleagues. They are employed chiefly in master's degree granting institutions. By inference, and without statistical verification, it appears that the role and function (and hence the setting and responsibilities) of both bachelors and doctoral level respondents are relatively stable and well defined. Master's granting institutions on the other hand, appear to be neither "fish nor fowl" and consequently reflect this inconsistency in their leader characteristics and role demands.

II. Implications for Training

One of the major objectives of this study was to derive some understandings which would be helpful in organizing programs for improving the performance of deans. What follows are some generalizations derived from our findings and impregnated with inferences, concerning the substance, process and desirability of such programs for deans.

A. Deans express a clear desire for further training. It is equally apparent that practicing deans are not receiving such instruction. It is probable that this dilemma exists because the training which deans desire is simply not available.

B. Deans are able to identify their own problems and needs. Deans are also able to identify their own areas of administrative expertise. There is a high degree of similarity between the needs of some deans and the expertise of others. Consequently, deans appear to be invaluable to the education of other deans.

C. Deans as a group need assistance with the management of their time. Not only should such assistance be part of the substance of training programs for deans, but this need also becomes one of the factors to be considered in program design.

D. Deans appear to have generic needs or problems (e.g., staff development activities). However, it appears that variability in the settings of deanships produce differences in the expectations and applications of the incumbents involved. For instance, the issue of fiscal affairs may be a common problem for many deans, but the solution for a dean in one institution may be quite different from the solution for a dean in another university.

E. The needs and competencies of deans appear, in the main, to be unrelated to the length of time that an individual has occupied the deanship. Consequently, one need not be concerned with grouping deans of similar length of experience when organizing training programs. Clearly this means that dean training programs need not be national in order to achieve the critical mass necessary for success.

F. There is only a brief span of time between when one first considers assuming a deanship and when successful candidates acquire such a position. Therefore, the time when one is receptive to pre-service training for the deanship is severely limited. In effect, it appears that in-service education for deans may be the most feasible approach.

G. We close on what we believe to be an extremely encouraging note. The fact that we received a 68% response to a complex questionnaire leads us to be confident that deans as a group are interested in improving their effectiveness and are therefore highly receptive to both the inquiries and the findings of researchers, as well as to efforts to devise training programs for them.

The Ohio State University
April, 1976

APPENDIX

INSTITUTIONAL CATEGORIES

I. Public Doctoral Level Institutions
22 institutions sampled
17 responses received

II. Private Doctoral Level Institutions
10 institutions sampled
5 responses received

III. Public Master's Level Institutions
49 institutions sampled
38 responses received

IV. Public Master's Level Institutions, Regional Campuses
8 institutions sampled
7 responses received

V. Private Master's Level Institutions
55 institutions sampled
30 responses received

VI. Public Bachelors Level Institutions
13 institutions sampled
10 responses received

VII. Public Bachelors Level Institutions, Regional Campuses
5 institutions sampled
3 responses received

VIII. Private Bachelors Level Institutions
109 institutions sampled
68 responses received

271 Total Institutions Sampled
178 Total Usable Responses Received